TERMS OF REFERENCE for RFPS
Evaluation Office
Evaluability Assessment and Formative Evaluation of UNICEF's Approaches to Advocacy

1. Executive Summary

UNICEF is strategically positioning advocacy in its new, 2022-2025 Strategic Plan (SP), jointly with an innovative vision for transforming advocacy for children. The independent Evaluability Assessment and Formative Evaluation of UNICEF's Approaches to Advocacy, commissioned by UNICEF Evaluation Office, is a proactive and forward-looking exercise that will provide critical evidence to inform UNICEF's advocacy planning to improve the chances of advocacy success. This *ex-ante* evaluation will also permit the most robust possible evaluation of UNICEF's work in this area toward the end of the SP. These Terms of Reference (ToR) describe the main purpose, primary users, objectives, and tentative evaluability matrix, proposed methodological approach, associated risks, and qualifications external consultants (tentatively two team members) required to undertake this evaluative exercise. The evaluation will be conducted between October 2022 and April 2023. Both institutional and individual bidders may apply.

2. Introduction

Since 1946, UNICEF has been "mandated by the United Nations General Assembly to advocate for the protection of children's rights, to help meet their basic needs and to expand their opportunities to reach their full potential".[1] Following a rights-based approach, and guided by the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), advocacy has therefore been an integral component of UNICEF programme work.

Over the past few years, the organization has undergone important structural changes to reinforce its advocacy and communication strengths and address its challenges. The 2018-2021 SP states the organization's mandate and comparative advantages in support of the 2030 Agenda through "normative work on child rights, policy advocacy, systems strengthening and service delivery with the goal of leaving no child behind (…).". Its commitment is clearly recognized through the key role that communications and advocacy played as a Change Strategy.[2] More recently, the updated "UNICEF Global Communication and Advocacy Strategy 2019-2021, Communicate to Advocate: Driving Change for Children",[3] framed UNICEF global communications and advocacy strategic goals, its monitoring and evaluation framework, and described the updates on its strategic shifts.

As part of the preparatory work to inform the design of the new SP 2022-2025, the Advocacy Taskforce prepared a vision paper "Transforming UNICEF's Advocacy for Children: A vision for the new Strategic Plan 2022-2025" (endorsed by the Co-Chairs of the Partnerships, Advocacy and Financing SP Workgroup and the SP Coordination Committee), describing the strengths and weaknesses of UNICEF advocacy work. This paper

---

[1] https://www.unicef.org/about-us/mission-statement
[2] The Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Change Strategy 3 "winning support for the cause of children from decision makers and the wider public" describes that "UNICEF will become an even stronger advocacy, campaigning, fundraising and communications force for children, working with others to build alliances and movements for change. Through this public engagement, the organization will make progress towards recruiting 100 million supporters to the cause of children, to volunteer, advocate and give. This strategy also includes strengthening the UNICEF brand, and supporting young people and children as agents of change."
[3] This document updated the first communication and advocacy strategy, "Communicate to Advocate for Every Child: UNICEF's Global Communication and Public Advocacy Strategy, 2014–2017".

produced specific recommendations to strengthen and transform UNICEF global advocacy role and practices, articulating the operationalization of Advocacy and Communications as an SP Change Strategy for children.[4]

Informed by this vision paper and other exploratory exercises (including the 2018 consultations, 2020 surveys, and several case studies), the organization recently re-structured its Division of Communications (DOC), renaming it as Division of Global Communication and Advocacy (GCA), in January 2022, to signify the role of advocacy in the current SP. These changes reflect the efforts made to further enhance the distinct and unique roles of advocacy work, related to and complementary to, but not the same as, communications, campaigning, public narrative, or technical assistance to governments work, among other tactics.[5]

Despite its prominence in UNICEF mandate and Strategic Plans, a comprehensive corporate evaluation of UNICEF advocacy work has never been conducted by the organisation. Advocacy evaluations have largely been designed within specific programme areas or campaigns, or as components of country programme work.

This proactive and forward-looking evaluability assessment and formative evaluation on advocacy is therefore planned at this early stage of the implementation of the SP. It will allow adjustments in UNICEF's advocacy planning to both improve the chances of advocacy success, and to permit the most robust possible evaluation of UNICEF's work in this area toward the end of the SP.

3. Background and Literature Review

UNICEF defines advocacy as the "*deliberate process, based on demonstrated evidence, to directly and indirectly influence decision makers,* *stakeholders and relevant audiences to support and implement actions that contribute to the realization of children's and women's rights*."

Four Global Advocacy Priorities (GAPs) have been defined, with specific Theories of Change (ToCs), indicators at the outcome and output levels (see Box 1), target results (current and future), barriers, key stakeholders, and strategic approaches. The four GAPs were designated as priorities to contribute to the acceleration, scaling up, and adjustment of UNICEF results for children:
1) *Build a global movement for **vaccine affordability, availability and equity** as a contribution to strengthening primary health care.*
2) *Drive a global advocacy effort to **tackle the learning crisis***, *prioritizing the most vulnerable and marginalized children, including through closing the digital divide.*
3) *Secure investment and action to support and protect the **mental health of children and young people, and to bring an end to neglect, abuse and childhood traumas** that drive poor life outcomes.*
4) *Work with and for children to **tackle environmental degradation and climate change**, so they have access to clear water, clean air, and a safe and sustainable environment.*

There are three levels of indicators concerning Advocacy within the 2022-2025 SP. The first two are clearly within the scope of this formative evaluation. The third is much larger in size and harder to define. It will need to be discussed in the inception phase.

---

[4] These recommendations were endorsed by the Global Management Team (GMT), they are to be operationalized by the Global Advocacy Taskforce, as commissioned by the Deputy Executive Director (DED) Partnerships. The following recommendations were presented: Recommendation 1: Advocacy explicitly highlighted and meaningfully applied as a primary avenue to achieve results for children in every country; Recommendation 2: Advocacy roles recognized as a core and critical organizational function; Recommendation 3: Advocacy leadership and accountabilities are clarified, and integrated ways of working formally established; Recommendation 4: Increased investment in Advocacy to meet needs and demands; Recommendation 5: The Results Framework and corporate reporting systems enable holistic advocacy efforts to be monitored and evaluated effectively, accompanied with robust and standardized advocacy M&E guidance.

[5] For additional reference, see UNICEF Advocacy Tactics Toolkit, developed in the context of the Advocacy Capacity Building Workshop.

Box 1: Global Advocacy and Communications Indicators (Numbers refer to the indicators within the SP results framework)

Level 1: Indicators of the Advocacy & Communication change strategy

H1.1. Number of countries that took advocacy action that triggered policy change related to the UNICEF global advocacy priorities: (a) Tackle the learning crisis; (b) Vaccine affordability, availability and equity; (c) Mental health of children and young people, and to bring an end to neglect, abuse and childhood traumas; (d) Increase access to clean water, and address environmental degradation and climate change (UNEP)

H1.2. Number of children, adolescents and youth engaged in: (a) Advocacy (campaigns, events, youth advocates, World Children's Day); (b) Communication (content and media features, youth reporters, user-generated content); (c) Platforms (U-Report, networks)

H1.3. Number of UNICEF digital supporters

H3.4. Number of countries in which UNICEF-supported policymaking or budgeting is informed by data, research, and evaluation

H9.8. Number of countries supported by UNICEF that have identified and financed transformative child rights policies and programmes that promote gender equality

Level 2: Outcome indicators with direct reference to policy changes that result from Advocacy work [indicative sample]

1.6.4. Number of countries with a national policy for the protection, promotion and support of optimal child nutrition, including legislation to protect children from harmful promotion/marketing of breastmilk substitutes and/or foods and beverages (WFP, WHO)

3.1.1. Number of countries with legislative and policy framework to (a) End corporal punishment of children; (b) End child sexual exploitation and abuse (including technology enabled); (c) Eliminate the worst forms of child labor

4.8. Number of countries developing, financing, and implementing child-sensitive climate policies and programmes

5.1. Number of countries in which measurement, analysis or policy advice has led to policies and programmes to reduce child poverty

H7.4 Number of countries in which UNICEF contributed to new or revised policies or regulations addressing business practices impacting children's rights

H9.6 Number of countries with child-responsive urban policies with a special focus on those living in slums and informal settlements

Level 3: Impact, outcome and output indicators that imply advocacy work/depend on prior advocacy work [indicative sample]

Impact indicator 30: Whether or not legal frameworks are in place to promote, enforce and monitor equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex

1.2.6. Number of countries implementing strategies to address under-vaccination

2.5 Percentage of countries in which the percentage of national education expenditure reaching the most marginalized is above 15 per cent

3.2.1 Number of countries with specialized justice for children system

4.3.3. Number of countries in which UNICEF supported the updating of government frameworks for preparedness and/or early/anticipatory action to be child-sensitive at the national and local levels (FAO, OCHA, UNDP, UNEP, WFP, WHO)

5.2.3 Number of countries with disability-inclusive social protection programmes with UNICEF support

H6.1 Proportion of UNICEF global innovation portfolios with at least one innovation that has attained multi-country scale and reach of more than 1 million people

Source: Integrated Results and Resources Framework of the UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2022–2025

A preliminary internal Evaluation Office review of UNICEF evaluations, research, studies, and descriptive assessments conducted between 2015 and 2021 shows that advocacy has frequently been included as a

component of global, regional, and country programmes. However, no systematic assessment has been conducted to explore its contributions to UNICEF results. This preliminary mapping shows that only four evaluations, one conducted at the global level[6] and three at the country level, had direct advocacy focus[7] and eight research papers were produced to inform policy advocacy efforts, at the field level.[8] The recent Humanitarian Review carried out by UNICEF included advocacy as a key component of UNICEF's work in humanitarian action. In addition, it is understood that UNICEF National Committees (NatComs) have conducted some advocacy evaluations that will hold meaningful lessons. These will be identified and examined in the inception phase.

The recent 2021 MOPAN assessment of UNICEF describes the progress made in strategic partnerships with the private sector for advocacy purposes and "a robust structure and processes to fulfil its mandate for knowledge production and policy advocacy"[9]. It also acknowledges the challenges to measure and to quantify normative advocacy efforts using the existing corporate monitoring system. These challenges are likely to create more inconsistencies around the quality of the policy advocacy evidence and knowledge produced at the field-level, an issue consistently found in decentralized organizations like UNICEF.[10]

Drawing from the UNICEF and partner work, a set of findings have been identified that describe the challenges to evaluate advocacy work:
- Lack of high quality and relevant data availability; [11]
- Lack of confidence and skills in both advocacy and advocacy evaluation;
- Lack of understanding of how to capture contribution as legitimate advocacy result, different from traditional programme results;
- As advocacy requires regular course-correcting and adjustment due to shifting external context, there is a need to build evaluation approaches and systems that allow the capturing of results including from opportunistic and reactive advocacy;
- The unpredictable nature of advocacy as outcomes heavily depends on external circumstances, often out of UNICEF's direct control;
- Lastly, in humanitarian contexts, advocacy has been identified as being often reactive, rather than pro-active and strategic, and linked to specific needs, making it even harder to assess. Similarly, UNICEF's humanitarian advocacy has been lacking a cohesive advocacy strategy with clear vision and accountabilities, making it more challenging to evaluate in these complex contexts.

Looking at the recent work conducted in the wider evaluation profession, the most recent and thoughtful summaries confirm that evaluating advocacy work is a complex task.[12] The non-linear and unpredictable course of most advocacy efforts make assessing their evaluability, readiness for a comprehensive evaluation, or defining the scope of their contribution to results a significant challenge. Additionally, the diversity of contexts in which UNICEF works across different programmes with their tailored advocacy campaign, the diverse portfolio of advocacy strategies and tools, and the multiplicity and diversity of partners and opponents among other factors complicate the desire to locate generalizable lessons.

---

[6] The 2015 Evaluation of UNICEF's Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Programme (PBEA). In addition, the 2020 Global evaluation of UNICEF WASH programming in protracted crises 2014-2019 includes an important advocacy component.

[7] These are the 2020 Evaluation of the child advocacy and support centers for children victims of violence (Bulgaria); the 2018 An evaluation of advocacy as a strategy in the UNICEF Thailand Country Programme 2012-2016 report; and the 2016 End-Project Evaluation of the Youth Leadership, Empowerment, Advocacy and Development in Sudan.

[8] Research reports have been produced from Madagascar CO (2021); Nicaragua CO (2020A, 2020B); Pakistan CO (2020); Bangladesh CO (2020, 2018); Tajikistan CO (2019); Uganda CO (2017).

[9] MOPAN (2021). "United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). 2021 Assessment Cycle".

[10] JIU (2018). Strengthening Policy Research Uptake in the Context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development report.

[11] See the 2018 report "An evaluation of advocacy as a strategy in the UNICEF Thailand Country Programme 2012-2016" or the 2015 report "Evaluation of UNICEF's Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Programme (PBEA)", as references.

[12] For further discussion see Teles, S., & Schmitt, M. (2011). *The Elusive Craft of Evaluating Advocacy*. Stanford Social Innovation Review, 9(3), 40-43; Innovation Network Inc. (2009). *Pathfinder: A Practical Guide to Advocacy Evaluation*; Coe, J., & Schlangen, R. (2019). *No Royal Road: Finding and following the natural pathways in advocacy evaluation*. Center for Evaluation Innovation.

Outside the boundaries of the SP, recent case studies of successful CO-based advocacy have been made to collect context-based descriptive evidence. These present a ready-made pool of memoir and documentation that can be easily accessed and included in this exercise's information base and review of existing evidence.

UNICEF and United Nations guidance has helpfully but incompletely addressed these challenges in assessing advocacy. The 2010 "UNICEF Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy, Companion to the Advocacy Toolkit" presents a list of key considerations when planning an advocacy evaluation and monitoring plan.[13] These include (i) advocacy timeframes are unpredictable and commonly follow a long-term process; (ii) advocacy strategies and milestones could evolve and shift, rather quickly; (iii) the evaluation purpose should be contribution, rather than attribution; (iv) the assessment of progress (not just results) is critical, given the complex and competing external factors at play; and (v) context must always be considered when choosing and evaluating advocacy strategies.[14] This toolkit has helped UNICEF offices, but is now due for a refreshing in light of new work and adjusted UNICEF advocacy goals and strategies, based also on the results of this evaluative exercise.

4. Purpose, Objectives and Scope of Work

There are two complementary **purposes** that animate this formative, forward-looking, exercise.
1. Increasing the success of advocacy efforts by identifying early adjustments to the Advocacy approaches employed (proactive): The central purpose is to proactively clarify Advocacy approaches to support the SP and identify early adjustments that can be made in the present Advocacy structure, supporting elements, and plans that could increase the success of UNICEF's advocacy efforts, and the resulting benefits to children, their families, and communities worldwide.

2. Preparing a future summative evaluation (forward-looking): The supporting purpose is to improve the Theory of Change (as well as the Practices of Change) that the Advocacy strategy is based on and identify the factors that will allow for a meaningful evaluation of the contribution of UNICEF advocacy work to the overall SP success, and the provision of timely and comprehensive information needed from the start to end of advocacy campaigns and other efforts.

The central purpose is more immediate and involves a larger percent of the UNICEF assets devoted to creating an enabling environment conducive for the overall success of Advocacy work. UNICEF evaluability and early formative exercises operate on the principle that weaknesses identified *ex-ante* are to be communicated to management for action. The supporting purpose will be critical to ensure the proper implementation of a later evaluation that will reveal if these adjustments helped to improve outcomes and impact.

The more specific set of **objectives** are the following:
A. Clarity and Best Practice. To assess the clarity and depth of UNICEF's understanding of what Advocacy is and what Advocacy work entails. This understanding is to be contrasted with existing evidence on current definitions, as well as best practices and theoretical frameworks on Advocacy. Emphasis should be given to differentiating Advocacy roles from those of Communication. Recommendations will guide UNICEF to align with best practice in the sector.

B. Coherence. To determine if UNICEF's key internal stakeholders and UNICEF's partners have a shared understanding of what Advocacy attempts to accomplish, and how it is achieved. Recommendations will advise on aligning thinking across all stakeholders and partners.

---

[13] See https://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/Advocacy_Toolkit_Companion%20(1).pdf
[14] Granted these considerations, the UNICEF M&E Advocacy companion toolkit suggests a set of five questions when planning monitoring advocacy work: (i) Who are the monitoring and evaluation users? (ii) How will monitoring and evaluation be used? (iii) What evaluation design should be used? (iv). What should be measured? (v) What data collection tools should be used? These are key questions that an advocacy evaluability assessment should explore and ensure that organization have clear responses to or have plans in place to answer them, prior to undertaking a full evaluation.

C. <u>Relevance.</u> To assess the importance of advocacy priorities in the real world, understanding the pertinence of the GAPs and other areas, in development and humanitarian settings. Recommendations will help refine and finetune advocacy priorities.

D. <u>Theories of Change</u>. For a set of selected case studies, the objective is to review and/or help develop ToCs for UNICEF's advocacy work in the GAPs and other fields. An overall ToC or framework independent of any specific subject matter, is also necessary to provide guidance on creating advocacy strategies in many different circumstances. This framework should provide a logical way of thinking about the various strategies and tactics, stakeholders, intermediate and final results, and starting points. Recommendations will help the advocacy work to increase its efficiency in targeting, techniques, and reviews and evaluations.

E. <u>Resourcing and Coordination</u>. Based on recent UNICEF and comparative experience, the objective is to estimate if the resources (human and financial) invested (or expected to be invested) in the advocacy efforts offer good prospects for success. This includes intellectual assets, funding and staffing, and UNICEF's 'social capital' to bring change. Recommendations will advise on achieving a balance between expectations and capacities at different levels of HQ, RO, CO, as well as NatComs.

F. <u>Adequacy of M&E systems</u>. Assessing the quality and coherence of the advocacy monitoring planning and data collection systems, examining (a) the availability and quality of the SMART indicators; (b) adequacy of baseline data; (c) adequacy of data collection systems in terms of frequency, disaggregation (i.e. gender, disability, with equity and human rights considerations), timeliness, and quality; (d) planning for complementary studies, research, and other evaluations; and (e) likely satisfaction by data users from the operational teams to the social accountability to affected populations to the highest strategic levels. Recommendations will be technical advice on indicators, means of verification, and stakeholder use.

G. <u>Baselining and Recommendations</u>. To summarize the strengths and weaknesses of UNICEF's readiness to engage in advocacy work at different levels and at different scales. If possible, to provide metrics by which changes can be measured. Recommendations will address actions to be taken over the next two years that will improve understanding, coherence, conceptualizing, resourcing, coordination, and evidence-based approaches.

There are three sets of **primarily, internal, users** (duty-bearers) of this exercise:

- **Set 1:** The core team(s) in the Division of Global Communication and Advocacy (GCA) and Programme Group (PG) that guide organization-wide advocacy activities and directly co-lead the four global priority efforts, as well as the Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS) on advocacy in humanitarian action. This core team includes their closely affiliated partners in related divisions that lead on fundraising, programming, and planning & monitoring.
- **Set 2:** UNICEF offices at the regional, national, and sub-national level. These are not simply dependencies of the global effort but have unique nationally and regionally generated priorities that must be supported through the Strategy.
- **Set 3:** UNICEF National Committees (NatComs). These bodies are chartered by UNICEF to operate in non-programme OECD countries. They have fundraising, development education, and Advocacy goals. While they have functional autonomy in many areas, they are also closely linked in Advocacy planning and execution, and in monitoring and reviews. There may be small differences to account for, but this evaluation considers the NatComs to be internal partners and will engage with them in the same way as the Advocacy staff and UNICEF offices.

Secondary users range widely. Some will in fact be consulted during and after the exercise as partners in creating and implementing the campaigns. Others are the intended recipients of the messaging (rights-holders). Listing them in terms of 'closeness' to UNICEF and thus the degree to which the evaluation findings will have relevance for them, the indirect beneficiaries include:
- United Nations agencies that are closely involved in the issues being advocated (for example, WHO on vaccines and mental health, UNESCO on Education, UNEP on climate change); and

- The full range of government, civil society organisations and private sector partners supporting advocacy efforts, as well as those that are the targets of those efforts.

The scope of this evaluation includes multiple organizational levels and themes while focusing on the implementation of the 2022-2025 SP. In particular, the scope will cover the following aspects:

Organizational levels. Advocacy priorities originating at each level will be examined, to make sure that the exercise does not imply that only the global priorities deserve the deepest attention. However, the GAPs will get the most attention. A necessary focus will be how levels collaborate to achieve a whole-of-UNICEF effect.

Case studies and thematic focus. Up to six case studies will be examined, to be determined in the inception phase. For the purposes of planning work effort and assessing applicants' capacities, six accompanying summaries will be produced with in-depth analyses. These will include each of the four GAPs, and one each from advocacy priority unrelated to the GAPs, but critical to regional and country level stakeholders, including humanitarian action.

Organizational capacities. The evaluation is asked to consider the full range of necessary capacities that go into advocacy success. These capacities include the following:
- Conceptualization: Understanding the issues; creation of theories of change that convert the understanding into an advocacy approach.
- Enabling environment: Arranging the partnerships, access to skills, funding and internal coordination [among other factors] that gives the operational efforts the maximum possibility to succeed.
- Implementation: Mobilizing UNICEF units and partners into action; executing the advocacy plans with skill; making timely and well-considered tactical and strategic adjustments.
- Evidence generation and use: Defining the indicators and means of verification to be employed as campaigns unfold; balancing the research, monitoring, and evaluation modes in an overall approach.

Advocacy, communications, and normative work. Having become a distinct unit within the GCA Division, the question is how Advocacy relates to Communications. For the purposes of this evaluation, it is understood that Communications is the means through which UNICEF disseminates messages based on moral claims of a shared humanity as embodied in the CRC and other normative documents. Advocacy is the process of obtaining concrete commitments to those normative goals through Constitutions, law, policies, etc. It is the 'How' in support of the 'What'. How Communications and Advocacy connect and coordinate in support of Advocacy goals will be within the scope of the evaluation. Communications work unrelated to Advocacy efforts will not be within the scope.

Development and humanitarian contexts. Advocacy goals exist for all host settings. The exercise will need to be attentive to the readiness to work across the span from very high-income settings (e.g., the site of NatComs) to the poorest nations. It is expected that advocacy efforts will be tailored to the different policy and operational environments. The adaptation or differentiation of the advocacy activities to humanitarian contexts will be a special concern. If there is a true humanitarian only Advocacy issue, it can become a case study. More certainly there will be interest in examining how UNICEF-wide advocacy priorities are pursued within the distinctive conditions of emergency settings.

Time period. The focus is on the 2022-2025 SP and beyond. The experience before 2022 may be examined where relevant to understanding the present state of UNICEF and partner's readiness.

RBM level. Following the purpose of identifying adjustments that can be made in the short-term to help increase the likelihood of success. This exercise will give central focus to Output-level UNICEF advocacy efforts. These are the elements under UNICEF direct operational control and whose success is fully in its hands. Outcome and impact-level indicators will be reviewed to assess intelligent projections and operationalization well beyond the span of control of UNICEF. Even further, the evaluability interest in a future evaluation means that the M&E systems must be attuned to all levels of measurement from activity up to impact.

It is not in the scope of this early, formative evaluation to assess organizational performance at the outcome level. As noted above, a summative evaluation will be conducted by the end of the SP, and it will apply a more summative, outcome-focused lens in assessing advocacy.

Table 1 below presents the proposed overarching **evaluative questions and sub-questions**. These tentative questions are expected to be refined during the inception phase of the evaluation.

Table 1: Tentative evaluative questions

Evaluative Questions	Evaluative Sub-questions
Q1. To what extent is there clarity and a coherent understanding of what Advocacy is?	Q1.1. How consistent is the understanding of Advocacy seen across the UNICEF's Advocacy staff, internal UNICEF's advocacy stakeholders including the National Committees, and external stakeholders such as UN agencies? Q1.2. How well do these one or multiple understandings of advocacy align with definitions and approaches used by the best current thinking on advocacy M&E?
Q2. To what extent are the existing UNICEF GAPs and broader advocacy objectives specific enough to permit coherent action and flexible enough to allow for context-specific and subject-specific adjustments?	Q2.1 To what extent do the GAPs and other advocacy priority ToCs and plans provide strategic guidance for operationalizing and harmonizing the Advocacy work across UNICEF functions and levels and among global, regional, and national level stakeholders according to the comparative strengths of the partners? Q2.2 To what extent do the GAPs and other advocacy priority ToCs provide sufficient guidance for operationalizing Advocacy work… • Across diverse political and economics contexts, (e.g., contexts with strong parliamentary systems; executive-dominant systems; with and without highly involved civic bodies, etc.); • Within humanitarian contexts as well as stable developmental settings; • Where the normative child-rights underpinnings need reinforcement through accompanying Communications work? Q2.3 To what extent do the GAPs and other advocacy priority ToCs provide sufficient guidance for contexts where the work must adjust and adapt to: • Dynamic changes in economic, social, and political contexts and national priority changes; • Changes in key stakeholders (right holders and duty bearers); • Changes in key strategic partners, particularly those working in direct coordination with UNICEF, such as NatComs, public and private sector, other UN and development agencies, civil society organisations, etc.; • Emergence of new opposition players?
Q3. To what extent are UNICEF GAPs and other areas of focus relevant to global development priorities and to the needs of children, families and communities in the real world?	Q3.1 How well can the advocacy subjects [i.e., mental health, climate change, vaccines, education, etc.] meet the needs of the Strategic Plan, the SDGs, the Agenda 2030 and other development goals? Q3.2 To what extent are the advocacy subjects likely to solve concerns among children, families and communities in the real-world?
Q4. To what extent are the human resources for UNICEF Advocacy efforts well-resourced to achieve the SP advocacy ambitions through a whole-of-UNICEF approach and by effective coordination with key stakeholders?	Q4.1 Are Advocacy roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities clearly defined across the senior management/strategic leadership, advocacy and communications, programme, social policy, partnerships and M&E levels? Q4.2 Are the recruitment, skills building, and accountability systems in place to resource UNICEF at all levels with sufficient cadres needed to achieve the evolving Advocacy results? Q4.3 To what extent does UNICEF actively develop the internal and external social, political and technical networks that will scale-up and sustain results over time?
Q5. To what extent are UNICEF Advocacy planning, monitoring and data collection systems adequate for the role assigned to	Q5.1 How advocacy efforts can be planned to achieve the policy or related goals that either resolves the issue directly or indirectly spark the programming that brings about the real-world impacts? Q5.2 How UNICEF and partners can program in order to bring about effective and rights-respecting changes in those domains? (This will include the designation of opportunities or needs for changes that advocacy efforts can help accomplish.)

Advocacy by the Strategic Plan?	Q5.3 To what extent do the existing UNICEF monitoring and data collection systems allow for and provide clear guidance for the collection of SMART data (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound) for…. • Mandatory Advocacy indicators at the impact and interim/process levels; • Indicators beyond the mandatory ones that will be necessitated by flexible or contingent advocacy strategies that emerge from the specific GAP ToCs or from the application of the more general ToC framework, including preparations for commonly underreported activities such as "quiet diplomacy", mobilizing constituencies, leveraging evidence, and feedback to stakeholders; • Each level of the organization? Q5.4 Does the indicator inventory and monitoring approach adequately guide the organization on how to report on relevant Advocacy indicators: • Across diverse political and economics contexts, (e.g., contexts with strong parliamentary systems; executive-dominant systems; with and without highly involved civic bodies, etc.); • Within humanitarian contexts as well as stable developmental settings; • In conjunction with non-UNICEF partners; • In support of aligned SP priorities such as gender, disability, climate change, and other cross-cutting areas?
Q6. To what extent are guidelines and systems in place for strategic decision-making around UNICEF Advocacy efforts?	Q6.1 Looking beyond the monitoring data, have UNICEF and its partners identified the summative, analytical, evaluation, and research requirements for the internal and collaborative strategic decision-taking required by the Advocacy strategy? Q6.2 Where can UNICEF locate appropriate Advocacy M&E guidance that can guide its strategic evidence gathering and use across the various contexts and stages of advocacy work? Q6.3 Taking all aspects into account, what is required for UNICEF to be able to conduct a successful summative evaluation of its advocacy work in 2025?

5. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

Global evaluations normally rely heavily on desk reviews and key informant interviews or surveys. This is expected to be true in this case, with a small number of refinements consistent with the topics and the context. A less common approach is also possible and will be decided on in the inception phase. In the meantime, some key **design considerations** for bidders include the following:

Case study-based design. For the larger design, it is judged that the best approach is case studies feeding into organization-wide analysis. This will avoid over-generalizations and will offer the specific insights needed by the UNICEF clients. While the exact number of case studies will be set in the inception phase, planning will proceed in the expectation that six will be conducted. These will include each of the four GAPs, and one each from advocacy priority unrelated to the GAPs but critical to regional and country level stakeholders, including humanitarian action. The value of the case study approach is two-fold:
1. It will generate clear and differentiated analysis of the ToCs and the M&E approaches of the different issues. It is not expected that there will be equally strong thinking and systems across all six issues, with a likely variation between issues of long UNICEF engagement [e.g., vaccines] versus newer engagement [e.g., mental health]. Certain resulting recommendations may well be differentiated in response whereas others will be uniform and thus will be stronger for having appeared in many different settings.
2. It will test the consistency of the enabling environment at all three levels of UNICEF. In particular, it will probe whether regionally and nationally-led advocacy efforts will be as equipped as it is likely to be the case for the GAPs.

The inception phase will determine what topics will be streamed into the case studies and which can be addressed through a more efficient organization-wide vision.

Theory-based work. This exercise will have significant theory-based elements, but not as much as prevails in a summative evaluation. In terms of least to greatest intensity, the work will involve some theorizing around, for instance:
1) How the advocacy subjects [mental health, climate change, vaccines, education, etc.] function to cause distress or solve concerns in the real-world;

2) How UNICEF and partners can program in order to bring about effective and rights-respecting changes in those domains. This will include the designation of opportunities or needs for changes that advocacy efforts can help accomplish; and

3) How advocacy efforts can be organized to achieve the policy or related goals, that either resolves the issue directly or indirectly spark the programming that brings about the real-world impacts.

The evaluation team must be able to understand the ToCs for each of these levels, and to guide discussions with UNICEF sections or offices to help improve their logic and to develop advocacy frameworks to select the best path/paths in different settings.

Of special note is the difference between direct and indirect impacts of the advocacy work. There are instances when advocacy success means the full objective is directly attained—e.g., securing full rights for women or the disabled within the national Constitution. In other instances, the effect is indirect, in which advocacy leads to a policy change that must be followed by derivative financing and programming actions. The ability of UNICEF to understand the full causal sequence and readiness to be present across the full chain of actions is a concern of this formative exercise.

Hypotheticals. Because this work anticipates forthcoming Advocacy efforts, it cannot aim for a retrospective view that generates reasonable estimations of causality for results, as there will not be results in view. Instead, the work will use hypotheticals: if UNICEF and partners were to act in this way, can they have a reasonable hope of success given their present state of understanding, resourcing, and leverage? It will be important to arrive at an agreed set of hypotheticals, as well as to have an accepted set of readiness measures, as discussed below.

Emphasizing learning and participation within the independent exercise. The evaluation team will retain its full independence to draw conclusions and make recommendations. Within this guarantee, UNICEF perceives the value and opportunity of a highly participatory exercise. Many of the outputs of the work will be tools that UNICEF will employ going forward. These include ToCs, frameworks, indicators and information systems emphases, among others. To the extent that some of these can be developed in a participatory way they will generate greater understanding and ownership, it is desired that the evaluators and GCA, PG, and partners will cooperate on them--e.g., the advocacy ToCs for the GAPs. A workshop format or other interactive means may be helpful in these cases. As noted, the final decision on what to conclude and recommend will rest with the evaluators.

It is expected that bidders will propose multiple data gathering methods to allow for robust triangulation and analysis of data. At a minimum, the following **data gathering methods** are recommended:

Desk review. UNICEF Global Communication and Advocacy (GCA) documents will be reviewed and assessed against external-to-UNICEF literature on good practices, definitions, and theoretical frameworks in advocacy planning, management, and M&E. This documentation includes overarching GAP strategies and frameworks; background papers produced to inform the UNICEF 2022-2025 SP Advocacy mandate, and all monitoring and evidence related guidance starting with the indicators noted earlier. Selected regional- and country-level Advocacy strategic materials will be included, especially in relation to the case studies noted below.

UNICEF will supply all information identified as relevant and can give the evaluation team access to UNICEF's intranet and management information systems for direct examination and searching. Partners cooperating in the exercise will be asked to supply relevant documentation.

Expert inputs. Consultations will be conducted through interviews with a selected sample of key informants, including internal stakeholders across all levels of the organization, and key external partners directly contributing to UNICEF Advocacy efforts. Group methods are encouraged, if useful. The three that are easily available are the following:
- Focus groups discussions among similarly situated respondents.
- Workshops where the object is to build more complex content and group contributions and agreement are important.

- Surveys of staff across and perhaps beyond UNICEF where a necessary density of response is required.

Both factual and perception information will be sought, the latter being especially important around issues of coordination, systems adequacy, and risk mitigation.

Much of the work will use entirely conventional analytic approaches, such as the SMART criteria for assessing indicators, or the RBM logic when distinguishing among impact, outcome, and outputs. These commonplaces are not repeated here. Instead, aspects of weaker definition and therefore of greater uncertainty are noted earlier, with an invitation to applicants to discuss how they would approach them, while considering the **analytical considerations** below.

Readiness analysis. As indicated above, the hypotheticals emphasis means the analytic approach must be whether UNICEF is ready to meet the demands of those scenarios. There are different approaches to assessing institutional readiness, with the most salient likely to be those around the enabling environment. The applicants will want to show their familiarity with approaches to measure institutional readiness to accomplish the different strands of advocacy efforts, from the M&E to developing ToCs to leveraging partners. UNICEF notes but does not mandate that readiness assessment frameworks it has employed in recent evaluations be repeated[15], but signals that the themes examined in them are likely to recur in the advocacy evaluation.

Social Network Analysis. Succeeding at advocacy requires mobilizing a broad range of partners and executing a set of strategies through them. The ability to identify and mobilize partners is a critical success factor. UNICEF's institutional partners, the staff members, and its allies have individual contacts that can be drawn into the advocacy network. Therefore, it is hoped that the exercise can test how well UNICEF is able to identify its potential partners using the social network analysis logic. The potential network can then be contrasted with the known and intended network to see where there is additional potential.

There is no specific method deemed most effective. Applicants are welcome to propose a strategy to achieve this goal, or to indicate why they think it is impossible or unhelpful to this exercise. If a strategy is proposed, it should be clear what methods will be employed. UNICEF is receptive to innovation in its evaluation exercises and will be interested in techniques based around documentation parsing, examination of corporate communications, and survey/individual response-based inputs.

Common concerns like time pressure and securing stakeholders' attention are not listed in favor of those issues more particular to this exercise, as noted in the Table 2 below on **risk management and possible mitigation measures**.

Table 2: Risks and mitigation measures

Risk	Risk Mitigation Measure
Lack of reliable or informed sources or key informants given that certain themes are recent priorities.	Augment UNICEF informants with relevant informants in other comparable agencies that engage with the same issues in similar ways.
Multiple baselines, TOCs, and models arising from the need to tailor advocacy efforts to local contexts.	Impose a standard or common frame in certain cases, especially in the GAP efforts to be co-led from and managed by GCA and PG. Select a few representative settings for the regional or country efforts that will occur within the four GAPs. Emphasize flexibility and adaptation in the framework that will emerge, including examining if they are likely to be relevant to other UNICEF settings.
Defining the boundary of the exercise, especially at the frontier where UNICEF and the National Committees may need to cooperate but may have different M&E systems, etc.	Remain alert to these potential differences and indicate in the findings where there might need to be adaptations or harmonization efforts to ensure all information is collected and shared.

---

[15]This refers to readiness assessments carried out by the EO in 2019 and 2020 for the Climate and Environment team (CERP) in the PG, as well as with PFP and PG on Business for Results (B4R) initiative. The approach used in the ongoing Strategic Plan Evaluability Assessment and Formative Evaluation will also be useful.

Potential to overlook the normative element in Advocacy. This can arise because Communications is now a separate unit, and because the Advocacy definition emphasizes evidence and not the normative base.	Make the normative element a specific line of enquiry and be ready to underscore its role in advocacy work even if under-evidenced if that is seen to be necessary.
Projecting advocacy work into emergency settings where that has not been a priority.	Ask for cooperating teams in 1-3 emergency settings to develop mock advocacy approaches as a model to test the TOCs and readiness. More generally, accept a higher level of uncertainty about how the results will apply to emergencies.

The selected applicant will be expected to follow UNICEF standards on **evaluation ethics and quality**, UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct, as well as with UNEG Guidance on Human Rights, Inclusion and Gender Equality in Evaluation. The process will include the following mechanisms:

- Respecting gender and human rights principles throughout the evaluation process, including: the protection of confidentiality; the protection of rights; the protection of dignity and welfare of people; and ensuring informed consent.
- Data validation will take place at all levels with participants' consent.
- Maximizing the degree of participation of stakeholders in the Evaluation itself wherever feasible and a commitment to using participatory approaches in field studies.
- Examining the potential to disaggregate data by gender, disability, equity, and human rights-relevant factors, where that will be important to advocacy success.
- Ensuring that outputs use disability-inclusive, gender-sensitive and human-rights language.
- Ensuring privacy protocols and compliance with all legal data management rules and considerations.
- Applying the principle of 'do no harm' into practice during the duration of the exercise.

The selected applicant will have access to important internal data and perspectives. These must be held with utmost **confidentiality**. Likewise, the willingness of internal and external stakeholders to speak to these issues in a critical way will depend on the provision of absolute confidentiality. The selected applicant needs to sign the non-disclosure agreement (NDA), abide by UNICEF's and their own security protocols, and ensure that sensitive data is protected.

6. Timeframe and Key Deliverables

The evaluation has a timeline of 7 months from October 2022 to April 2023. Adequate effort should be allocated by the evaluation team to ensure timely submission of all the deliverables. The proposed organisation of the evaluation phases is as follows:

Inception phase: October-November 2022
During this phase, the evaluation team is expected to gather a deep understanding of the proposed documentation, assessing possible information gaps, refining the scope, methods, and key stakeholders. The main deliverable for this phase will be the inception report, presenting a detailed description of the final scope; revised methodological approach, including any data collection and analytical instruments (also piloted during this phase); preliminary evidence from initial desk review and key informant consultations; as well as the structure of the final report and an updated timeline for deliverables. It is expected that a short meeting will be planned with the Reference Group, for presentation of the inception report plan and discussion. During this phase, a decision will be made on which case study reports will be relevant and feasible for this exercise, and whether the social network analysis approach is feasible and helpful.

Data collection and analysis phase: December 2022-February 2023
Additional documentation, secondary and primary data will be collected using instruments previously piloted during the inception phase. The main deliverable for this phase is data analysis, including primary data, stored in a secure repository, cleaned and processed to ensure anonymity of key informants. A presentation with emerging findings is also expected during this phase. Meetings with the Reference Group and possibly relevant managers from participating levels will be scheduled.

Report drafting and dissemination phase: March-April 2023
The main deliverables for this phase are the preliminary draft of the final report and the final report. The case studies will exist as chapters in the report, but with the ability to be used as stand-alone documents within those topical communities. In addition, it is expected that main findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned will be presented to the Reference Group and other relevant stakeholders, with a stand-alone Evaluation Brief and Power-Point to be delivered.

Other interim products are:
- Minutes of key meetings with the Reference Group;
- Monthly progress reports;
- Copy of the anonymized data collected during the evaluation; and
- Presentation materials for the meetings with the Reference Group. They may include Power-Point summaries of work progress and conclusions to that point.

7. Management and Governance Arrangements

Supervisor/Approving authority: An Evaluation Manager in the Institutional Effectiveness portfolio in UNICEF Evaluation Office will manage and supervise the exercise. S/He may delegate oversight duties to other persons for portions of the work but will retain overall approving authority.

The normal UNICEF Evaluation Office quality control protocols and processes will be in place to ensure close management through all the stages of this exercise.

Reference Group (RG): A Reference Group (RG) will be created to support the consultants and the supervisor. The roles of the RG will be:

- Offer insights on issues under discussion, especially in the inception phase where the methods, design and data to be sought are to be determined.
- Review all deliverables produced, including the inception, emerging evidence summary presentations, and final report.
- Participate in workshop-style meetings for presentation and discussion of emerging findings, for validation and further comments.

8. Evaluation Team: Qualifications and Experience Required

The team conducting this evaluation is expected to include two team members, one *team leader* and one *team member* with advocacy evaluation experience. Thematic expertise in any of the GAPs areas and familiarity with the optional or innovative elements will represent strong advantages.

Both institutional and individual bidders may apply

Consulting firms, institutions, and other organizations may apply to perform this work. They must present a full team of persons within their bid.

Individual consultants without an institutional affiliation may also apply. In this case, they are acknowledging that UNICEF may match them with another individual applicant to form the evaluation team.

Individuals without an institutional affiliation that wish to be considered as a team may also present a linked application. UNICF will either hire both or neither.

UNICEF estimates that this assignment requires a minimum of two persons (full-time) on the evaluation team. A maximum of three (on a part-time basis) may be proposed by institutional or linked individual applicants.

Team Leader: Senior Evaluation Specialist
Expected responsibilities:
- Direct all parts of the evaluability assessment and formative evaluation, being directly accountable to UNICEF.
- Coordinate and supervise the work of the evaluation team in their contributing roles.

- Ensure the quality of the process, outputs, methodology and timely delivery of all products.
- Take direct responsibility for all deliverables being of satisfactory quality.
- Ensure that the deliverables emerge in a timely fashion, following a high quality in-depth analytic process, as well as ongoing consultation with the UNICEF Evaluation Manager and the Reference Group.

Key qualifications:
- At least ten years of professional experience in evaluations, research, and evaluability assessments or other formative exercises, with evidence of understanding global standards, theories, models and methods related to organizational/institutional effectiveness issues.
- Minimum first advanced degree [Master's Level] in a relevant field across the social sciences, with an advantage for degrees or major emphases in evaluation or related evidence fields.
- Direct expertise on advocacy evaluations or advocacy evaluability or formative exercises.
- Familiarity with thematic areas included in the Global Advocacy Priorities represents a strong advantage.
- Proven experience in leading exercises similar in scope to the present task.
- Demonstrated ability to supervise an evaluation team at the talent and experience level required.
- Excellent written and oral communication skills in English.

Team Member(s): Evaluation Specialist (minimum 1, maximum 2)
Expected responsibilities:
- The Team Member / Evaluation Specialist will support the Team Leader / Senior Evaluation Specialist, providing substantive feedback, based on experience and skills that complement the team leader's, particularly on thematic areas.

Key qualifications:
- A work history in the fields of advocacy, with work conducted in UN or international development environments is a major advantage. A work history in Communications as it relates to advocacy is an advantage.
- More than five years of professional experience in evaluations, research, analysis of organizational/institutional effectiveness issues is a strong advantage. Prior experience on advocacy evaluations is likewise a major advantage.
- Experience participating as a mid-level or senior team member in an institutional effectiveness evaluation, preferably within the UN system.
- Ability to support with documentation review and data gathering, including the management of interviews/consultations with key informants.
- Ability to lead on one or more elements of the work as a complement to the strengths of the team leader.

Combined team strengths
One or multiple of the team members must be able to take the lead in the following:
- Ability to analyse M&E systems in terms of indicators and systems SMARTness.
- Ability to lead participatory methods with stakeholders.
- Ability to construct and review ToCs to a suitable level of complexity.
- Clear understanding of UNICEF's institutional structure as a decentralized organization, and the ability to analyze how global initiatives can be implemented through this decentralized structure.
- Familiarity with at least two of the thematic areas included in the GAPs.

9. Payment Schedule

Unless applicants propose an alternative payment schedule, payments will be as follows:
- Approved Inception Report: 2 months after signing the contract (25% of payment);
- Approved presentation on emerging findings: 4 months after signing the contract (25% of payment);
- Approved preliminary draft of the final report: 6 months after signing the contract (25% of payment); and

- Approved final report, presentation and other materials: 7 months after signing the contract (25% of payment).

10. Application Requirements for Technical and Financial Proposals

Proposals will be evaluated based on a combination of technical and financial considerations including the need to meet the mandatory criteria. The technical quality of the proposals will account for 70 per cent of the final score; financial proposals will account for 30 per cent.

A panel of UNICEF specialists will review the technical proposals first; only proposals that meet the mandatory criteria and receive a minimum of 70 points during the technical evaluation will be considered further. Proposals that pass the technical stage will then receive a financial score and the two will be added together.

Content of the technical proposal
The technical proposal will be in PDF format and must include at a minimum the following elements:
A. Table of contents

B. Request for proposals for services form (page 3 of the Request for Proposals for Services document)

C. Presentation of the bidding institution (institutions if a consortium, or individual consultant), thereafter referred as the applicant including:

- Name of the applicant
- Date and country of registration/incorporation, and location of offices or agents
- Summary of corporate structure (detailed organogram), business areas, corporate directions, experience, and values
- Past two years' annual turnover (in US dollars)
- Past two years' audited financial report (income statement and balance sheet)
- Number of full-time employees and type (technical experts, administrative and logistics support staff, financial staff, etc.).

D. Short narrative description of the applicant's experience and capacity in the following areas:

- Evaluability assessments
- Formative evaluations conducted for international development organisations
- Previous evaluations of advocacy
- Capacities, including the ability (if a part of the proposed methodology) to conduct case studies in the areas related to UNICEF advocacy priorities.

E. List of similar/relevant past and on-going assignments carried out by the proposer in the past 5 years. UNICEF may contact reference persons for feedback on services provided by the proposers.

F. Full reports or preferably links to full reports listed as examples of relevant past and on-going assignments of the proposer (at least 3), on which the proposed key personnel directly and actively contributed or authored.

G. Proposed methodology. It should minimize repeating what is stated in the ToR. There is no minimum or maximum length. If in doubt, ensure sufficient detail is provided for UNICEF to be able to judge the technical expertise. Required content is as follows:

- Understanding of and comments on the context and rationale for the evaluation, and on UNICEF's action in the area of advocacy.
- Understanding of and comments on the evaluation scope.

- Comments on the evaluation criteria, key evaluation questions, and areas of particular interest.
- Understanding of, comments on, and in-depth analysis of the aspects of complexity, potential challenges, risks, and ethical issues related to this evaluation exercise. This must include a description of the applicant's ethics protocols including data privacy protocols.
- Proposed evaluation design and methodology, with a sufficient level of detail on each phase and activity of the evaluation process, including on data to be collected to answer the evaluation questions, envisaged data collection and analysis methods, the sampling methodology and criteria to select the final case study countries, as well as the duration of the country visits and the number and profile of evaluation team members participating AND/OR methods to conduct remote data collection in the selected case study countries. Particular attention should be paid to the issues of management of local partners/consultants; stakeholder availability and participation; access and security constraints; mix of quantitative and qualitative data and methods; data disaggregation, accuracy, and triangulation; approaches to data treatment and analysis; and quality assurance.
- Comments and additional details/suggestions on the deliverables proposed in the ToR, if any.
- Comments and suggestions on the management arrangements described in the ToR, if any, and proposed internal management and quality assurance arrangements.
- The presence of any local consultants/researchers or others not normally full-time members of the bidding institution should be indicated, with a description of how they will be engaged, trained, supported, and supervised.

H. Work plan, which will include as a minimum requirement the following:

- General work plan based on the one proposed in the ToR, with comments and proposed adjustments, if any.
- Detailed timetable by activity. It must be consistent with the general work plan and the financial proposal. It must factor in sufficient time for the drafting of deliverables report, their quality assurance by the evaluation team, UNICEF and the Reference Group, and their finalization. It should also consider the vacation time of evaluation team members.

I. Evaluation team:

- Summary presentation of proposed experts.
- Description of support staff, if any.
- Level of effort of proposed experts by activity. It must be consistent with the financial proposal.
- CVs of each proposed expert. For information, senior and intermediate level experts will be asked to sign a statement of exclusivity and availability prior to contract signature; however, at the stage of the proposal submission, the proposed team is expected to be available for the full duration of this assignment.

Content of the financial proposal

The financial proposal must be fully separated from the technical proposal. The financial proposal will be submitted in both PDF and Microsoft Excel format. Costs will be formulated in US dollars and free of all taxes. It will include the following elements as a minimum requirement:

A. Overall price proposal
B. Budget by phase, by activity, and by cost category (including staff, anticipated travel, and interpretation)

As per UNICEF procurement procedures, the budget for this evaluation assignment is not disclosed.

During any travels that may be undertaken for the evaluation if COVID-19 restrictions are no longer in place, costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals shall not exceed applicable daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, as promulgated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC): http://icsc.un.org/.

11. Assessment of Proposals

Mandatory criteria

Applicants must provide documentation of proven expertise from a UN agency or development partner showcasing the applicant's expertise in designing, managing, administering, and managing complex analysis and strategy development processes. This could include a track record in conducting similar analysis and strategy development processes across a range of development partners for UN agencies or similar type of organization.

Technical criteria

The following criteria will be used in evaluating the technical proposals:

Technical Evaluation Criteria		
Section 1: OVERALL RESPONSE	Demonstrated understanding of the purpose, scope, requirements, and deliverables of this assignment, including of UNICEF's work in advocacy.	5
	Overall structure of the proposal including conceptual framework for analysis and reporting, including clarity and completeness of the proposal.	5
	Adequacy of the technical plan demonstrated through the overall concord between RFPS requirements, and the proposal submitted.	5
	Demonstrated ability to conduct high quality evaluations in various contexts.	5
	Focus, scale/size, and scope of past and current evaluations/research implemented, including evaluation types.	5
	Adequacy of risk assessment, with- recognition of the risks/peripheral problems and methods to prevent and manage risks/peripheral problems.	5
Total Section 1: 30 points		
Section 2: METHODOLOGY	Quality of proposed implementation plan, i.e., how to undertake and execute each stage, with proposed project schedules.	10
	Quality of proposed approach and methodology for the assignment, including for information collection, compilation, and analysis.	10
	Ability to conduct data remotely, including proposed tools and methods for doing so.	10
	Demonstrated ability to conduct evidence generation activities ethically. These include description of existing in-house ethical review mechanisms/ teams and/existing partnerships with independent ethical review boards.	10
Total Section 2: 40 points		
Section 3: QUALIFICATOINS	Quality and relevance of the sample work provided, including validation through reference checks.	15
	Relevant academic qualifications, skills, and years of technical experience of team members, including familiarity with UNICEF.	5
	Oral and written communication skills of the proposed team members, including ability to facilitate and conduct meetings and ability to conduct work in English, French, and Spanish and Arabic (using in-house or outsourced resources).	5
	Clear description of quality assurance mechanisms to be used by the applicant to deliver quality products under this RFPS. Includes both in house and outsourced quality assurance.	5
Total Section 3: 30 points		
Total Possible Points		**100**
Minimum qualifying required Score (Total Technical Proposal)		**70**

Financial criteria

The following criteria will be used in evaluating the financial proposals:

- The price should be broken down for each component of the proposed work based on an estimate of time which needs to be stated.
- Applicants must complete the financial proposal form with the daily rate of each team member.
- The price proposal should include separate travel costs if field missions are able to be undertaken.
- The total amount of points allocated for the price component is 30. The maximum number of points will be allotted to the lowest price proposal that is opened and compared among those invited firms/institutions/individuals which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the technical component. All other price proposals will receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest price, e.g.:

Score for price proposal X = (30*Price of lowest priced proposal)/(Price of proposal X)