Final Evaluation Terms of Reference for Response-Recovery-Resilience for Conflict-Affected Communities in Ethiopia (3R4CACE)

Project Code: 23546-001
Executing Agency: United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)
Funding Partner: World Bank

11 August 2025

UNOPS

Table of contents

List of Acronyms **2**
Executive Summary **3**
1. Introduction and Project Context **4**
1.1. Project Background 4
1.2. Project Scope and Amendments 4
1.3. Theories of Change (ToC) Summary 4
2. Evaluation Purpose **5**
3. Objectives **6**
4. Evaluation Scope **7**
4.1. Thematic Scope 7
4.2. Geographic Scope 7
4.3. Temporal Scope (Evaluation Period) 7
4.4. Key Components for Assessment 7
5. Evaluation Questions **8**
6. Evaluation Methodology **11**
6.1. Analytical Framework 11
6.2. Data Collection Methods 12
6.3. Sampling Strategy 14
6.4. Key Indicators 16
6.5. Data Analysis 21
7. Security, Ethical, and Quality Assurance **22**
8. Stakeholder Engagement Plan **24**
9. Work Plan and Deliverables **25**
10. Roles, Responsibilities, and Quality Assurance **26**
10.1. Evaluation Team Structure 26
10.2. Quality Assurance and Management 28
11. Bid Evaluation Criteria **29**

List of Acronyms

Acronym	Full name
3R4CACE	Response-Recovery-Resilience for Conflict-Affected Communities in Ethiopia
DNP	Defects Notification Period
ESS	Environmental and Social Standards
FCV	Fragility, Conflict, and Violence
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
GESI	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion
GoV	Government of Ethiopia
GRC	Grievance Redress Committee
HROC	High-Risk Operating Context
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
KIIs	Key Informant Interviews
MIS	Management Information System
MoF	Ministry of Finance
NROC	Non-high Risk Operating Context
NRCs	Neighborhood Relations Committees
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee

Executive Summary

The Response-Recovery-Resilience for Conflict-Affected Communities in Ethiopia (3R4CACE) project, implemented from June 2022 to December 2025, aimed to bridge immediate humanitarian needs with long-term infrastructure reconstruction in the Tigray region. This final independent evaluation assesses the performance of the UNOPS-Ministry of Finance partnership, specifically focusing on the delivery of 17 schools, 15 health facilities, and 711 WASH systems.

Utilizing OECD/DAC criteria, the evaluation employs a mixed-methods, retrospective longitudinal case study to measure relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. Key deliverables include a robust assessment of institutional strengthening efforts, such as the Neighborhood Relations Committees (NRCs), and actionable recommendations to inform future programming in Fragility, Conflict, and Violence (FCV) settings.

Approach	Description	Purpose
Document Review	Analysis of project agreements, reports, and baseline data.	Establish a baseline and assess efficiency/compliance.
Quantitative Data	Analysis of oneUNOPS Collect (oUC) MIS data and household surveys. All raw quantitative data will remain the sole property of UNOPS and must be delivered in a format compatible with the UNOPS database for MIS dashboard integration.	Measure service utilization and infrastructure functionality.
Qualitative Data	Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).	Assess social cohesion, NRC functionality, and community impact.
Field Observation	Technical site audits across 10 sampled Kebeles.	Verify durability and O&M status of reconstructed assets.

The total estimated budget for this evaluation, utilizing a lean implementation model with national consultants, is $29,500. This covers consultancy fees ($19,500), local field data collection ($5,000), logistical/security support ($4,000), and reporting/admin costs ($1,000).

1. Introduction and Project Context

1.1. Project Background

The armed conflict that erupted in November 2020 within the northern region of Ethiopia, specifically Tigray, between the Federal Government and the Tigray People's Liberation Front, caused a humanitarian and developmental crisis. This conflict, which subsequently expanded into the neighboring Amhara and Afar regions, resulted in loss of life, the internal displacement of over four million individuals, and the destruction of essential social and economic infrastructure. In response to this emergency, the Government of Ethiopia (GoE), in collaboration with the World Bank, initiated the Response-Recovery-Resilience for Conflict-Affected Communities in Ethiopia (3R4CACE) project. The project is designed to bridge the immediate humanitarian needs of conflict-affected populations with the longer-term requirements of post-conflict reconstruction and institutional resilience.

The 3R4CACE project was launched in June 2022 to rebuild essential services and increase community resilience. The project prioritized the restoration of social infrastructure, including 17 schools, 15 health facilities, and 711 water supply systems (water schemes and hand pumps) in the five woredas of Tigray region. As part of the resilience phase, institutional strengthening was also a key focus area, including the strengthening of WASHCO, Operation and Maintenance Committee, and Neighborhood Relations Committees (NRC) and Grievance Redress Committees (GRC). Additionally, fruit seedling plantation and other coping mechanism activities were implemented.

1.2. Project Scope and Amendments

The project was structured to deliver outputs through a phased approach: Phase 1 (Assessments), Phase 2 (Implementation), and Phase 3 (Handover and Defects Notification). Legal amendments ensured the transition from rapid response to long-term infrastructure delivery, with the final handover of sites occurring in December 2025.

- Amendment 1 (April 2025): Detailed the transition to full-scale reconstruction and realigned the budget to prioritize infrastructure.
- Amendment 2 (July 2025): Extended the timeline to ensure a 12-month Defects Notification Period (DNP) for the finished infrastructure.

1.3. Theories of Change (ToC) Summary

Based on the project's logic model and results framework, the Theory of Change (ToC) for the 3R4CACE project can be stated as follows:
IF the project effectively mobilizes human resources, funding, and construction materials while maintaining strong partnerships with the government and community , **AND** utilizes these inputs to conduct technical assessments, construct or rehabilitate health, education, and WASH facilities, and deliver resilience-building activities, **THEN** the project will produce functional community sub-projects, operational Neighborhood Relations Committees (NRCs), and high-level

community participation and beneficiary satisfaction, leading to the **OUTCOME** of rebuilt climate-resilient social infrastructure, which will ultimately lead to the long-term **IMPACT** of improved, sustainable access to basic services.

This is predicated on the **ASSUMPTIONS** that the security situation remains stable, stakeholders continue to cooperate, and the supply chain remains reliable. However, the project must navigate **RISKS** such as potential construction delays, high inflation, and community resistance.

Fig 1. Theory of Change for 3R4CACE

Input	Activity	Output	Outcome	Impact
Resources needed to conduct activities efficiently: ❑ Human Resources ❑ Funding ❑ Construction Materials ❑ Government & community support ❑ Partnership from govt and other stakehplders	Activities implemented to achieve project objective: ❑ Conduct technical assessment ❑ Rehabilitation of health facilities,schools and WASH ❑ Construction of health facilities,schools and WASH facilities ❑ Resilience activities (capacity building, institutional strengthening, enhance coping mechanisms) ❑ Supervision and monitoring	Tangible results produce through the activities: ❑ Functional schools, health and WASH facilities supported by rehabilitation ❑ Households in selected communities participating in planning, decision-making, and/or implementation ❑ NRC formed or reinforced and still operational one year after receiving funding ❑ Beneficiaries that feel project investments reflect their needs	Outcomes expected from project intervention: ❑ Rebuilt climate-resilient community infrastructure (Health, education and WASH)	Long term results expected beyond project intervention time frame: ❑ Improved access to basic service (Health, education and WASH)
Key Assumption: Cooperation from stakeholders, Stable security, Supply chain stability				
Risks: Inflation, Delay of material supply, construction delay, community resistance				

2. Evaluation Purpose

The primary purpose of this final independent evaluation is twofold:

1. **Accountability:** To provide an impartial, evidence-based assessment of the performance of the UNOPS-Ministry of Finance partnership in delivering rebuilt social infrastructure (Health, Education, and WASH) and resilience activities. It evaluates whether the project achieved its intended outputs and outcomes while adhering to agreed-upon quality standards, World Bank Environmental and Social Standards (ESS), and the budget ceiling.

2. **Learning and Future Programming**: To extract critical lessons learned and develop actionable recommendations regarding the Third-Party Implementation (TPI) model used in high-risk conflict zones. The evaluation aims to identify best practices for transitioning from "Rapid Response" to "Recovery" and "Resilience" phases in Fragility, Conflict, and Violence (FCV) settings.

The findings will be used by the Project Board (Ministry of Finance and UNOPS) and the World Bank to inform strategic decision-making regarding the sustainability of completed facilities and

the design of future emergency response and health capacity enhancement programs in Ethiopia.

3. Objectives

Structured around the globally recognized OECD/DAC 'Gold Standard' criteria, the specific objectives of this evaluation ensure a rigorous assessment of the project's success, effectiveness, and long-term impact in the region:

1. **Relevance:**
    - To evaluate the extent to which the project's strategy and site selection aligned with the priority needs identified in the 3R4CACE Multi-level Assessment for both host and IDP populations.
    - To assess the extent to which the tailoring of the infrastructure scope (Education, Health, and WASH) responded to the actual service demands and priorities of the specific target communities within the selected Woreda of Tigray.
2. **Coherence:**
    - To analyze the compatibility of the project's Third-Party Implementation (TPI) partnership model between UNOPS and the Ministry of Finance with Ethiopia Resilient Recovery and Reconstruction Planning Framework (2023–28) and other policy frameworks.
    - To evaluate how the project's activities complemented other donor-funded initiatives, such as the Durable Solutions Initiative, to ensure a seamless transition and avoid duplication of efforts.
3. **Effectiveness:**
    - To measure the achievement of physical targets, specifically the reconstruction and functional status of 17 schools, 15 health facilities, and 711 WASH systems.
    - To determine the extent to which the project reached its target beneficiaries with improved access to basic services.
    - To evaluate the success of capacity-building activities for Neighborhood Relation Committees (NRCs), Gender Redress Committee (GRC), and local authorities in fulfilling their operational mandates.
4. **Efficiency:**
    - To analyze the economy and efficiency of resource utilization, specifically assessing the cost-effectiveness of procurement and construction, and the efficacy of risk mitigation strategies in minimizing financial and timeline impacts.
5. **Impact:**
    - To identify early evidence of improved social cohesion resulting from the joint Host-IDP management of community assets through the NRCs.
    - To assess the project’s contribution to enhanced community resilience and preparedness for future health and socio-economic shocks in conflict-affected zones.

6. **Sustainability:**
    - To determine the institutional and financial readiness of local Woreda administrations to continue funding and implementing Operation and Maintenance (O&M) plans after the project closure.
    - To assess the technical durability and functional status of constructed assets beyond the 12-month Defects Notification Period (DNP)

4. Evaluation Scope

The Evaluation Scope of the 3R4CACE project is structured to assess the full lifecycle of the project, focusing on the transition through its various phases and the delivery of outputs across its primary components. Based on the project structure and legal agreements/amendments, the scope is defined as follows.

4.1. Thematic Scope

The evaluation should cover all activities implemented under Component 1 of the project, which focuses on:

- **Infrastructure Delivery:** Rebuilding and improving access to social and economic services, specifically in the Health, Education, and WASH sectors.
- **Community Governance:** The formation, reinforcement, and operational status of Neighborhood Relations Committees (NRCs).
- **Resilience and Capacity Building:** Activities aimed at institutional strengthening and community-led recovery planning.
- **Social and Environmental Compliance:** Adherence to quality standards, environmental safeguards, and gender-related considerations (GESI) during the implementation process.

4.2. Geographic Scope

The evaluation's primary focus is on the Tigray Region of Ethiopia, specifically within the five prioritized Woredas identified in the project agreement: Abergele, Asgede, Hawzen, Hintalo, and Endamekhoni.

4.3. Temporal Scope (Evaluation Period)

The evaluation should cover the full project lifecycle from its start date on June 30, 2022, through its operational conclusion. This includes:

- **Phase 1:** General assessment and planning.
- **Phase 2:** Rapid Response, Recovery, and Resilience implementation.
- **Phase 3**: The Defects Notification Period (DNP), which was extended to ensure a 12-month quality monitoring phase for all physical works before final closure.

4.4. Key Components for Assessment

The following specific outputs and outcomes should be assessed for quality, quantity, and timeliness:

- **Reconstructed Facilities:** 17 schools, 15 health facilities, and 711 WASH Systems.
- **Service Delivery:** Functionality of infrastructure six months after completion.

- **Sustainability:** The effectiveness of Operation and Maintenance (O&M) plans developed for the new facilities.

5. Evaluation Questions

The evaluation questions are structured around the six OECD/DAC criteria for the 3R4CACE project evaluation. The evaluator is expected to review and propose additional questions, as needed, during the inception phase.

Table 1. Evaluation questions

Evaluation Criteria	Specific Objectives	Evaluation Questions
Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right things?	• To evaluate the extent to which the project's strategy and site selection aligned with the priority needs identified in the 3R4CACE Multi-level Assessment for both host and IDP populations. • To assess the extent to which the tailoring of the infrastructure scope (Education, Health, and WASH) responded to the actual service demands and priorities of the specific target communities within the selected Woreda of Tigray.	1. How well did the project's site selection and prioritization of infrastructure (schools, health, and WASH) align with the priority needs identified in the 3R4CACE Multi-level Assessment for the specific communities served?
		2. To what extent did the transition from the "Rapid Response" phase to the "Recovery" phase accurately reflect the evolving security and humanitarian context in Tigray?
		3. How effectively did the project design incorporate the specific needs of vulnerable groups within these communities, including female-headed households and internally displaced persons (IDPs)?
Coherence: How well does the intervention fit?	• To analyze the compatibility of the project's Third-Party Implementation (TPI) partnership model between UNOPS and the Ministry of Finance with Ethiopia Resilient Recovery and Reconstruction Planning Framework (2023–28) and other policy frameworks. • To evaluate how the project's activities complemented other	4. How coherent was the project's Third-Party Implementation (TPI) model with the Government of Ethiopia's national recovery strategies and the Durable Solutions Initiative?
		5. To what extent did the project avoid duplication by coordinating with other humanitarian and development actors through the UN Cluster teams?

Evaluation Criteria	Specific Objectives	Evaluation Questions
	donor-funded initiatives, such as the Durable Solutions Initiative, to ensure a seamless transition and avoid duplication of efforts.	
Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?	• To measure the achievement of physical targets, specifically the reconstruction and functional status of 17 schools, 15 health facilities, and 711 WASH systems. • To determine the extent to which the project reached its target beneficiaries with improved access to basic services. • To evaluate the success of capacity-building activities for Neighborhood Relation Committees (NRCs), Gender Redress Committee (GRC), and local authorities in fulfilling their operational mandates.	6. To what extent were the physical targets of 17 schools, 15 health facilities, and 711 WASH systems completed according to technical specifications? 7. Did the project achieve its high-level goal of reaching target beneficiaries with improved access to basic services? 8. How successful were the Neighborhood Relations Committees (NRCs) and Grievance Redress Committees (GRCs) in facilitating community-driven decision-making and operating effectively as accountability and feedback mechanisms?
Efficiency: How well are resources being used?	• To analyze the economy and efficiency of resource utilization, specifically assessing the cost-effectiveness of procurement and construction, and the efficacy of risk mitigation strategies in minimizing financial and timeline impacts.	9. How does the project's cost-effectiveness (analyzing unit costs for procurement and construction) compare to market benchmarks and similar projects in Ethiopia and the region? 10. To what extent did the use of the oneUNOPS Collect (oUC) mobile application improve the timeliness and accuracy of monitoring data from high-risk conflict areas?

Evaluation Criteria	Specific Objectives	Evaluation Questions
		11. How cost-sensitive and efficient was the budget preparation, use, and amendment process?
		12. How successfully did the project's risk mitigation strategy minimize negative impacts on overall timelines and resources?
		13. Was the phased implementation approach (Rapid Response, Recovery, and Resilience) an efficient mechanism for scaling up work as security conditions improved?
		14. What were the perceived advantages and disadvantages of the UNOPS-MoF Third-Party Implementation (TPI) model compared to direct implementation or other models in this specific High-Risk Operating Context (HROC)?
Impact: What difference does the intervention make?	• To identify early evidence of improved social cohesion resulting from the joint Host-IDP management of community assets through the NRCs. • To assess the project's contribution to enhanced community resilience and preparedness for future health and socio-economic shocks in conflict-affected zones.	15. What early evidence exists that the project improved social cohesion between IDPs and host communities through joint management of community assets?
		16. How has the restoration of climate-resilient infrastructure contributed to the long-term resilience of the five prioritized Woredas against socio-economic shocks?
Sustainability: Will the benefits last?	• To determine the institutional and financial readiness of local Woreda administrations to continue funding and implementing Operation and	17. To what extent are the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) plans functional and being implemented by local Woreda administrations after the project handover?

Evaluation Criteria	Specific Objectives	Evaluation Questions
	Maintenance (O&M) plans after the project closure. • To assess the technical durability and functional status of constructed assets beyond the 12-month Defects Notification Period (DNP)	18. Did the project successfully build the institutional capacity of local civil servants to manage and maintain the delivered infrastructure independently?
		19. Are the social outcomes, such as the operational status of the NRCs, likely to persist one year after the project closure?

6. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation will employ a mixed-methods, retrospective longitudinal case study design to assess performance from project inception in June 2022 through the conclusion of implementation in December 2025. This approach allows the evaluation to track the "trajectory of change" across the three distinct project phases: Assessment and Planning, Implementation (Rapid Response, Recovery, and Resilience), and the Defects Notification Period (DNP).

6.1. Analytical Framework

Evaluation framework: The foundation of the analysis is globally recognized OECD-DAC Criteria (Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, and Sustainability). These criteria are directly linked to the specific evaluation questions outlined in Section 5.

The assessment will employ a Theory-Based Evaluation approach to systematically trace the logical links between project inputs, activities, outputs, and the intended outcomes/impact as defined in the ToC and determine the project's plausible contribution to the observed results in a complex, conflict-affected operating environment.

Leveraging Established Baselines and Multi-Source Triangulation: The evaluation will leverage the quantitative baseline values established during the 3R4CACE Multi-level Assessment and prioritization exercise to provide a robust, evidence-based foundation for measuring change. The methodology for utilizing this data includes:

1. **Multi-source data triangulation:** Systematically comparing the quantitative change observed (baseline to end-line) with qualitative and secondary data sources (KIIs, FGDs, Project Reports, and external datasets) to ensure findings are robust and consistent.
2. **Project documentation as evidence:** Leveraging initial assessment documents to contextualize the established baseline. Project implementation records, procurement logs, financial data, etc. will be analyzed to provide detailed, in-depth evidence for the Efficiency and Effectiveness criteria, explaining how and why the project moved from the baseline to the end-line status.

3. **Explaining Change:** Designing qualitative methods (KIIs, FGDs, Most Significant Change stories) to capture the pathway of change and the community's perception of impact. This data will be used to provide contextual meaning to the quantitative results, explaining why a particular change (or lack thereof) occurred, particularly for the Impact and Sustainability criteria.

6.2. Data Collection Methods

A mixed-methods approach will be employed, combining document reviews, qualitative data analysis, and quantitative data collection to ensure a robust and triangulated assessment of the project's performance across the OECD/DAC criteria.

1. **Document review (Secondary Data)**
   - **Project Documents:** Review of foundational documents including the Project Agreement, Results Framework, Amendments (1 and 2), progress reports, financial statements, and monitoring data.
   - **Baseline Data Integration:** The evaluation will utilize the available project baseline data to establish a pre-intervention reference point for key indicators. This quantitative comparison will be crucial for assessing project achievements and contributing to a robust analysis of effectiveness and potential early signs of impact.
   - **External Documents:** Review of relevant national policies and other donor-funded initiative documents to assess project Coherence.
2. **Quantitative Data Collection and Analysis**
   - **Primary Data Collection**: Primary quantitative data will be collected, through surveys for selected key indicators. This endline data will be systematically compared against the available baseline values to quantitatively measure the change (progress or shortfall) achieved by the intervention.
   - **Secondary Data:** Analysis of project-specific data from the MIS, including technical completion reports, asset registration data, and financial expenditure records.
   - **Verification of Physical Targets**: Collection of final completion and functionality data to verify the status of the 17 schools, 15 health facilities, and 711 WASH systems against technical specifications and project targets.
3. **Qualitative Data Collection**
   - **Key Informant Interviews (KIIs):** Semi-structured interviews will be conducted with key stakeholders, including:
     - Project management staff (UNOPS, Ministry of Finance) and World Bank Task Team.
     - Woreda (district) and regional government officials across relevant sectors (Health, Education, WASH).
     - Contractors and partners involved in infrastructure delivery.
   - **Focus Group Discussions:** FGDs will be held with beneficiaries at the community level, categorized to capture diverse perspectives:

  - Host community members and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) to assess social cohesion and access to services.
  - Members of Neighborhood Relations Committees (NRCs) and Grievance Redress Committees (GRCs) to evaluate their operational success and capacity.
  - Female-headed households and other vulnerable groups to assess inclusivity (GESI).
- **Direct Observation and Site Visits:** Field visits to a representative sample of reconstructed facilities across the five prioritized Woredas will be conducted for physical verification and to assess the technical durability and functional status of the assets.

Table 2. Evaluation data sources, tools, and purpose matrix

Data Source	**Tools**	**Focus and Purpose**
1. Document Review	Project Agreements (Amendments 1 and 2), Financial Reports, Technical Specifications, 3R4CACE Multi-level Assessment Reports, Project plan (RR DIP and Resilience Plan), Periodic reports, E&S Monitoring Reports.	**Relevance, Coherence, Efficiency.** Establishes the reconstructed baseline, verifies budget compliance under high inflation, and establishes the legal framework for the phased transition.
2. Management Information System (MIS)	oneUNOPS Collect (oUC) data extraction and Indicator Tracking Sheets.	**Effectiveness.** Verifies quantitative output achievement for rebuilt infrastructure access, service delivery reach, and sub-project functionality.
3. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)	Semi-structured Interview Guides tailored for strategic stakeholders such as the UNOPS HAMCO Director, HoP, Project manager, PMO, MoF Federal Project Coordinating Unit, Regional Sector Bureaus, and World Bank Task Team.	**Efficiency, Coherence, Sustainability.** Gather strategic insights on project partnership, transition, and sustainability mechanisms.
4. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)	Guides tailored for Neighborhood Relations Committees (NRCs), IDP representatives, and host community groups.	**Relevance, Effectiveness, Impact.** Assesses project alignment with community needs, service utilization, and early evidence of social cohesion.

Data Source	Tools	Focus and Purpose
5. Site Visits & Observation	Field Verification Checklists and Technical Assessment Protocols.	**Effectiveness, Sustainability.** Verifies the functionality, quality of works, and technical durability of reconstructed assets post-DNP.
6. Household Surveys	Structured Questionnaires (cluster sampling) with IDP and Host community members.	**Relevance, Effectiveness, Impact.** Measures changes in service access, user satisfaction, and unintended consequences.

6.3. Sampling Strategy

The evaluation utilizes a **Multi-Stage Cluster Sampling approach** as the primary framework, supplemented by Purposive Sampling for all qualitative components. This design allows the team to narrow focus from the regional level to specific clusters, ensuring that findings from quantitative surveys are directly contextualized by qualitative insights from the same locations.

Table 3. Sampling strategy

Sample Group	Rationale	Minimum Coverage	Justification for Minimum Coverage
Site Sampling (Kebeles)	To compare project outcomes across different conflict risk profiles and local environmental contexts.	10 Kebeles: 2 Kebeles from each of the 5 prioritized Woredas in Tigray.	Selection of 10 Kebeles (2 kebeles per Woreda) provides a substantial sample out of the 15 intervention kebeles. This selection is purposive to compare one High-Risk Operating Context (HROC) site and one Non-high Risk Operating Context (NROC) site per Woreda, which is essential for comparative analysis of the TPI model's effectiveness and capturing geographic breadth.
Education Infrastructure	To verify technical quality, climate resilience, and desk distribution in primary	5 Primary Schools	Ensures 33% of the regional target for Education is physically verified, providing high confidence in the quality of

Sample Group	Rationale	Minimum Coverage	Justification for Minimum Coverage
	schools.		reconstructed classroom blocks.
Health Infrastructure	To verify the rehabilitation of health posts and health centers and the delivery of medical furniture.	5 Health facilities	Ensures 33% of the regional target for Health is physically verified to assess the functionality of service delivery six months post-completion.
WASH Infrastructure	To validate the functionality and sustainability of all WASH components: Rehabilitation (RR), New Construction (Recovery), and Hand Pump Maintenance (Resilience).	38 WASH facilities (18 water systems [rehabilitated/new] and 20 maintained hand pumps) for physical verification, ensuring all 10 sampled Kebeles are covered.)[1]	Achieves 33% coverage for the 54 high-investment WASH systems (18 out of 54), aligning the sampling rigor with the Health and Education sectors. The 20 maintained hand pumps provide a feasible and representative sample of the 657 total hand pumps across the 10 sampled Kebeles, capturing distributed maintenance efforts.
Beneficiary Households	To provide statistically significant data for the "need-alignment" and "participation" indicators, and to quantify change from the baseline.	Multi-Stage Cluster Sample: A representative Sample to be determined using a clustered approach.	Given the scattered nature of the population, a clustered approach ensures field feasibility; households within selected clusters are identified via Systematic Random Sampling.
Neighborhood Relations Committees (NRCs)	To measure institutional functionality and sustainability of community governance one year after funding.	10 NRCs: One committee from each selected Kebele cluster.	Coverage of 10 out of 15 established NRCs provides a sufficient majority to determine if the 70% operational target has been met.

[1] Total Water systems delivered by the project include: 36 water systems under Rapid Response (Rehabilitation) - 22 Institutional WASH and 14 community WASH; 18 new water system construction under Recovery (new construction) - 12 institutional WASH and 6 Community WASH; and 657 hand pump maintenance done in the 15 target kebeles and other kebeles within the five Woredas

Sample Group	Rationale	Minimum Coverage	Justification for Minimum Coverage
Grievance Redress Committee	To assess the functionality, independence, and effectiveness of the GRC as an independent complaint and feedback mechanism for sensitive cases.	10 GRCs: One committee from each selected Kebele cluster.	Coverage of 10 out of 15 established GRCs provides a sufficient majority. Interviews will be conducted with a diverse subset of the GRC membership (Kebele Admin, Community Representatives, Sector Representatives) in each of the 10 sampled Kebeles to triangulate findings on independence, multi-stakeholder participation, and operational effectiveness in handling complaints.
Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)	To capture qualitative data on social cohesion, gender equity, and collective committee functionality.	Separated by gender and status (IDP vs. Host) within the 10 clusters.	Segregated groups are required to safely and accurately validate indicators related to female leadership and community participation in planning.
Key Informants (Strategic Level)	To gather high-level insights on risk mitigation, implementation efficiency, and coordination.	All Key Partners: Representation from MoF, regional bureaus, World Bank, and UNOPS Project Management unit.	Full coverage of lead stakeholders is necessary to reconstruct the "trajectory of change" and document institutional lessons learned.

6.4. Key Indicators

To ensure a comprehensive and evidence-based assessment against the OECD/DAC criteria and the project's intended results, the evaluation will focus on collecting data and evidence related to the following key indicators. These indicators are specifically designed to measure the achievement of project outputs and outcomes across the core sectors of intervention. The evaluator is expected to review, refine, and, as necessary, propose additional indicators during the inception phase.

Table 4. List of key indicators to be assessed

Area	Key Indicator	Indicator Description	Relevance of the Indicator
Health	Percentage of Health Facilities Completed	Measures the physical achievement and operational status of the 15 health facilities and 1 Primary Hospital according to technical specifications.	**Effectiveness and Output Achievement:** Directly measures the success of the physical reconstruction targets (15 health facilities, 1 hospital)
	Number of Outpatients per Day	Measures the volume of health service utilization at the reconstructed facilities, with disaggregation by gender, IDP status, and children.	**Effectiveness** and **Outcome:** Measures the volume of restored service utilization.
	Percentage of Daily Outpatients	Measures the proportion of outpatients to the total potential service user to understand service reach.	**Effectiveness** and **Outcome:** Measures the rate of restored service utilization.
	Number of Inpatients per Day	Measures the volume of critical inpatient health services utilized at the reconstructed Hospital and Health Centers, with disaggregation by gender, IDP status, and children.	**Effectiveness** and **Outcome:** Measures the rate of restored service utilization.
	Percentage of Daily Inpatients	Measures the proportion of inpatients to the total potential service user to understand service reach.	**Effectiveness** and **Outcome:** Measures the rate of utilization of restored critical service capacity.
	Proportion of health facilities with a functional WASH System	The percentage of reconstructed health facilities that have a fully functional iWASH system (clean water supply, working toilets, and handwashing stations) on-site.	**Effectiveness** and **Quality:** Assesses the successful integration of a critical essential WASH service into the health infrastructure.
Education	Percentage of school facilities completed and functional	Measures the percentage of the 17 target schools constructions (classroom blocks, admin blocks,	**Effectiveness** and **Output Achievement:** Directly measures the successful

Area	Key Indicator	Indicator Description	Relevance of the Indicator
		library, school feeding blocks, etc.) that have been completed according to technical specifications and are fully operational.	delivery and usability of the education infrastructure targets (17 schools).
	Percentage change in pupil/student enrollment rate	Measures the change in the number of students officially registered in the targeted schools after the infrastructure upgrade, compared to the number registered before the upgrade. This aims to capture increased access to proper learning facilities for students previously out of school or learning in inadequate conditions.	**Effectiveness** and **Outcome Achievement:** Directly measures the project's success in restoring and increasing access to education services.
	Percentage of Schools with functional iWASH facilities	Measures the percentage of the 17 target schools where the dedicated iWASH systems (toilet, hand washing facility, clean water supply) are fully operational and in good working order.	**Effectiveness** and **Quality:** Assesses the provision of essential supportive infrastructure for student health and facility operations.
	Number of pupils out of school	Measures the absolute count of children (with baseline comparison) who are not attending school in the target Woredas.	**Effectiveness** and **Outcome:** Measures the volume of the population yet to be reached or who have not returned to school.
	Percentage of Pupils Out of School	Measures the change in the number of out-of-school children against the total pupil population in the target area to determine the severity and reach of the educational deficit. disaggregating by female and	**Effectiveness** and **Outcome:** Assesses the project goal of restoring education access, with key disaggregation for vulnerable groups (IDPs, female pupils).

Area	Key Indicator	Indicator Description	Relevance of the Indicator
		IDP pupils to assess inclusivity and impact.	
	Percentage of school provided with essential learning materials	Assesses the provision of essential learning materials (blackboard, school desks, etc.) to the 17 target schools across the Rapid Response and Recovery phases.	**Effectiveness** and **Output Achievement:** Measures the completion of the material provision activity required to resume basic education services.
	Female students Retention Rate in trained schools	Measures the percentage of female students who remain enrolled in the trained schools over a specified period, used to assess the effectiveness of the training on early marriage/psychosocial support.	**Impact** and **GESI:** Evaluates the success of the project's capacity-building and resilience activities in addressing specific social barriers to education (Gender Equality and Social Inclusion - GESI).
WASH	Percentage of community WASH systems completed and functional	Measures the physical achievement and operational status of the 711 water supply systems (hand pumps, reservoirs, distribution lines, etc.) after completion.	**Effectiveness (Output):** Directly measures the successful delivery and operational state of the community WASH infrastructure targets (711 systems).
	Water Point Productivity (Litres per Day)	Assess the yield of the repaired or newly constructed water points to determine capacity.	**Effectiveness (Outcome):** Measures the performance and quality of the reconstructed water source infrastructure, ensuring it meets service demand.
	Potential Liters per Day per Person	The volume of water (in liters) that a specific WASH facility or system is capable of delivering per day, divided by the total number of people residing	**Effectiveness:** Measures the adequacy and capacity of water supply (WASH) infrastructure relative to the immediate service demand,

Area	Key Indicator	Indicator Description	Relevance of the Indicator
		within its 1KM service radius.	providing a direct metric for the availability of basic services.
	Population within 1 km radius of a Functional Water Point	Measures the project's success in increasing physical access to safe water for the target population.	**Effectiveness (Outcome):** Measures the reach of the project and its direct contribution to the outcome of improved community access to basic services.
	Percentage change in average household income or asset value for women participants (e.g., from sales of compost or produce) post-intervention III	Assesses the success of institutional strengthening, farming activities, and training (e.g., compost production, seedling plantation) in demonstrably improving women's livelihoods and capacity.	**Impact:** Evaluates the long-term project component focused on community resilience, economic empowerment, and coping mechanisms, specifically for women as a vulnerable group
Recovery	Households in selected communities participating in planning, decision-making, and/or implementation of community recovery plans (Percentage)	The percentage of households in target communities with at least one member (male or female) documented as having participated in the planning, decision-making, or implementation of community recovery plans. Disaggregated by female and male header households.	**Effectiveness and Relevance:** Measures community ownership, buy-in, and alignment of the project with community needs.
	Community recovery plans implemented (Percentage)	The percentage of prepared recovery plans for which the identified actions were executed successfully using at least 85% of assigned project resources.	**Effectiveness and Efficiency:** Direct measure of achieving planned recovery outputs on time and with efficient resource use.

Area	Key Indicator	Indicator Description	Relevance of the Indicator
	Neighborhood Relations Committees formed or reinforced and still operational one year after receiving funding (Percentage)	The proportion of Neighborhood Relations Committees (NRCs) established or strengthened that remain active and functional 12 months after project funding for capacity building ends. Functionality includes foundational documents, representative membership (Host/IDP, male/female), and an assigned budget.	**Sustainability:** Assesses the long-term viability of the community-led governance structures.
	Trained females in new or reinforced Neighborhood Relations Committees undertaking outreach, training, and/or advocacy activities (Percentage)	The proportion of women in NRCs who, following capacity-building training, are documented as having led or actively participated in outreach, training, or advocacy activities.	**Impact and GESI**: Evaluates the project's success in empowering women and promoting social inclusion in leadership.
General	Beneficiaries that feel project investments reflect their needs (Percentage)	The percentage of project beneficiaries who confirm that the restored or newly provided infrastructure (Health, Education, and WASH) and resilience activities accurately address their priority needs.	**Relevance:** A direct measure of project alignment with the priority needs of the served communities.

6.5. Data Analysis

The data analysis phase will focus on triangulating evidence from the established baseline, primary data collection, and project documentation to rigorously assess the project against the six OECD/DAC criteria. The analysis will be structured to first measure the change and then explain the context and causality.

1. Quantitative Analysis

- ***Change Measurement:*** The analysis will start with a direct comparison of end-line values against the established quantitative baseline values derived from the 3R4CACE Multi-level Assessment for all key performance indicators (e.g., number of functioning facilities,

retention rates, service utilization volumes). This will determine the magnitude of change attributable to the project's intervention.

- ***Performance and Efficiency Assessment:*** Quantitative data extracted from the MIS and financial records will be analyzed to assess performance against physical targets, budget adherence, and timeline. This includes unit-cost comparisons for procurement and construction to determine project Efficiency.
- ***Disaggregation:*** All quantitative data will be disaggregated by location (Woreda), gender, and Internally Displaced Person (IDP) status to ensure that findings are inclusive and to accurately measure the project's reach and equity in line with GESI considerations.

2. Qualitative Analysis

- ***Causality and Contribution:*** Qualitative data from KIIs and FGDs will be used to provide contextual meaning to the quantitative results. This process will focus on explaining why a particular change (or lack thereof) was observed between the baseline and end-line, thereby establishing the plausible contribution of the 3R4CACE project to the observed outcomes and early impact.
- ***Process and Experience:*** Thematic analysis will be applied to the qualitative data to identify key themes, challenges, and lessons learned related to the project's operational processes, the Third-Party Implementation (TPI) model, partnership effectiveness, and community perceptions of Relevance and Sustainability.
- ***Evidence of Resilience:*** The Most Significant Change stories and case studies will be used to capture non-quantifiable project effects, such as evidence of improved social cohesion between Host/IDP communities and increased institutional capacity in local Woreda administrations, which directly addresses the Impact and Sustainability criteria.

7. Security, Ethical, and Quality Assurance

The evaluation team/consulting firm is expected to strictly adhere to the highest standards of security, ethical conduct, and quality assurance throughout all phases of the assignment.

Security:

- *Fieldwork and Site Visits:* All fieldwork, including site visits and data collection activities, must adhere strictly to the United Nations Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) guidelines and any specific security advisories issued by UNOPS or the Ministry of Finance (MoF) for the geographic areas covered by the evaluation. The evaluation team will maintain daily coordination with the UNOPS Security Office and utilize the Geo-enabling Monitoring System (GEMS) for real-time risk assessment and location tracking during site visits to High Risk of Ongoing Conflict (HROC) and Non-high Risk of Ongoing Conflict (NROC) areas.
- *Risk Mitigation*: The Inception Report must include a comprehensive Security Plan detailing how the team will manage and mitigate security risks to its personnel, data, and stakeholders.

Ethical Compliance:

- *Informed Consent:* The evaluation must be conducted in an ethical manner, prioritizing the rights, safety, and well-being of all individuals involved. The team must obtain informed consent from all key informants and focus group participants prior to their involvement.
- *Confidentiality and Anonymity:* The evaluation must ensure the confidentiality of all sensitive information and the anonymity of respondents, particularly when dealing with health data, financial information, or social safeguards issues (including information related to the GESI/SEA-SH). Any quotes or sensitive findings used in the report must be appropriately anonymized to prevent identification.
- *Impartiality:* The team must maintain complete independence and impartiality, ensuring that the findings, conclusions, and recommendations are evidence-based and free from any external influence or bias from the implementing partners (UNOPS/MoF) or the Data

Data Ownership and Transfer:

- All raw quantitative data generated during this evaluation is the sole and exclusive property of UNOPS. The evaluation team must ensure that this data is transferred to the UNOPS database in a specified structural format to enable seamless linkage and integration with the UNOPS MIS dashboard.

Quality Assurance:

- *Inception Approval*: A detailed Inception Report (methodology, tools, and work plan) must be approved by the Project Board/PMU before fieldwork can commence.
- *Data Triangulation and Ground Truth:* Findings must be systematically triangulated across all data sources (Documentary Review, KIIs, FGDs, Technical Site Visits) to ensure validity. Specifically, the team will cross-reference oneUNOPS Collect (oUC) data with physical GPS-stamped site photos and community feedback to ensure "Ground Truth" accuracy.
- *Technical Verification:* Ensure that technical site verification is conducted using established, verifiable protocols and a verification checklist.
- *Data Integrity Audit*: Mobile data collection forms will include mandatory fields, range constraints, and skip-logic. All quantitative entries will be geo-tagged and timestamped to verify that data collection occurred at the designated cluster location. Field supervisors will conduct Spot-Checks on a minimum of 10% of completed household surveys.
- *Analytical Consistency:* To ensure consistency in the Constant Comparative Method for qualitative data, 10% of all qualitative transcripts will be double-coded by the Lead Evaluator.
- *Quality of Deliverables:* All deliverables (Inception Report, Draft Report, Final Report) must be submitted in professional English, clearly structured, evidence-based, and follow a logical flow of argument, adhering to UNOPS and international evaluation reporting standards.
- *Stakeholder Review:* The team must maintain a formal log of all comments received during the stakeholder review periods (MoF, UNOPS, World Bank) and provide a clear justification of how each comment was addressed, ensuring a transparent finalization process.

8. Stakeholder Engagement Plan

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) is summarized below. The evaluation will employ a multi-level stakeholder engagement plan to ensure comprehensive triangulation of findings from all partners and beneficiaries. Engagement will be stratified into three key levels:

- Strategic & Institutional Level: Engagement with high-level decision-makers to assess coherence, efficiency, and sustainability. This includes:
    - UNOPS (HAMCO Director, HoP, Project Manager, PMO).
    - Ministry of Finance (MoF) Federal Project Coordinating Unit.
    - World Bank Team and Portfolio Managers.
    - Regional Sector Bureaus (Health, Education, WASH).
- Implementation and Partner Level: Engagement with those directly responsible for execution to assess effectiveness and risk mitigation. This includes:
    - Implementing Contractors and technical partners.
    - Woreda (district) and Kebele administration officials.
- Community and Beneficiary Level: Engagement with end-users to assess relevance, effectiveness, and impact. This will primarily be achieved through FGDs and Household Surveys, engaging groups such as:
    - Host community members and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs).
    - Members of Neighborhood Relations Committees (NRCs) and Grievance Redress Committees (GRCs).
    - Female-headed households and other vulnerable groups.

Table 5. Stakeholder engagement plan

Stakeholders	**Role in Project/Evaluation**	**Engagement Method**
Strategic Partners (MoF, World Bank)	Quality Oversight: Review and approve the evaluation design, inception report, and final findings to ensure compliance with the M&E framework.	Inception Briefings, Strategic Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), and Draft Report Review.
UNOPS PMU & Technical Staff	Information Providers: Facilitate access to the oneUNOPS Collect (oUC) MIS data, provide project documentation, and coordinate field security/access.	Technical KIIs, MIS Data Extraction sessions, and Logistical Planning meetings.
Regional & Woreda Bureaus (Health, Education, Water)	Technical Validation: Confirm the operational status of infrastructure from a government perspective and validate hand-over documentation.	Regional-level KIIs and Woreda-level entry/exit briefings during fieldwork.
Neighborhood Relations Committees (NRCs)	Institutional Case Studies: Act as primary qualitative sources for evaluating community governance and the sustainability of sub-project maintenance.	Purposive Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and review of committee operational records.

Beneficiary Households (Host Communities & IDPs)	Primary Data Sources: Provide first-hand data on service access, satisfaction, and social cohesion. Provide the quantitative and qualitative evidence needed to measure “need-alignment," "participation," and "satisfaction."	Cluster-based Household Surveys and community-level Direct Observation.
Women and Marginalized Groups	Equity Verification: Provide specific evidence on whether the project’s gender-sensitive and GBV interventions reached intended targets.	Segregated FGDs (Women-only) and targeted purposive interviews.
Contractors & Field Engineers	Quality Auditors: Provide technical context regarding construction challenges, material quality, and the status of the Defects Notification Period (DNP).	Technical Site Audits and structured KIIs focused on infrastructure durability.

9. Work Plan and Deliverables

The evaluation is estimated to be completed within a maximum period of 8 weeks following the official contract commencement date. The following table outlines the key phases, duration, main activities, and corresponding deliverables.

Table 6. Work plan and key deliverables with payment term

Phase	**Timeline**	**Detailed Activities**	**Deliverable**	**Payment Term**
Phase I: Preparation & Inception	Week 1-2	• **Desk Review:** Comprehensive review of WNCCA, monthly progress reports, and MIS dashboards. Extract baseline data from the 3R4CACE Multi-level Assessment. Review project documents, financial logs, and oUC MIS data. • **Stakeholder Briefings:** Conduct initial briefings with UNOPS PMU and MoF to refine the evaluation's focus. • **Inception Report:** Draft, submit, and revise the Inception Report and Data Collection Tools based on stakeholder feedback.	D1: Inception Report (including finalized data collection tools, cluster itinerary, and sampling frame).	**10%** (Upon approval of Deliverable A)

Phase II: Field Data Collection	Week 3-4	• **Training**: 2-day training for local enumerators on the mobile data collection platform and ethical "Do No Harm" protocols. • **Multi-Stage Collection**: Concurrent execution of household surveys, purposive FGDs, and technical engineering audits across the 10 selected Kebeles. Perform direct observation and technical site audits across the 10 sampled Kebeles. • **Quality Assurance Monitoring**: Weekly submission of GPS to verify cluster coverage.	D2: Data Collection Completion Note. Fieldwork across 10 clusters, including technical audits of 15 sub-projects.	**30%**[2] (Upon completion of Phase II)
Phase III: Analysis & Synthesis; Reporting and Finalization	Weeks 5-8	• **Data Analysis and Triangulation**: Conduct quantitative and qualitative data analysis. Cross-referencing the qualitative information with quantitative data (community satisfaction metrics). • **Drafting**: Submission of the draft report and conduct validation workshop with the project team to discuss the findings. • **Final Synthesis**: Addressing all stakeholder comments and refining the report, and submit the final report. • **Data Handover**: Clean and geo-tagged raw datasets (Excel/Stata/SPSS) handed over to UNOPS for future monitoring. The raw quantitative data must be structured and submitted in a format fully compatible with the UNOPS database to allow direct linkage to the UNOPS MIS dashboard.	D3: Draft Evaluation Report. D4: Validation Workshop presentation. D5: Final Evaluation Report and submission of raw quantitative data formatted for UNOPS MIS integration.	**60%** (Upon acceptance of Deliverable C)

10. Roles, Responsibilities, and Quality Assurance

[2] Please note that all logistics, security arrangements, insurance, and transportation costs for field data collection must be included in the financial proposal and managed by the vendor.

10.1. Evaluation Team Structure

The evaluation will be conducted by an external consulting firm. The firm will be responsible for proposing a team structure that covers the full range of expertise required by this Terms of Reference (ToR), specifically in evaluating infrastructure and resilience projects in conflict-affected settings.

The firm must possess valid legal registration, demonstrate institutional capacity, and maintain appropriate liability insurance to operate in the Tigray region. The firm is responsible for the overall management of the evaluation, including the recruitment, training, and security of all personnel.

Table 7. Evaluation team requirements

Position	Role in Evaluation	Core Expertise Required
Lead Evaluator (Team Leader)	Overall technical and management; lead report writer	• Master's degree or higher in a relevant field (e.g., Social Science, Public Health, Development Studies, Monitoring & Evaluation, Statistics). • Minimum 10 years of professional experience managing or leading complex, multi-site project evaluations in the infrastructure, health, or emergency response sectors, preferably in an FCV (Fragility, Conflict, and Violence) context. • Proven expertise in designing and leading mixed-methods evaluations and applying the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. • Strong knowledge of international development partners (World Bank, UN agencies, UNOPS) procedures and evaluation standards. • Excellent command of English and proven report writing skills.
M&E Specialist	Data quality assurance and analysis of quantitative/qualitative data.	• Master's degree in Statistics, Economics, Epidemiology) or Monitoring & Evaluation. • Minimum 7 years of experience in data management, quantitative analysis (descriptive statistics, comparative analysis, unit cost benchmarking), and/or qualitative analysis (thematic coding) for large datasets. • Proven ability to conduct rigorous triangulation of findings from multiple sources (oneUNOPS Collect data, interviews, site data).

Position	Role in Evaluation	Core Expertise Required
Technical Engineer	Providing the specialized support that the core team	• A degree in Civil Engineering, Water Resource Engineering, or a related infrastructure field • Experience in WASH and social infrastructure (schools/health) audits in rural/conflict-affected contexts.
GESI/Protection Specialist/Social Governance Specialist		• A degree in Public Administration, Social Development, Gender Studies, Sociology, Human Rights, Social Work, or a related field. • Proven ability to manage sensitive protection, GESI, and SEA-SH data ethically and safely in a conflict-affected context • Expertise in community-based planning, social cohesion, and resilience-building in Fragility, Conflict, and Violence (FCV) settings

The consulting firm must also ensure that the team collectively possesses:

- Fluency in relevant local languages (e.g., Amharic, Tigrinya) for conducting Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with local communities and authorities in the Tigray region.
- Deep understanding and experience with Environmental and Social (E&S) safeguard compliance, particularly in relation to infrastructure projects in the Ethiopian context, and a proven ability to handle sensitive information related to GESI/SEA-SH in a confidential manner.

10.2. Quality Assurance and Management

The Quality Assurance and Management framework ensures the integrity, impartiality, and utility of this final evaluation. This section details the roles and review processes required to maintain the highest standard of methodological rigor, data accuracy, and compliance with the OECD/DAC criteria and World Bank Environmental throughout the assessment.

Table 8. Roles of key stakeholder in quality assurance and management

Party	Responsibilities in Quality Assurance
UNOPS	Contract Management, logistical support, formal acceptance of all deliverables, ensuring the evaluation team adheres to the approved Inception Report.

MoF	Providing strategic guidance, facilitating access to relevant project information, and conducting a formal review of the Draft Report (Deliverable B) to ensure factual accuracy and practical relevance of recommendations.
Evaluation Team	Adhering to the approved Inception Report, rigorously using triangulation across all data sources to validate all findings, and ensuring the final report is objective, evidence-based, and politically neutral, following international evaluation reporting standards. Additionally, the team is responsible for handing over all raw quantitative data to UNOPS in the required format for database and MIS dashboard integration.

11. Bid Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria will be used to evaluate and score the technical and financial proposals submitted by prospective vendors. The evaluation is conducted in three distinct stages to ensure the selection of a qualified organization capable of operating in a high-risk context.

Item No	UNOPS Eligibility and Formal Requirements
STAGE I: ELIGIBILITY AND FORMAL CRITERIA	
1	Bidder is eligible as defined in the document **Section I: Instructions to Bidders, Article 3** **1.1** A Bidder shall not have ***a conflict of interest*** (refer the detail under Article 3). **1.2** A Bidder is not included in any UNOPS, UNGM, World Bank, and/or UNOPS Partner ***Ineligibility List*** (refer the detail under Article 3) — Pass or Fail
2	Completeness of the Quotation. Returnable Bidding Forms and other documentation requested under the Document Checklist section have been provided and are complete — To be checked by UNOPS and clarified if necessary
3	Bidder accepts UNOPS General Conditions of Contract as specified in Section IV: Contract Forms — Pass or Fail
STAGE II: QUALIFICATION CRITERIA	
1	A bidder submitted renewed Business Licence and Tax Registration Certificate(s)
2	Bidder has been in continuous business for a minimum of 10 years with a proven institutional experience in conducting complex, multi-site project evaluations for international development agencies and international organizations in Fragility, Conflict, and Violence (FCV) settings.

3	Submission of at least three (3) previous work certificates confirming successful delivery of similar services, at least one should be on infrastructure or health/resilience evaluation service implemented in more than one region.
4	Bidder Confirmed the Quotation is Valid for the period of 90 days from the date fixed for the submission deadline as set out in this RFQ
STAGE III: MINIMUM TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS	
1	**Technical Proposal:** Submission of a detailed technical proposal including methodology, work plan, risk mitigation strategy, and data collection tools tailored to the 3R4CACE project implementation and FCV context.
2	**Key Personnel Qualifications:** • Lead Evaluator (Team Leader): Master's degree or higher in Social Science, Public Health, Development Studies, Monitoring & Evaluation, Statistics, plus 10 years experience in complex multi-site project evaluations, preferably in an FCV context. • M&E Specialist: Master's degree in Statistics, Economics, Epidemiology) or Monitoring & Evaluation plus 7 years experience in data management and analysis. • Technical Engineer: First degree in Civil Engineering, Water Resource Engineering, or a related infrastructure field, plus experience in WASH and social infrastructure (schools/health) audits in rural/conflict-affected contexts. • Social Governance Specialist/GESI/Protection Specialist: First degree in Public Administration, Social Development, Gender Studies, Sociology, Human Rights, Social Work, or a related field, plus proven experience in WASH/Social infrastructure assessment, community-based planning, and GESI/Protection in conflict-affected settings.
3	**Work Plan & Schedule:** Clear implementation work plan and schedule demonstrating commitment to accomplish the evaluation within the 8-week timeline.

UNOPS

UNOPS HQ
PO Box 2695
2100 Copenhagen
Denmark

Tel: +45 4533 7500
Fax: +45 4533 7501
Email: info@unops.org
www.unops.org

/unops.org
/company/unops
/unops
/unops_official