

## **Terms of Reference for Local Organization for Evaluation of the Joint SDG Programme “Transforming Social Protection for Persons with Disabilities in Georgia”**

### **INTRODUCTION**

In an effort to transform the social protection system for persons with disabilities in Georgia, UNICEF, UNDP, WHO, UNFPA, UN Women and OHCHR have been implementing a Joint Programme (JP) “Transforming Social Protection for Persons with Disabilities in Georgia” since January, 2020 under UNICEF leadership and the overall coordination from UN RC’s Office. As the JP is on a final stage of its implementation, the JP commissions an external, independent and gender-responsive<sup>1</sup> evaluation of the Joint Programme. This Terms of Reference (ToR) set out the purpose and objectives, methodological options and operational modalities for an institutional contract with a team of at least two evaluation consultants. Findings and recommendations from this evaluation will inform the Joint Programme team, Joint SDG Fund and relevant stakeholders on:

- Accomplishment of the main expected results of the JP
- Contribution to improving the situation of vulnerable groups identified in the JP document
- JP’s contribution to SDG acceleration,
- JP’s Contribution to UN reforms
- Scalability and sustainability of the JP interventions

The final evaluation of the JP is expected to be conducted from April 2022 to June 2022 for a total duration of approximately 12 working weeks. It will be supervised by JP focal points, Joint Evaluation Management Group comprised by UNICEF (convening agency), UNDP, WHO, UNFPA, UN Women and OHCHR evaluation specialists who are not involved in the programme implementation in close coordination with UN RC’s Office.

### **ABOUT THE JOINT PROGRAMME:**

About 15% of the world's population lives with some form of disability.<sup>2</sup> Women are more likely to experience disabilities. The disability prevalence rate among women worldwide is 19.2%.<sup>3</sup>

While Georgia collects data on PwDs via census and other household surveys, this data is rarely analyzed and disseminated with disaggregation by sex, age and form of disability. The policy formulation relies on figures derived from administrative sources on recipients of disability pension, which significantly underestimates the number of people experiencing various forms of disability, e.g. approx. 125,898 PwDs (of which 49,916 women and 10,969 children) are registered as recipients of disability pensions in 2019. This constitutes about 3% of the total population of Georgia which is well below the WHO global prevalence estimates. The official figure is particularly low for children and contradicts the figure from the latest national census. The lack of data on the incidence of different types of disabilities makes it impossible to discern the real extent of the problems and accordingly, the specific needs of PwDs and their families.

Georgia relies on the outdated “medical model” for determining the disability status. The legislation<sup>4</sup> outlines the diagnoses qualifying children and adults for disability status and does not take into consideration the overall health state of a person. The assessment process is conducted only by physicians and seeks to identify only health-related

---

<sup>1</sup> How to manage a gender responsive evaluation, Evaluation handbook, UN Women, 2015

<sup>2</sup> World Health Organization (WHO), Disability and Health: Factsheet (Nov. 2016)

<sup>3</sup> WHO and World Bank Group (WBG), World Report on Disability 28 (2011)

<sup>4</sup> Law of Medical-Social Expertise and Ministerial Orders #1/N and #62/N

needs.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, the current assessment system ignores some developmental disabilities of infants and deprives them from accessing disability benefits. Moreover, the assessment process does not consider the needs for utilization of assistive technologies and social services or barriers to participation.

6 UN agencies (UNICEF, UNDP, WHO, UNFPA, UN Women and OHCHR) under the leadership of UNICEF and overall coordination of UN RC's Office have developed a joint programme for transforming social protection system for people with disabilities in Georgia. The programme is initiated under the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal Fund (Joint SDG Fund) and it is implemented between January 2020 and June 2022 in Georgia. It has a total budget of USD 2,200,000

This Joint Programme (JP) "Transforming Social Protection for Persons with Disabilities in Georgia" aims to address one of the largest gaps in Georgia's social protection system in order to transform the situation of persons with disabilities (PwDs) in the country. The overall strategy of the project is to address one of the key factors leading to social exclusion of people with disabilities in the society, i.e. the societal and institutional medical approach to people with disabilities, which considers disability as individual deficiency. Introduction of the social model of disability will be supported by addressing the data, legal and institutional framework and definition of disability and related social protection, while simultaneously increasing societal awareness and stimulating change of social norms, providing support for empowering organizations of people with disabilities as important change agents and expanding employment opportunities for PwD.

The JP is committed to deliver three transformative results:

- Strengthen legislative framework and evidence-based policy environment and promote non-discriminatory social norms to enable all PwDs to effectively enjoy their rights. Strengthen systems to enable quality integrated services for PwDs, including revised social system entitlements, especially for children, women and young people.
- Expand Existing pilot of disability status assessment system based on the social model to one more region of Georgia.
- Improve Capacities for data collection, monitoring and advocacy for the implementation of Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD, International Conference on Population and Development Programme of Action (ICPD PoA), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), Beijing Platform for Action (BFPA), Universal Periodic Review (UPR), Commission on the Status of Women (CSW).

Broadly, all of the JP's outcomes and outputs are in line with the UNDAF outcomes and could be grouped under the focus areas of democratic governance, jobs, livelihood and social protection and health. The JP specific outcomes are the following:

Outcome 1: By 2022, persons with disabilities, especially those from vulnerable groups, benefit from enabling environment through disability inclusive legislation, evidence-based policy, decreased stigma on disability and expanded employment opportunities.

Outcome 2: By 2022, the social protection system, health and social services are transformed in line with the social model of disability to ensure social inclusion and equal rights for people with disabilities.

The COVID-19 outbreak created additional challenges for people with disabilities that required more focused intervention from all UN agencies. Hence, the workplan was revised and the funds repurposed to better fit the new needs PwDs have during the pandemic.

Outcome 3: Persons with disabilities, especially those from vulnerable groups, are supported during the COVID-19 pandemic via adjusted communication strategies, developing relevant guidelines, protocols and policy documents to better respond to the needs of PwDs in the light of COVID-19 outbreak.

Relevant specificities related to the intersection of the gender and disability, as well as outputs related to other vulnerable groups within the disability community are reflected in the results framework (*Annex 1*)

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://matsne.gov.ge/ka/document/view/15772?publication=11> Article 10

## **OVERALL STRATEGY OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME:**

The objectives and the overall strategy of this proposal are fully reflecting the national priorities stated by the Government of Georgia, the UNDAF framework and the demands voiced by the civil society. The JP is transformational as it delivers changes that will directly affect all PwDs in Georgia. By adopting the inter-sectoral approach, the JP contributes to achieving the following SDGs in Georgia: Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere; Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages; Goal 4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all; Goal 5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls; Goal 8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all; Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries; Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels; Goal 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.

**UNICEF** contributes to the Joint Program in three main directions: a) improving the legal framework for children with disabilities through technical support to harmonize national legislation (laws and bylaws) with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with disabilities. The special emphasis is placed on formulating draft amendments of the Law of Georgia on medical-social expertise that determines the rules for granting disability status, b) Another important direction of work for UNICEF is the adoption of the social model of disability. Through the JP It was rolled in out in one of the regions of Georgia c) Revision of the social assistance entitlements for children with disabilities and PwDs based on the new status determination system by supporting relevant evidence- based policy and decision-making processes.

**UNDP** focuses on two major issues – accessibility and employment. Support to development of national regulatory framework and policy on accessibility to physical environment and information that complies with international standards are followed up by knowledge building on newly adopted legislation among the major stakeholders, such as construction companies, state agents at national and local levels responsible for issuing construction permits and monitoring the observance of permit conditions and other professionals (architects, urban designers, students of relevant faculties) in the field. In addition, UNDP closely works with local municipalities to provide knowledge on methods and measures that should be implemented at local level for ensuring accessibility for PwDs, including through service delivery (e.g. accessible transportation to workplace). Moreover, UNDP works closely with state officials, private sector and local municipalities to create favorable conditions of PwDs' employment.

**WHO** conducts Model Disability Survey (MDS) to better understand the situation of people with disabilities, including their prevalence, and what needs to be done to ensure they can enjoy their human rights fully on an equal basis with others. The implemented activities are the following: 1. Preparation of a study protocol for the MDS in Georgian 2. Ethical approval to conduct MDS in Georgia. 3. Customization of the MDS questionnaire for the social protection indicators. 4. Selection of interviewers and provision of a five-day training for the interviewers administering the MDS 5. Data collection in two regions of Georgia 6. Monitoring visit to support data collection. 7. Provision of three-day training on data management and analyses for the statisticians at national center for Public Health under MoH. 8. Evidence-based Disability report for Georgia 9. Convening the high-level forum to review the findings of the MDS 10. Development of monitoring indicators for Social Protection.

**UNFPA's** strategy is expected to play an important role in protecting, promoting and fulfilling the human rights of women and girls with disabilities and are fully in line with the priorities of SDG goals that call for universal access to Sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR). UNFPA supports creating enabling legislative and policy environment by conducting: a) Assessment of the legal environment and health programmes with regard to SRHR of PwDs; b) Recommending legislative provisions to comply with CRPD obligations for making SRH services and information accessible for PwDs; and c) Updating relevant National Policies and Plans that guarantee access to SRHR for PwDs. UNFPA also supports strengthening systems through development/updating relevant SOPs, development of training resources and providing trainings to ensure access to quality GBV and SRHR services for women and young people with disabilities.

**UN Women** mobilizes a network of CSOs to effectively monitor and lobby for the implementation of the CRPD in the context of national and international commitments to gender equality and women's empowerment. UN Women will further work with data producers to strengthen data collection, analysis and dissemination from gender and disability

perspective for improved monitoring on CRPD and SDG implementation with the ultimate goal to strengthen inclusion of women with disabilities to all areas of life, including in the decision-making.

**OHCHR** strategy for intervention mainly rests on the following pillars: a) facilitating the process of bringing Georgian legislation in compliance with CRPD standards and benefitting to the elaboration of state monitoring mechanism, and b) promoting the reliance of national administrative and judicial authorities on CRPD standards in decision-making process. On the one hand, there is a clear need for a piece of legislation which would compile and consolidate relevant regulations on PWDs. Bylaws and decisions adopted by administrative authorities should be in conformity with this overarching legislation and CRPD standards.

*Overall results framework, detailing the components of the programme and the responsibility of each UN agency, is in **Annex 1***

*See the SDG targets directly addressed by the Joint Programme in **Annex 2***

*The Theory of Change of the joint programme as well as the main ToC assumptions to be monitored is available in **Annex 3***

## **PURPOSE, OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE WORK**

The purpose of this evaluation is knowledge and evidence generation and high-quality lessons learned (learning). This is supposed to be the final evaluation of the JP that has been implemented for 30 months with an end date 30 June, 2022 (The last 2,5 months are designated for the evaluation). Findings and recommendations from this evaluation will inform the Joint Programme team, Joint SDG Fund and relevant stakeholders on:

- Accomplishment of the main expected results of the JP
- Contribution to improving the situation of vulnerable groups identified in the JP document
- JP's contribution to SDG acceleration,
- JP's Contribution to UN reforms
- Scalability and sustainability of the JP interventions

The final evaluation objective of the JP is manifold that aims to:

- Examine the conceptual underpinnings and design of the JP including its underlying Theory of Change (ToC) and provide an assessment of how the Joint Programme activities and approaches were effective in meeting the needs of people with disabilities;
- Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the joint programme from its inception to its completion, with focus on its ability to respond to the needs of people with disabilities;
- Assess to what extent the main transformative results were accomplished during the JP implementation using the ToC, in terms of: (i) coordination, collaboration and organisational structures formed for transforming the social protection for persons with disabilities in Georgia (ii) quality and delivery of the proposed activities within the JP (iii) consultation and participation with the disability community to promote the participatory approaches within the JP; (iv) the internal M&E system;
- Examine to what extent the JP activities influenced the improvement of the situation of vulnerable groups identified in the JP document
- Assess to what extent the JP contributed to the SDG acceleration and UN reforms
- Document and provide recommendations regarding lessons learned, good practices and innovations that can be applied within other programmes

The evaluation will provide an independent assessment of the joint programme, and it will be forward-looking by reinforcing good practices, identifying areas for improvement and providing conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation will focus not only on identifying outcomes of JP activities, but it will also attempt to assess the approach taken by UNICEF, UNDP, WHO, UNFPA, UN Women and OHCHR, whether the assumptions made in the ToC are appropriate, whether activities and interventions are indeed contributing to progress within the framework of the ToC, whether the proposed approach is scalable and to determine why or why not progress has been occurring.

Evaluation evidence will be judged using modified Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and

sustainability, as well as equity, gender equality and human rights considerations. Key evaluation questions (and sub-questions) include (but are not limited to) the following:

**Relevance** of the JP interventions in relation to the national social protection priorities and policy and the needs of PwDs in Georgia:

- How relevant was the JP to national priorities/policies at the national level and to the needs of the main vulnerable groups?
- Were the planned outcomes and outputs of the JP relevant to the needs of persons with disabilities including, children, girls and women?
- Have contextual factors been considered in the design and implementation and adaptation of Joint Programme?
- Considering the COVID-19 outbreak how have the JP interventions on an outcome and output level remain relevant to the needs of PwDs?
- How relevant was the jointness in programme design, implementation, and management for addressing the country's development priorities and challenges?
- To what extent the JP ensured the continuous participation of the vulnerable groups in implementation?

**Effectiveness** of the JP in achieving its programme objectives, including:

- To what extent did the JP contribute to achieving its development objectives, especially around the 3 transformative results (mentioned p.2)?
- What programme interventions and strategies are (or are not) meeting the needs of persons with disabilities including, children, girls and women?
- What have been the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the programme objectives?
- To what extent has the JP contributed to accelerating the SDGs at the national level?
- To what extent the JP produced a catalytic effect in terms of generating systems change across sectors to leave no one behind including children, girls and women with disabilities?
- To what extent the JP contributed to achievement of UNDAF/CF outcome/s and national development priorities?

**Efficiency** of the JP outcomes and outputs - both qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs provided:

- How efficiently have the JP been managed in terms of its human / financial resources and organizational / governance structure?
- How efficient was coordination among agencies?
- Was the JP intervention more efficient in comparison to what could have been done through a single agency intervention?
- To what extent did the JP contribute to enhancing UNCT coherence and UNCT efficiency (reducing transaction costs)?
- What are the comparative strengths of the joint programme in comparison to other social protection programmes?
- What are the comparative strengths of the coordination and convening roles of the joint programme?
- What are the comparative strengths and added values of individual agencies in the frames of the programme?

**Sustainability** of the benefits of the JP implemented in Georgia:

- To what extent has the strategy adopted by the JP contributed to sustainability of results, especially in terms of LNOB and the social protection system?
- To what extent has the JP supported the long-term buy-in, leadership and ownership by the Government and other relevant stakeholders?
- How likely will the results be sustained beyond the JP through the action of Government and other stakeholders and/or UNCTs?
- What are the lessons learned about the provision of JP?

## **EVALUATION SCOPE:**

The JP evaluation should mainly focus on the stakeholders and target groups identified in the JP document. The emphasis should be placed on children, women, young and older people with disabilities during the evaluation as

much as possible. Where possible, the research should further elaborate on equity gaps e.g. between rural v. urban residents, gender, etc.

The geographical scope of the project is national, excluding Abkhazia region and South Ossetia as the GoG does not exercise effective control over these regions. If the inception phase shows that nationally representative research is too costly or methodologically infeasible, the Steering Committee may decide to reduce the territorial scope of the research. Such decision shall be objectively justified and documented.

When it comes to the chronological scope of the project the JP evaluation should focus on the period from January, 2020 – April, 2022 when the JP started the implementation and finalized most of the activities by the end of April, 2022

## **EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

### **Participatory approach**

The final JP evaluation will be based on an inclusive, transparent and participatory approach, involving a broad range of partners and stakeholders at national and sub-national levels. An initial stakeholder map will be developed to identify stakeholders who have been involved in the preparation and implementation of the JP and those partners who do not work directly with UN, yet play a key role in a relevant outcome or thematic area in the national context. These stakeholders include government representatives, civil society organizations, implementing partners, the private sector, academia, other United Nations organizations, donors and, most importantly, rights-holders - people with disabilities. They can provide information and data that the evaluators should use to assess the contribution of UN support to changes in each thematic area of the JP. Particular attention will be paid to ensuring participation of women, adolescent girls and young people, especially those from vulnerable and marginalized groups (e.g. young people and women with disabilities).

*Stakeholders' mapping and analysis available in **Annex 4***

### **Mixed-method approach**

The evaluation will primarily use qualitative methods for data collection, including document review, interviews, group discussions and observations during field visits, where appropriate. The qualitative data will be complemented with quantitative data to minimize bias and strengthen the validity of findings. Quantitative data will be compiled through desk review of documents, websites and online databases to obtain relevant financial data and data on key indicators that measure change at output and outcome levels.

### **Methodology**

The JP envisages the evaluation will be theory based. It will use a Theory of Change (ToC) to assess progress of JP and its contribution to the SDG acceleration, UN reform and improving situation of persons with disabilities in Georgia. The ToC will detail a process for how JP travelled from activities, producing outputs to contribute to intermediate outcomes and outcomes. It is expected that based on the analysis the ToC will be reconstructed retroactively.

The methodology that the evaluation team will develop builds the foundation for providing valid and evidence-based answers to the evaluation questions and for offering a robust and credible assessment of the JP. The methodological design of the evaluation shall include in particular: (1) a theory of change; (2) a strategy for collecting and analyzing data; (3) specifically designed tools for data collection and analysis; (4) an evaluation matrix<sup>6</sup>; and (5) a detailed evaluation work plan and agenda for the field phase.

---

<sup>6</sup> The evaluation matrix is a centerpiece to the methodological design of the evaluation. It is used at all phases of the evaluation. It deserves particular attention from the evaluation team, who should know how to develop and use it. Both the JP evaluation management task force and the external evaluation team should get an in-depth understanding of this tool. The evaluation matrix contains the core elements of the evaluation: (a) what will be evaluated (evaluation criteria, evaluation questions and related issues to be examined – “assumptions to be assessed”); (b) how to evaluate (sources of information and methods and tools for data collection)

The methodology should be in line with the evaluation approach and guidance provided in the UNEG Guidelines which will help the evaluators develop a methodology that meets good quality standards and the professional evaluation standards of UNEG in accordance with the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation<sup>7</sup>, Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation<sup>8</sup>, Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System<sup>9</sup>, and Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations<sup>10</sup>.

## Data collection

The evaluation will consider primary and secondary sources of information:

**Primary data** will be collected through semi-structured interviews with key informants at national and sub-national levels (government officials, representatives of implementing partners, civil society organizations, other United Nations organizations, donors, and other stakeholders), as well as group discussions with service providers and rights-holders (notably women, adolescents and youth with disabilities) and direct observation during visits to selected sites. Surveys and questionnaires including participants in development programmes, UNCT members, and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders could also be considered.

**Secondary data** will be collected through desk review, primarily focusing on annual work plans, work plan progress reports, monitoring data and results reports, surveys, census.

The collected data shall include baseline, indicator, targets, output and outcome data available through M&E, progress reports. The evaluation team shall ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex, age, location and other relevant dimensions, such as disability status, to the extent possible. The data collection tools that the evaluation team will develop, which may include protocols for semi-structured interviews and group discussions, checklists for direct observation at sites visited or a protocol for document review, shall be presented in the inception report.

Data collection will focus on the areas the joint programme is addressing. To the extent possible, the evaluation should be participatory in nature and include the views of not only key stakeholders, participating UN agencies but different groups of people with disabilities. During data collection, where possible, gender and human rights (including child rights) shall be incorporated in the evaluation design and instruments in accordance with UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations<sup>11</sup> and the UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicators.<sup>12</sup>

*See the guiding questions on persons with disabilities as **Annex 5***

## Data analysis

The evaluation matrix will be the major framework for analyzing data. The evaluators must enter the qualitative and quantitative data in the evaluation matrix for each evaluation question and each assumption. The evaluation matrix must have indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based, and evaluative conclusions drawn. The design should show clearly how the evaluation will assess the JP's path towards outcomes and impact. Once the evaluation matrix is completed, the evaluators should identify common themes and patterns that will help to answer the evaluation questions. The evaluators shall also identify aspects that should be further explored and for which complementary data should be collected, to fully answer all the evaluation questions and thus cover the whole scope of the evaluation adherence to a code of ethics and a human right based and gender sensitive approach in the gathering, treatment and use of data collected should be made explicit in the inception report. Perspective from both rights holders and duty bearers shall be collected

## EVALUATION PROCESS

---

<sup>7</sup> Document available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

<sup>8</sup> Document available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>

<sup>9</sup> Document available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

<sup>10</sup> Document available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/980>

<sup>11</sup> UNEG [www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2107](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2107)

<sup>12</sup> UN-SWAP [www.uneval.org/document/download/2433](http://www.uneval.org/document/download/2433)

The evaluation process can be broken down into different phases that include different stages and lead to different deliverables: inception phase; field phase; reporting and dissemination phase; The evaluation team leader must undertake quality assurance of each deliverable at each phase and step of the process, with a view to ensuring the production of a credible, useful and timely evaluation.

The Evaluation team will be responsible for conducting the evaluation. This entails among other responsibilities designing the evaluation according to this terms of reference; gathering data from different sources of information; analyzing, organizing and triangulating the information; identifying patterns and causal linkages that explain the JP performance and impact; drafting evaluation reports at different stages (inception, draft, final); responding to comments and factual corrections from stakeholders and incorporating them, as appropriate, in subsequent versions; and making briefs and presentations ensuring the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations are communicated in a coherent, clear and understandable manner once the report is completed.

The evaluation process is expected to contain three phases: inception (1), data collection and field visit (2); and analysis and reporting (3).

### **Inception Phase**

In the inception phase, the activities will be carried out by the evaluation team, in close consultation with the JP Evaluation Management Task Force. This phase includes:

- Evaluation kick-off meeting between the Joint Evaluation Management Task Force comprised of JP implementation managers and evaluation specialists;
- Desk review of background information and documentation on the programme context, as well as other relevant documentation;
- Conduct the evaluability assessment, examine the available data sources and possible extent of data disaggregation;
- Formulation of a final set of evaluation questions based on the preliminary evaluation questions provided in the ToR;
- Development of the evaluation matrix including indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based, and evaluative conclusions drawn;
- Development of a final stakeholder map and a sampling strategy to select sites to be visited and stakeholders to be consulted through interviews and group discussions;
- Development of a data collection and analysis strategy, as well as a concrete and feasible evaluation work plan and agenda for the field phase;
- Development of data collection methods and tools, assessment of limitations to data collection and development of mitigation measures.

At the end of the inception phase, the evaluation team will develop a inception report that presents a robust, practical and feasible evaluation approach, detailed methodology and work plan. The Inception Report should include evaluability assessment and examination of the extent of data disaggregation in M&E data, collection and reporting tools and systems, as well as evaluation approach, tools, and protocols. The evaluation team will develop the inception report in consultation with the JP Evaluation Management Task Force and submit for review. The Inception Report will be subject to quality assurance, a review conducted by internal evaluation stakeholders and external quality assurance that requires a satisfactory rating for the field mission to proceed and be considered an acceptable product.

### **Field Phase**

The evaluation team will collect the data and information required to answer the evaluation questions in the field phase. Towards the end of the phase, the evaluation team will conduct a preliminary analysis of the data to identify emerging findings that will be presented to the JP Evaluation Management Task Force. This should allow the evaluators sufficient time to collect valid and reliable data to cover the thematic scope of the JP. The field phase includes:

- Meeting with the JP Participating Agencies to launch the data collection;
- Meeting of the evaluation team with relevant agencies staffs;
- Meeting with implementing partners and stakeholders;
- Meeting with PwDs;
- Data collection at national and sub-national levels.

At the end of this phase, the evaluation team will hold a debriefing meeting the JP Evaluation Management Task Force to present the emerging findings from the data collection. The meeting will serve as a mechanism for the validation of collected data and information and the exchange of views between the evaluators and important stakeholders and will enable the evaluation team to refine the findings, formulate conclusions and develop credible and relevant recommendations.

## **Reporting Phase**

In the reporting phase, the evaluation team will continue the analytical work (initiated during the field phase) and prepare a draft evaluation report, taking into account the comments and feedback provided at the debriefing meeting at the end of the field phase. The draft report will be circulated to the the JP Evaluation Management Task Force for review. The final evaluation report will be subject to a review undertaken by internal as well as external quality assurance that requires a satisfactory rating.

In the event that the quality of the draft report is unsatisfactory, the evaluation team will be required to revise the report and produce a second draft. On the basis of the comments, the evaluation team should make appropriate amendments, prepare the final evaluation report and submit it to the JP Evaluation Management Task Force. The final report should clearly account for the strength of evidence on which findings rest to support the reliability and validity of the evaluation. Conclusions and recommendations need to clearly build on the findings of the evaluation. Each conclusion shall make reference to the evaluation question(s) upon which it is based, while each recommendation shall indicate the conclusion(s) from which it logically stems.

The evaluation report is considered final once it is formally approved and agreed with the JP Evaluation Management Task Force and the JP steering Committee. The final report should be compliant with UNEG quality checklist of evaluation reports.

The evaluation team is responsible for developing a PowerPoint presentation of the evaluation results that summarizes the key findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation in an easily understandable and user-friendly way. The evaluation results should be shared with all agencies (incl. senior management), implementing partners, and the JP steering committee. The evaluation brief (a concise note) will present the key results of the JP, thereby making them more accessible to a larger audience.

## **EVALUTION LIMITATIONS**

The evaluation process poses some limitations stemming from the limited timeframe of the evaluation, availability of primary and secondary data, budget constraints, as well as potential difficulties to include all vulnerable groups during the field phase (data collection). The latter might be challenged by the lack of availability of certain representatives of the disability community and other contextual factors. Every effort should be made by the evaluation team to identify the potential limitations and hindrances, come up with the mitigation measures, and ensure that relevant efforts are made to develop high-quality evaluation of the programme.

## **EXPECTED DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

The Evaluation team will be accountable for producing the following products/deliverables:

- Inception report: The inception report should translate the requirements of the ToR into a practical and feasible evaluation approach, methodology and work plan. It should include (at a minimum): (i) the evaluation approach and methodology (incl. the theory of change and sampling strategy); (ii) evaluability assessment; (iii) the final stakeholder map; (iv) the evaluation matrix (including the final evaluation questions, indicators, data sources and data collection methods); (v) data collection tools and techniques (incl. interview and group discussion protocols); and (vi) a detailed evaluation work plan and agenda for the field phase.
- Presentation of initial findings and provisional recommendations: at the end of the field work, the Evaluation team will present their draft findings and provisional recommendations through a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the main findings recommendations and lessons learned and conclusions.
- Draft and Final Evaluation Report: A final evaluation report will encompass all key sections required in the draft report and will include additional stakeholder feedback. The final report needs to be clear,

understandable to the intended audience and logically organized based on the comments received from stakeholders (around 40-60 pages). The first and revised drafts of final evaluation report (40-60 pages plus annexes) at minimum should contain the following:

- Executive summary (4-6 pages);
- Literature review;
- Description of JP
- Final Evaluation features including approach and methods as well as its purpose and goals;
- A Theory of change;
- Evaluation findings
- Conclusions logically derived from the body of the findings;
- Good practices and lessons learned;
- Recommendations which are feasible and practical to the maximum extent possible;
- The Report must be compliant with UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards.

The final evaluation report should be presented in a solid, concise and readable form and be structured around the issues in the Terms of Reference (ToR). All Reports should be prepared according to the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards (2017)<sup>13</sup> as per Global Evaluation Reports Oversight (GEROS) guidelines<sup>14</sup>. The Evaluation team is responsible for editing and quality control and the final report that should be presented in a way that directly enables publication.

- The evaluation brief (a concise note) and PowerPoint presentation that will present the key results, conclusions and recommendations, thereby making them more accessible to a larger audience.

## **ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS:**

The evaluation team is responsible to provide adequate guidance and take appropriate measures to ensure their employees and contractors adhere the highest ethical standards during every stage of their work. Before commencement of the field work, the team will ensure ethical review of full research protocol (that includes all data gathering tools/instruments and methods as well as information on how ethical issues will be dealt with) by an independent and impartial ethics review board as per UNEG Ethical Guidelines<sup>15</sup> and UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis.

The evaluation team can make use of national ethical review boards as well as UNICEF regional Long-Term Agreement (LTA) holders – contractors that provide ethical review service (the list of the LTA holders will be provided upon request). The team should keep JP and/or the Steering Committee fully informed on measures undertaken to safeguard full observance of ethical standards and provide JP any additional information on this matter if requested. Proposals to apply for the project should clearly identify any potential ethical issues and approaches, as well as quality assurance/oversight mechanisms.

Persons with Disabilities who participate in the data collection should be informed of the context and purpose of the impact assessment, as well as the privacy and confidentiality of the information they reveal, their right to refuse or halt their participation at any time. Special attention should be paid to issues specifically relating to:

- No harm;
- Informed consent;
- Privacy and confidentiality;
- Conflict of interest of the evaluation informants;
- Conflict of interest of the evaluation team members.

Protection protocols and procedure should be in place and fieldworkers should be adequately trained in case a survey participant is in distress or attention of public authorities is required (e.g. in case of domestic violence, crime, etc.).

Personal data protection protocols shall be elaborated by the team and strictly adhered with by everyone involved in the project.

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/media/816/file/UNICEF-Adapted-UNEG-Evaluation-Report-Standards.pdf>

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/documents/global-evaluation-reports-oversight-system-geros-handbook-and-summary>

<sup>15</sup> UNEG Ethical Guidelines [www.uneval.org/document/download/548](http://www.uneval.org/document/download/548)

## **INDICATIVE TIMEFRAME AND WORK PLAN:**

The evaluation is expected to be conducted from April 2022 to June 2022 for a total duration of approximately 10 working weeks.

## **GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS OF THE EVALUATION:**

**The JP Evaluation Management Task Force** is responsible for managing the evaluation activity and is comprised of PUNOs and RCO (JP implementation managers and evaluation specialists where available). The JP Evaluation Task Force will be responsible for the selection of the organization, day-to-day oversight, and management of evaluation and for management of the budget. The Task Force will assure the quality of evaluation and guarantee its alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines and provide quality assurance checking that the findings and conclusions are relevant and proposed adaptations are actionable. All major deliverables will be reviewed firstly by JP Evaluation Task Force (zero draft) and then shared to the JP steering Committee

**The JP Steering Committee** - There is a functioning JP steering Committee within the Joint SDG Programme comprised of RCO, PUNOs, Government and Non-Government stakeholders. The Steering Committee will be responsible for the overall strategic oversight of the evaluation process and all documents will be shared with them. The representatives of the disability community will be added to the Steering Committee to ensure that all relevant stakeholders participate in the process. The committee is also the main body responsible for providing written and management response to the evaluation.

### **External Evaluation Team:**

The evaluation will be conducted through an institutional contract with an evaluation firm on a national level. The proposed evaluation team will consist of at minimum one (1) senior-level consultant (Team Leader) to conduct the evaluation that will be supported by at least one (1) additional consultant (Team Member/Technical Expert). Additional researchers/enumerators can be considered by the bidders to conduct the data collection.

The Team Leader should bring the following competences:

- Having extensive evaluation experience (at least 8 years) with an excellent understanding of evaluation principles and methodologies, including evaluability, capacity in an array of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods, and UNEG Norms and Standards.
- Having extensive experience on social protection interventions - planning, implementing, managing or M&E.
- Holding an advanced university degree (Master or higher) in economics, social policy, international development, public policy, public administration, or similar, including sound knowledge of social protection; familiarity with human rights and disability issues
- 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, 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.
- Specific evaluation experience of social protection is essential, as well as a strong mixed-method evaluation background;
- Previous solid experience of designing and leading Theory-Based Evaluation designs and documented professional experience in conducting rigorous independent evaluations that meet professional evaluation standards
- 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

The Team Leader will 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 in English and communication of the evaluation results.

One (1) national Team Member/Technical Expert:

- Holding advanced university degrees (Masters-level) in statistics, economics, international development, public policy, public administration, or similar coursework.
- Strong training and experience in disability and social protection.
- Hands-on experience in collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data, especially in relation to socio-economic interventions.
- Experience in conducting efficiency analysis
- Strong expertise in 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.
- Excellent Georgian and English communication and report writing skills.

The Team Member will play a key role in data collection, analysis and presentation, and preparation of the debriefings, and will make significant contributions to the 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 request for proposals for services will be involved in conducting the evaluation. In the review of the proposals, while adequate consideration will be given to the technical methodology, significant weighting will be given to the quality, experience (including CVs, at least 2 references and written sample(s) of previous evaluations) and relevance of individuals who will be involved in the evaluation.

**EVALUATION PROCESS:**

Proposals will be evaluated against two elements: technical and financial. The ratio between the technical and financial criteria depends on the relative importance of one component to the other. Cumulative Analysis will be used to evaluate and award proposals. The evaluation criteria associated with this ToR is split between technical and financial as follows:

- Weigh for Technical Proposal = 70%
- Weigh for Financial Proposal = 30%
- Total Score = 100%

**a. Technical Proposal:**

The Technical Proposal should address all aspects and criteria outlined in this ToR.

Table: Evaluation of Technical Proposal

The Technical Proposals will be evaluated against the following:

| REF | Category  | Points |
|-----|---|--------|
| 1.  | Overall response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completeness of response</li> <li>• Overall concord between the ToR requirements and propose</li> </ul>  |        |
| 2.  | Company/Key personnel/individual consultant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Range and depth of experience with similar projects</li> <li>• Sample(s) of previous work</li> <li>• relevance of references</li> </ul> |        |

- Key personnel: relevant experience and qualifications of the proposed team for the assignment

3. Proposed methodology and approach:

- Detailed proposal with main tasks, including sound methodology to achieve key outputs
- Proposal presents a realistic implementation timeline

Total Technical

70

Only proposals which receive a minimum of 60 points will be considered further.

**b. Financial Proposal**

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 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.,

$$\text{Max. score for price proposal} * \text{Price of lowest priced proposal}$$

$$\text{Score for price proposal X} = \frac{\text{Max. score for price proposal} * \text{Price of lowest priced proposal}}{\text{Price of proposal X}}$$

**BUDGET AND PAYMENT MODALITIES**

|  |      |
|--|------|
| The payment of fees will be based on the submission of deliverables, as follows: Upon approval of the Inception report | 30 % |
| Upon submission of a draft final evaluation report of satisfactory quality   | 30%  |
| Upon approval of the final evaluation report and the PowerPoint presentation of the evaluation results                 | 40%  |

As the JP is implemented by 6 UN agencies the payment modality is reflective of this specificity. Every agency participating in the evaluation is responsible for processing the payment for their portion of the evaluation. The details will be further discussed with the organization within the precontracting phase.

**CRITERIA FOR SELECTION**

- o Having extensive evaluation experience with demonstrated understanding of evaluation principles and methodologies, including evaluability, capacity in an array of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods, and UNEG Norms and Standards;
- o Previous solid experience of designing and leading theory-based evaluation designs and documented professional experience in conducting rigorous independent evaluations that meet professional evaluation standards;
- o Demonstrated experience/potential to bring a strong commitment to delivering timely and high-quality results, i.e., credible evaluations that are used for improving strategic decisions;
- o Having knowledge of the UN’s human rights, gender equality and equity agendas;
- o Strong training and experience in disability and social protection will be an asset;
- o Prior research/evaluation experience with UNICEF or other UN agencies will be considered as an asset;
- o Having a strong management track record;
- o Ability to work independently, with limited regular supervision;

- o A qualified team for evaluation design/implementation, quantitative and qualitative data collection and analyses.

More detailed criteria are elaborated on pg. 11-12 under the External Evaluation Team requirements and competences.

**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED:**

- Company's profile;
- Project proposal with description of the proposed work plan and timeline;
- CVs of suggested experts;
- At least 2 references;
- Sample(s) of previous work;
- Information regarding organization's bank account issued by Bank (stamped);
- filled VMIP Vendor Registration form (template is attached);
- Financial proposal.

Detailed information on application documents and procedure is provided in the Instructions to Proposers.

**Prepared by:**

Tinatin Tsertsvadze, Social Services Officer

**Date:**

**Submitted by:**

Nona Tsikhelashvili, OIC Child Protection Specialist

**Date:**

**Endorsed by:**

Vakhtang Akhaladze, Operations Manager

**Date:**

**Endorsed by:**

Ketevan Melikadze, OIC Deputy Representative

**Date:**

**Approved by:**

Amy Clancy, OIC Representative

**Date:**