

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANTS

<p>International Consultancy: Process Evaluation of Cambodia’s Social- and Rights-Based Disability Identification Mechanism</p>	<p>Duty Station: Phnom Penh</p>
<p>Context:</p> <p>The rights of persons with disabilities in Cambodia are enshrined under the 2009 Law on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which Cambodia ratified in 2021. In order to identify these individuals, a Guideline on Social- and Rights-Based Disability Identification was adopted by the Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation (MoSVY) in August 2020. This disability identification mechanism (DIM) intends to organize a common standard on disability identification and recording in a Disability Management Information System (DMIS), which then issues identification cards that enable beneficiaries to access social protection benefits and other services provided by the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) and partners. The DIM was further institutionalized with the recent passage of an RGC Sub-decree on Disability identification through social-and rights-based models, in July 2023.</p> <p>The national Social and Rights-Based Disability Identification Mechanism (DIM) serves as an administrative database and forms the basis for providing services and promoting the development of persons with disabilities, including for children both above and below age 8 (with different screening questionnaires used for early identification among the younger children). Data from individuals with disabilities are collected at the village level through focal points at the commune/sangkat, and these records are stored digitally in the DMIS.</p> <p>The National Social Assistance Family Package for IDPoor households and the vulnerable (NSA-FP) was approved by the RGC and is set to launch in December 2023. It is designed to strengthen poor households’ ability to invest in human capital and achieve long-lasting prosperity and reduce poverty and vulnerability in families through integrating cash transfers. The NSA-FP includes several programmes such as the Cash Transfer Program for Pregnant Women and Children under 2 (CTP-PWYC), Scholarships for Primary and Secondary students, Cash Transfer for People with Disabilities (CTP-PWD), and the Cash Transfer for Elderly and people living with HIV/AIDS. For people with disabilities in the vulnerable group (near poor), the data from DMIS will be used for targeting and links with the IDPoor system.</p> <p>The DIM is included as one of the objectives of the National Social Protection Policy Framework 2016-2025 (NSPPF). The NSPPF provides the framework and action plan for the implementation of social protection in Cambodia, including its two current pillars on Social Assistance and Social Security. The implementation of the NSPPF is coordinated by the National Social Protection Council (NSPC), with social protection measures under NSPPF seeing significant acceleration in recent years. The NSPPF caters for specific vulnerabilities of the Cambodian population (including persons with disability – PWD), with a number of objectives set forth for the protection of PWD under the social assistance and social security pillar, including reforming the identification system for PWD and reviewing conditions for the provision of protection and support, amongst other measures.</p> <p>As the DIM is relatively new and has gone through initial phases of implementation, in order to enable learning and potential improvements in the design and delivery of the programme, the RGC, through the General Secretariat of the National Social Protection Council (GS-NSPC) has requested UNICEF support for implementation of a process evaluation of the mechanism.</p>	

Purpose of Activity/Assignment:

The primary purpose of this process evaluation is to foster learning and the improvement of the DIM delivery. The evaluation will aim to assess and improve the effectiveness, efficiency and accuracy of the process used to identify individuals with disabilities, as well as to identify and address any potential barriers impeding access to identification. In addition, the evaluation is to explore possibilities for the use of disability data, including through disability inclusive social protection and potential interoperability with other data systems including health, education and employment. The evaluation will identify lessons learned from the DIM and provide recommendations for improvements in DIM design and implementation.

The primary audience of this evaluation is the GS-NSPC, as primarily responsible for the coordination of the DIM, and the monitoring and evaluation of the social protection sector. MoSVY as the lead implementing ministry through its Disability Department also constitutes the primary audience for the evaluation. UNICEF Cambodia PPF4C (Policy and Public Finance for Children) section and management will use the evaluation to enhance its support to the DIM. All partner implementing ministries will also be part of the primary audience as the evaluation will provide recommendations that will be aimed at all key stakeholders. Rights holders (persons with disability) are expected to be directly impacted by the evaluation findings through improvements and changes to the DIM design and delivery.

Secondary audiences are development partners and UN Agencies engaged in the social protection sector as well as the UNICEF Regional Office, who will benefit from increased evidence on what works and what lessons can be applied to other countries in similar situations.

Scope of Work:

1. Objectives, and scope of the evaluation

Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation has three primary objectives:

- 1.1. Analyse the DIM programme design and the programme’s normative and implementation framework following agreed assessment criteria (e.g. existence and effectiveness of guidelines, work processes, MIS)
- 1.2. Analyse the effectiveness and efficiency of DIM implementation following key components of its design and the operational/delivery steps as identified in the operational manual, including the mobilization, assessment process, case management, grievance system, amongst other steps, as well as the effectiveness and efficiency of the institutional arrangements and delivery mechanisms, particularly at sub-national level;
- 1.3. Assess, to the extent possible, the barriers linked to both the operational steps in the identification process as well as other barriers preventing households from accessing or demanding registration, including the physical and information barriers as well as social norms and other concerns/perceptions linked to the identification process.

Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation will cover the national social- and rights-based DIM. The evaluation sample of respondents will be designed in such a manner to cover key stakeholders at different levels following

the programme design. The sample for direct service providers and beneficiaries will include selection of different age groups and geographic areas reflecting different realities of persons with disabilities in Cambodia (rural/urban and specific areas with over representation of minorities and hard to reach populations). The evaluation will be primarily qualitative but will also, to the extent possible, include analysis of available quantitative data on processes and intermediary outcomes.

The evaluation will focus on persons with disability as primary rights-holders, and on programme implementers (expected to be involved within the evaluation as key informants) and service providers (Ministry officials, commune officials, health workers, among others) as primary duty bearers. Given that the DIM delivery is implemented by a limited number of institutions, whereas it has potential to inform programmes and service delivery in multiple sectors, the evaluation will also include KIIs with selected ministries and other institutions that may become users of the DIM data.

The temporal scope of the evaluation covers the period since August 2020 when the MoSVY DIM guideline was adopted. Due to constraints imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic, the 2020-2021 period likely experienced some delay in implementation of the guideline. The evaluation will draw from previous versions of disability identification to understand changes, but these will not be subject to the evaluation.

This being a process evaluation, the impacts of social protection measures for PWD (on improved wellbeing, including health and nutrition) cannot yet be assessed.

2. Evaluation framework and questions

The evaluation criteria to be used in this evaluation are based on the OECD/DAC Evaluation criteria supplemented and adjusted where necessary to ensure that the evaluation meets specific objectives. The criteria covered under this evaluation are relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency and coherence. In addition, cross-cutting equity, gender equality and human rights considerations are also considered. Some key questions include:

Relevance of the programme:

1. *To what extent is DIM relevant to the identified needs of target populations and their families?*
 - *Are the programme and interventions customized enough to address the needs of the target population by age, gender, type of disability, place of residence and other factors?*
2. *Were relevant partners involved in the programme design and implementation, including target population, their families and organizations of people with disabilities?*
3. *Is the project responsive to changing needs and circumstances? Was it adjusted through the course of its implementation?*

Effectiveness of the programme, including its delivery mechanisms:

4. *To what extent have the objectives of DIM been realized? Are there signs that the DIM is facilitating access to services for PWDs?*
5. *How effective is DIM in identifying different types of disability? What are the main constraints/challenges in assessing all types of disability?*
6. *Does the DIM involve any practices that may have a differential impact on specific groups? Is the process inclusive and equitable?*

7. *Are the methods and procedures (e.g. awareness raising and outreach activities, on-demand approach, grievance mechanism) used in the DIM accessible and acceptable for individuals with different types of disabilities?*
8. *What are the main barriers in accessing DIM for persons with disabilities?*
9. *What are the (perceived) advantages of the DIM?*

Sustainability of the programme's service provision:

10. *To what degree does the programme build capacities of relevant service providers for implementation of the DIM? How is this capacity built? Are there any specific capacity gaps in following the identification steps that need to be addressed and/or strengthened?*
11. *Are there sufficient resources allocated from government to sustain the DIM in the future? Is current budget allocation approach sustainable?*

Efficiency of the delivery mechanism, considering:

12. *How cost-effective is the DIM from the perspective of administrative costs versus the benefits received?*
13. *Is the project implementation appropriately monitored? How are the results of monitoring used? Will the DIM be reviewed/adjusted regularly over the course of its implementation?*
14. *Is the DIM time efficient from the perspective of supporting beneficiaries in a timely manner?*

Coherence:

15. *To what extent are there synergies and interlinkages between the DIM and other interventions carried out by the government and partners? (such as those under NSSF, the Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training for workplace injuries, and the MoP IDPoor process)*
 - *Do **coordination mechanisms** between key stakeholders exist, and if so, to what extent are they well designed, clear and active? Are there differences in coordination at national or sub-national levels?*
16. *Does the DIM identification process work coherently across different age categories?*

Cross-cutting dimensions:

17. *Are there any difficulties in accessing the DIM for women with disabilities? Are there any special barriers or concerns from a gender perspective?*
18. *What are the main concerns and/or barriers linked to the assessment of different age groups, particularly young children and the elderly, under DIM?*

Gender equality, equity and human rights considerations must also be used as a lens when responding to all evaluation questions and not be limited to the questions posed above. Reference and use of rights-based frameworks such as CRC, CCC, CRPD, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks are expected in the design of the evaluation and analysis and presentation of findings.

The above evaluation questions are indicative. Through a consultative process, the evaluation team is expected to review the feasibility of answering the existing evaluation questions and propose changes if needed during the inception phase ensuring that all questions can be answered. As agreed, evaluation questions will need to be answered in the final evaluation report and will guide the findings of the evaluation.

3. Evaluation approach and methodology

Based on the objectives of the evaluation, this section indicates a possible approach, methods, and processes for the evaluation. Methodological rigor will be given significant consideration in the assessment of proposals. Hence consultants are invited to interrogate the approach and methodology proffered in the ToR and improve on it, or propose an approach they deem more appropriate, which should be guided by the UNICEF's revised Evaluation Policy (2023)¹, the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016)², Guidance on Integrating Disability Inclusion in Evaluations and Reporting on the UNDIS Entity Accountability Framework Evaluation Indicator³, UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation (2014)⁴, UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator, UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2020)⁵, UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards and Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis (2015)⁶ and UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards (2017).⁷ Moreover, the evaluation should consider throughout issues of equity, gender equality and human rights. In their proposal, consultants should clearly refer to triangulation, sampling plan, ethical considerations (including, ethical clearance) and methodological limitations and mitigation measures. They are encouraged to also demonstrate methodological expertise in evaluating similar initiatives.

It is expected that the evaluation will employ non-experimental, mixed methods approach drawing on key project documents, the constructed Theory of Change and the monitoring framework for guidance. The evaluation should also consider throughout issues of equity, gender equality and human rights.

The evaluation takes a process evaluation approach with the purpose of informing the potential adjustments in the Programme design and its delivery system.

At minimum, the evaluation will draw on the following methods:

- Desk review of project documents and other relevant data;
- Review and analysis of secondary quantitative data;
- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs);
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs);
- Case studies of women with disabilities and persons with disabilities that are difficult to identify;
- Cost-effectiveness analysis;
- Observation of Programme processes;
- Consultant should pay particular attention to disability accessibility features when developing data collection tools.

The data collected should be disaggregated by sex, age, disability etc. where relevant and focus on both the implementers (incl. communes, health centres, CCWCs, village chiefs, and other key stakeholders) as well as persons with disabilities and the key informants at central, provincial and district levels.

¹ UNICEF's revised Evaluation Policy: <https://www.unicef.org/executiveboard/media/18416/file/2023-27-Revised-evaluation-policy-EN-ODS.pdf>

² UNEG Norms: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>, UNEG Standards: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/22>

³ <https://unevaluation.org/document/detail/3050>

⁴ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616>

⁵ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>

⁶ https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/ATTACHMENT_IV-UNICEF_Procedure_for_Ethical_Standards.PDF

⁷ [https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/files/UNICEF_adapated_reporting_standards_updated_June_2017_FINAL\(1\).pdf](https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/files/UNICEF_adapated_reporting_standards_updated_June_2017_FINAL(1).pdf)

Sampling of KIIs and FGDs should be done in consultation with GS-NSPC, MoSVY and UNICEF. The evaluation sample should reconsider a balance of criteria such as socioeconomic indicators, remoteness, ethnicities, age groups, etc.

To enrich the analysis, the evaluation will use, to the extent possible, quantitative data gathered by MoSVY through the disability identification database.

Conventional ethical guidelines are to be followed during the evaluation. Specific reference is made to the revised UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System and UNEG Ethical Guidelines as well as to the UNICEF's revised Evaluation Policy, and the UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis and UNICEF's Evaluation Reporting Standards.⁸ In case children or vulnerable populations are expected to be included under the data collection, ethical review from an IRB will be required and will be responsibility of the evaluation team upon approval of the inception report. Good practices not covered therein are also to be followed. Any sensitive issues or concerns should be raised with the evaluation management team as soon as they are identified.

There are several limitations to the evaluation which can hinder the process, notably: (i) disaggregated data may not be available at the local level, or the quality of available data may not be satisfactory; (ii) interviewing government counterparts may depend on their availability. Applicants should discuss the above or other potential limitations (including limitations of proposed methodologies and sampling) in their proposal and further identify during the inception phase. The limitations that could lead to changes in evaluation questions and scope of analysis and mitigation measures should be clearly identified at the inception phase before initiation of data collection.

4. Evaluation management and coordination

The evaluation will be conducted by an external evaluation team to be recruited by UNICEF Cambodia, on behalf of GS-NSPC and MoSVY. The evaluation team will operate under the direct supervision of UNICEF, which will coordinate management with GS-NSPC. This evaluation management team will be responsible for the day-to-day oversight and management of the evaluation and for the management of the evaluation budget; will assure the quality and independence of the evaluation and guarantee its alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines; will provide quality assurance checking that the evaluation findings and conclusions are relevant and recommendations are implementable, and; will contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response. The final report will also be approved by the Country Representative at UNICEF Cambodia.

Additional stakeholders from GS-NSPC, Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation (MoSVY), Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Planning, and other partners (to be identified) will be engaged to support management of the evaluation. These stakeholders will contribute to preparation and design of the evaluation, including providing feedback and comments on the inception report and on the technical quality of the work of the consultants; provide comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality – from a technical point of view – of the draft and final evaluation reports; assist in identifying internal and external stakeholders to be consulted during the evaluation process; participate in review meetings organized by the evaluation management team and with the evaluation team as required; play

⁸ Please refer to: <http://www.unicef.org/evaluation>

a key role in learning and knowledge sharing from the evaluation results, contributing to disseminating the findings of the evaluation and follow-up on implementation of the management response.

The consultant will work in close collaboration with the GS-NSPC and MoSVY, as well as line ministries and institutions responsible for the DIM programme implementation.

5. Evaluation team profile

The evaluation will be conducted by engaging a qualified individual consultant (Team Leader). The proposed consultant may be supported by an additional assistant (Team Member/Technical Expert). The exact composition of the team to meet the requirements and timelines should be specified in the technical proposal.

The Team Leader will sign the contract and be responsible for undertaking the evaluation from start to finish, for managing the evaluation, for the bulk of data collection, analysis and consultations, as well as for report drafting and communication of the evaluation results.

The Team Member will play a major role in data collection, analysis and presentation, and preparation of the debriefings and will make significant contributions to analysis and writing of the main evaluation report.

The evaluation team is expected to be balanced with respect to gender to ensure accessibility of both male and female informants during the data collection process. Back-office support assisting the team with logistics and other administrative matters is also expected. **It is vital that the same individuals that develop the methodology for the proposal will be involved in conducting the evaluation. In review of proposals, while adequate consideration will be given to the technical methodology, significant weighting will be given to the quality, experience (based on CVs and written samples) and relevance of individuals who will be involved in the evaluation.**

Please see qualification requirements section.

Child Safeguarding

Is this project/assignment considered as "[Elevated Risk Role](#)" from a child safeguarding perspective?

YES NO If YES, check all that apply:

Direct contact role YES NO

If yes, please indicate the number of hours/months of direct interpersonal contact with children, or work in their immediately physical proximity, with limited supervision by a more senior member of personnel:

Child data role YES NO

If yes, please indicate the number of hours/months of manipulating or transmitting personal-identifiable information of children (name, national ID, location data, photos):

<p>More information is available in the Child Safeguarding SharePoint and Child Safeguarding FAQs and Updates</p>		
<p>Budget year: 2023</p>	<p>Requesting Section/Issuing Office: PPF4C and Evaluation</p>	<p>Reasons why consultancy cannot be done by staff: Evaluation need to be carried out independently to avoid conflict of interests</p>
<p>Included in Annual/Rolling Workplan: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No, please justify: Programme Area: Social Policy Output 5.1: By 2023, children and adolescents, including the most disadvantaged, benefit from effective social services and a child-sensitive social protection system. Key Result Area 5.1.6: The Social and Rights Based Disability Identification database is available and used for integration with other social assistance programmes, and evaluated. Activity 5.1.6.1 Technical Assistance to conduct process evaluation of disability identification mechanism</p>		
<p>Consultant sourcing: <input type="checkbox"/> National <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> International <input type="checkbox"/> Both</p>		
<p>Competitive Selection: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advertisement <input type="checkbox"/> Roster <input type="checkbox"/> Informal competitive (Low Value Contract)</p>		
<p>Single Source Selection: <input type="checkbox"/> (Emergency - Director's approval)</p>		
<p>If Extension, Justification for extension:</p>		
<p>Supervisor: Multi Country Evaluation Specialist</p>	<p>Start Date: 1 January 2024</p>	<p>End Date: 31 May 2024</p>

<p>5. Final evaluation report, executive summary, infographic and other materials finalized. All final materials will need to be submitted also in Khmer.</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>Minimum Qualifications required*: <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelors <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Masters <input type="checkbox"/> PhD <input type="checkbox"/> Other</p> <p>Team Leader:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holding an advanced university degree (Masters or higher) in international development, public policy, evaluation or similar, including sound knowledge of policy and systemic aspects; familiarity with monitoring and evaluation social protection programmes <p>National Team Member/Technical Expert (if required):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holding advanced university degrees (Masters-level) in international development, public policy or similar. 	<p>Knowledge/Expertise/Skills required*:</p> <p>Team Leader:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having extensive evaluation experience (at least 12 years) with an excellent understanding of evaluation principles and methodologies, including capacity in an array of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods, and UNEG Norms and Standards. • A minimum of 3 evaluations led at the programme and/or outcome levels with international organizations • Bringing a strong commitment to delivering timely and high-quality results, i.e., credible evaluations that are used for improving strategic decisions. • Having in-depth knowledge of the UN’s human rights, disability inclusion, gender equality and equity agendas. • Having a strong team leadership and management track record, as well as excellent interpersonal and communication skills to help ensure that the evaluation is understood and used. • Experience in undertaking cost-effectiveness and value for money analysis of social protection programmes or schemes. • Previous experience of working in a Southeast Asian context is desirable, together with understanding of the Cambodian context and cultural dynamics. • The Team Leader must be committed and willing to work independently, with limited regular supervision; s/he must demonstrate adaptability and flexibility, client orientation, proven ethical practice, initiative, concern for accuracy and quality. • S/he must have the ability to concisely and clearly express ideas and concepts in written and oral form as well as the ability to communicate with various stakeholders in English. <p>Team Member (if required):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hands-on experience in collecting and analysing quantitative and qualitative data, but this is
---	---

	<p>secondary to solid expertise in social protection or disability identification in Cambodia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong expertise in disability inclusion, equity, gender equality and human rights-based approaches to evaluation and expertise in data presentation and visualisation. • Be committed and willing to work in a complex environment and able to produce quality work under limited guidance and supervision. • Having good communication, advocacy and people skills and the ability to communicate with various stakeholders and to express concisely and clearly ideas and concepts in written and oral form, with attention to disability accessibility features. • Experience of conducting evaluations of RGC and/or UN programmes is an asset. • Excellent Khmer and English communication and report writing skills.
<p>*Minimum requirements to consider candidates for competitive process</p>	<p>*Listed requirements will be used for technical evaluation in the competitive process</p>
<p>Submission of applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Letter of Interest (cover letter) ▪ CV ▪ Performance evaluation reports or references of similar consultancy assignments ▪ Technical proposal: The written technical proposal will be submitted in electronic (PDF) format and include the following elements, at a minimum: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Narrative description of the team leader’s experience and capacity in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation of social protection or disability identification interventions; - Process evaluation of social protection interventions, ideally implemented by government institutions; - Previous assignments in developing countries in general, and related to social protection programmes, preferably in South-East Asia; and - Previous and current evaluation assignments using UNEG Norms and Standards. b) Relevant references of the proposer (past and on-going assignments) in the past five years. UNICEF may contact reference persons for feedback on services provided by the proposers. c) Samples or links to samples of previous relevant work listed as reference of the proposer (at least three), on which the team leader directly and actively contributed or authored. d) Methodology proposed, with minimum repetition of this ToR. There is no minimum or maximum length. If in doubt, ensure sufficient detail. e) Work plan, which will include as a minimum requirement the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General work plan based on the one proposed in the ToR, with comments and proposed adjustments, if any; and - Detailed timetable by activity (must be consistent with the general work plan and the financial proposal). f) Evaluation team (for Team member(s) as well if Team lead decides to compose a team): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summary presentation of proposed experts; 	

- Description of support staff (number and profile of research and administrative assistants etc.);
- Level of effort of proposed experts by activity (it must be consistent with the financial proposal); and
- CV of each expert proposed to carry out the evaluation.

Please note that the duration of the assignment will be from January to May 2024, and it is foreseen that the Team Leader and the Team Member will devote roughly 60% of their time to the evaluation. The presence of a conflict of interest of any kind (e.g., having worked for or partnered with MoSVY or any other implementing ministry or agency on the design or implementation of Cambodia’s disability identification mechanisms will automatically disqualify prospective candidates from consideration).

- Financial proposal: All-inclusive lump-sum cost including consultancy fee, travel fee, translation services, report editing, overheads, accommodation cost and medical health insurance fee for this assignment as per work assignment.

The financial proposal must be fully separated from the technical proposal. The consultant will be responsible for all travel arrangements, including in-country (if required). No additional cost outside of the scope of this TOR will be covered by UNICEF. Travel cost shall be calculated based on economy class travel, regardless of the length of travel and costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals shall not exceed applicable daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, as promulgated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC).

In case a consultant with a disability requires reasonable accommodation for travel or to execute certain tasks, this information should be shared, with a separate budget line (if any). To ensure a fair process, this information will not be part of the financial assessment or evaluation of the competing applications.

Evaluation Criteria (This will be used for the [Selection Report](#) (for clarification see [Guidance](#)))

A) Technical Evaluation (points out of 75)

- Educational background: 8 points
- Relevant experience: 12 points
- Technical proposal: 55 points

B) Financial Proposal (points out of 25)

Please see more detail in Annex 3

The maximum number of points shall be allotted to the lowest Financial Proposal that is opened /evaluated and compared among those technical qualified candidates who have attained a minimum (50) points score in the technical evaluation. Other Financial Proposals will receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest price.

The Contract shall be awarded to candidate obtaining the highest combined technical and financial scores, subject to the satisfactory result of the verification interview.

Administrative details:

Visa assistance required:

If office based, seating arrangement identified:

IT and Communication equipment required:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Home Based <input type="checkbox"/> Office Based:	Email/O365 access required: <input type="checkbox"/> Internet access required: <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--

¹ Costs indicated are estimated. Final rate shall follow the “best value for money” principle, i.e., achieving the desired outcome at the lowest possible fee. Consultants will be asked to stipulate all-inclusive fees, including lump sum travel and subsistence costs, as applicable.

Payment of professional fees will be based on submission of agreed deliverables. UNICEF reserves the right to withhold payment in case the deliverables submitted are not up to the required standard or in case of delays in submitting the deliverables on the part of the consultant

Text to be added to all TORs:

Individuals engaged under a consultancy or individual contract will not be considered “staff members” under the Staff Regulations and Rules of the United Nations and UNICEF’s policies and procedures and will not be entitled to benefits provided therein (such as leave entitlements and medical insurance coverage). Their conditions of service will be governed by their contract and the General Conditions of Contracts for the Services of Consultants and Individual Contractors. Consultants and individual contractors are responsible for determining their tax liabilities and for the payment of any taxes and/or duties, in accordance with local or other applicable laws.

The selected candidate is solely responsible to ensure that the visa (applicable) and health insurance required to perform the duties of the contract are valid for the entire period of the contract. Selected candidates are subject to confirmation of fully-vaccinated status against SARS-CoV-2 (Covid-19) with a World Health Organization (WHO)-endorsed vaccine, which must be met prior to taking up the assignment. It does not apply to consultants who will work remotely and are not expected to work on or visit UNICEF premises, programme delivery locations or directly interact with communities UNICEF works with, nor to travel to perform functions for UNICEF for the duration of their consultancy contracts.

UNICEF offers [reasonable accommodation](#) for consultants with disabilities. This may include, for example, accessible software, travel assistance for missions or personal attendants. We encourage you to disclose your disability during your application in case you need reasonable accommodation during the selection process and afterwards in your assignment.

ANNEX 1: List of key stakeholders

Stakeholder	Roles and responsibilities	National/ Sub-national level
General Secretariat for the National Social Protection Council (GS-NSPC)	Responsible for coordination with relevant ministries and institutions in programme implementation; provides policy and strategy orientation; monitors progress; coordinates evaluation of the programme; prepares progress reports for the RGC	National
Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation (MoSVY)	Responsible for leading and managing the programme. develops legal instruments; programme administration; establishes and manages database; capacity building; implements plans and budgets for the programme; cooperates and coordinates with relevant ministries; resource mobilization; monitoring; reporting	National
Ministry of Interior (MoI)	Responsible for coordinating and supporting programme implementation at sub-national administrations; develops legal instruments to enhance effectiveness; coordinates with MoSVY and other ministries for training; awareness raising, strengthens existing sub-national mechanisms to monitor implementation and cooperate in M&E.	National
Ministry of Planning (MoP)	Use disability identification data to be incorporated in the IDPoor database system; provides technical support to include data on poor families into the disability identification database system; coordinates and promotes cooperation between ministries or institutions and development partners to support data exchange.	National
Provincial/District Department of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation (PDoSVY)	Responsible for leading, implementing, awareness raising and monitoring the programme implementation with support of MoSVY to ensure quality provision of the disability identification process, and to respond to implementation issues	Provincial
Commune administration	Responsible for mobilizing PWD to register in the disability identification programme, interview PWD or caretakers, case management, monitoring, addressing grievances and collaboration with CCWCs and PDoSVY/MoSVY	Commune
UNICEF	Responsible for provision of technical and direct support in all phases of programme design, implementation and monitoring	National
Other DPs	Responsible for provision of technical inputs and partnership for future linkage of cash transfers with referral to services and social care.	

Annex 2: Evaluation deliverables and timeline

Evaluation products expected for this exercise are:

- a) An inception report (in English), in an agreed format, in preparation for data collection, and a PowerPoint presentation of the inception report (in English and Khmer) to present to the Reference Group;
- b) A report of the initial evaluation findings from primary data collection (in English), including a desk review analysis and a PowerPoint presentation of the initial findings (in English and Khmer) to facilitate a stakeholder consultation exercise;
- c) A draft report (in English) and final report (in both English and Khmer) that will be written in accordance to the requirements of the Global Evaluation Report Oversight System¹ and revised until approved (incl. a complete first draft to be reviewed by the evaluation management team and UNICEF; a second draft to be reviewed by the reference group, and a final draft);
- d) A PowerPoint presentation of the final report (in both English and Khmer) to be used to share findings with the reference group and for use in subsequent dissemination events;
- e) A four-page evaluation brief (in both English and Khmer) that is distinct from the executive summary in the evaluation report and is intended for a broader, non-technical and non-UNICEF audience.

Other interim products are:

- a) Minutes of key meetings with the evaluation management team and the reference group; and
- b) Presentation materials for the meetings with the evaluation management team and the reference group. These may include PowerPoint summaries of work progress and conclusions to that point.

Outlines and descriptions of each evaluation product are meant to be indicative, and include:

- Inception report: The inception report (of maximum 20 pages, excluding annexes) will be key in confirming a common understanding of what is to be evaluated, including additional insights into executing the evaluation. At this stage the evaluation team will refine and confirm evaluation questions, confirm the scope of the evaluation, further improve on the methodology proposed in the ToR and their own evaluation proposal to improve its rigor, as well as develop and validate evaluation instruments. The report will include, among other elements: i) evaluation purpose and scope, confirmation of objectives and the main themes of the evaluation; ii) evaluation criteria and questions, final set of evaluation questions, and evaluation criteria for assessing performance; iii) evaluation methodology (i.e., sampling criteria), a description of data collection methods and data sources (incl. a rationale for their selection), draft data collection instruments, for example questionnaires, with a data collection toolkit as an annex, an evaluation matrix that identifies descriptive and normative questions and criteria for evaluating evidence, a data analysis plan, a discussion on how to enhance the reliability and validity of evaluation conclusions, the field visit approach, a description of the quality review process and a discussion on the limitations of the methodology; iv) proposed structure of the final report; v) evaluation work plan and timeline, including a revised work and travel plan; vi) resources requirements (i.e., detailed budget allocations, tied to evaluation activities, work plan, deliverables); v) annexes (i.e., organizing matrix for evaluation questions, data collection toolkit, data analysis framework); and vi) format of an evaluation briefing note for external communication purposes. The inception report will be presented at a formal meeting of the reference group.
- Initial evaluation findings: This report will present the initial evaluation findings from primary data collection, comprising the desk-based document review and analysis of the programme.

The report developed prior to the first drafts of the final report should be 10 pages, or about 6,000 words in length (excluding annexes, if any), and should be accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation that can be used for validation with key stakeholders.

- Final evaluation report: The report will not exceed 50 pages, excluding the executive summary and annexes.
- PowerPoint presentation (both in English and Khmer): Initially prepared and used by the evaluation team in their presentation to the reference group, a standalone PowerPoint will be submitted to the evaluation management team as part of the evaluation deliverables.
- An evaluation brief of four pages (distinct from the executive summary, both in English and Khmer) for external users will be submitted to the evaluation management team as part of the evaluation deliverables.
- Reports will be prepared according to the UNICEF Style Guide and UNICEF Brand Toolkit (to be shared with the winning bidder) and UNICEF standards for evaluation reports as per Geros guidelines (referenced before).

Quality assurance of evaluation key reports: The first draft of the final report (in English) will be received by the evaluation management team and UNICEF who will revert with comments within 5 working days, and work with the team leader on necessary revisions. The second draft will be sent to the reference group (in both English and Khmer). The evaluation management team will consolidate all comments on a response matrix and request the evaluation team to indicate actions taken against each comment in the production of the final draft. The evaluation team needs to revert with revised reports within one week of receipt of comments. All final deliverables are to be developed with attention to disability accessibility features and to maximise its utility and accessibility.⁹

The documents produced during the period of this consultancy will be treated strictly confidential and the rights of distribution and/or publication shall solely reside with UNICEF (as per standard terms and conditions). Some of the documents (see where indicated in the deliverables above) should be developed in both English and Khmer. The translation costs are to be covered by the consultants and clearly budgeted in the financial proposal. All deliverables are to be developed with attention to disability accessibility features. Any costs regarding disability accessibility features are to be clearly budgeted in the financial proposal as well (if any).

Annex 3: Detailed selection criteria

Criteria	Points	Unit of Analysis
Experience of Key Personnel		
1. Range and depth of experience with similar projects (reference to similar contracts)	5	Information on similar activities having been undertaken by the team of individuals going to be involved in this evaluation (max 3 points) Recent and current contracts with similar agencies (UN, NGOs) using UNEG Norms and Standards (max 2 points)

⁹ Tips and guidance to produce content for people with limited or no vision is available at: <http://www.euroblind.org/publications-and-resources/making-information-accessible-all> and 10 tips for accessible content: <https://4syllables.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/tip-sheet-accessible.pdf>

2. Team Leader (relevant experience, qualifications, certifications)	10	<p>Number of years of relevant professional experience in delivering high-level, evidence driven evaluations of disability or social protection interventions or similar, and preferably in East Asia (max 2 points)</p> <p>Experience in social protection sector or similar (max 2 points)</p> <p>Experience as team leader or project manager (max 1 point)</p> <p>Quality of written sample (max 4 points)</p> <p>Qualifications/certificates (max 1 point)</p>
3. Team Member (relevant experience, qualifications, certifications)	5	<p>Numbers and respective years of relevant professional experience in social protection programmes related to disabilities (max 2 points)</p> <p>Relevant technical expertise in in collecting and analysing quantitative and qualitative data (max 2 points)</p> <p>Qualifications/certificates (max 1 point)</p>
Proposed Methodology and Approach		
4. Description of implementation, operational methodology	40	<p>Description of the proposed process for conducting the quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis including the tools that will be used (max 10 points)</p> <p>Match between the proposed approach and requested scope of the evaluation (max 10 points)</p> <p>References to relevant data and information sources (max 5 points)</p> <p>Description of data analysis (max 5 points)</p> <p>Other creative, innovative referenced ideas for methodology/tools and presentation of findings (max 10 points)</p>
5. Timeframe	10	<p>Adherence of the proposed timeframe and work plan to the ToR (max 5 point)</p> <p>Adherence to all the milestones outlined in the ToR (max 5 point)</p>
6. Potential constraints considered	5	<p>At least two considerations outlined (max 2 points)</p> <p>Description of the process and procedures to deal/mitigate these constraints (max 2 points)</p> <p>Reference to additional resources which can be made available for the evaluation (max 1 point)</p>
Sub-Total		Maximum 75

PRICE EVALUATION

Criteria		Total costs (in USD\$)
Sub-Total	25	The maximum score assigned to the price proposal (i.e., 25 points) will allocated to the lowest priced proposal. All other price proposals receive scores in inverse order and proportional to the lowest price (i.e. double the price would receive half the score).
TOTAL		Maximum 100