Final Evaluation of the Telling the Real Story Project 2.0

Key Information at glance about the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the evaluation:</th>
<th>Final Evaluation of the Telling the Real Story Project 2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe covered:</td>
<td>July 2018 – May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of evaluation:</td>
<td>April 2020 - September 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation type:</td>
<td>Decentralized Evaluation; Process Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation commissioned by:</td>
<td>Division of External Relations, UNHCR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

1. These draft Terms of Reference (ToR) have been prepared by Communicating with Communities (CwC)/Telling the Real Story team under the UNHCR Division of External Relations in Geneva. They provide the evaluation with its overall purpose, focus and deliverables. A set of tentative evaluative questions and a suggested methodology are proposed. The evaluation team would be expected to review, adapt and finalize the questions and the methodology in the inception report.

2. The aim of the evaluation is to provide an evidence-based assessment of Telling the Real Story 2.0 (TRS) project design and implementation with a view to drawing lessons learnt and contributing to organisational learning for future project implementation, or any future UNHCR information campaigns targeting other nationalities.

Background

Project Context

3. Refugees and migrants continue to move in large numbers from Sub-Saharan Africa to North Africa and across the Mediterranean Sea to Europe. In 2019, arrivals from the Central Mediterranean route to Italy dropped in comparison to 2018. A 51% decrease in arrivals was recorded in Italy whilst a significant increase in arrivals to Malta was recorded. Despite the decreasing numbers, the journeys to Europe are as dangerous as ever. For many, the sea journey is just a final step of a much longer and far dangerous land routes where they face torture, trafficking for labour or sexual exploitation and many die along and through the routes to Libya.

4. On the North African front, the political turmoil is expected to fundamentally shift dynamics of migration. With the intensification of the armed conflict and overall unstable situation in Libya, Morocco is becoming an important gateway for migrants and refugees fleeing the calamities of wars in the region. The number of refugees registered with UNHCR increased by over 400% since 2014. They are settled in 52 cities across the
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country and the length of stay of refugees on Moroccan territory is increasing. Reinforced controls over the Central Mediterranean route of Morocco have led to additional migratory pressure on the Western Mediterranean route.

5. Nigeria is a significant hub for persons of concern in mixed flows who move to, through or from Nigeria. As of December 2019, there are over 2 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) in the North East regions of Nigeria. Nigeria faces immense humanitarian and protection challenges due to the ongoing insurgency in the North East. IDPs are reportedly increasingly targeted by smugglers. For women, many are highly vulnerable to sex trafficking to Europe through Libya and Morocco.

6. Of particular concern is the increase of unaccompanied and separated children embarking on dangerous irregular movement. As of August 2019, some 1,600 (93% unaccompanied and separated) refugee and asylum-seeking children were being held in detention centres in Libya. Of all arrivals in Italy in 2019 (11,471) were registered in just the last four months of the year. An estimated 6,400 unaccompanied and separated children are reported to have remained in Italian reception facilities, while another 5,300 are unaccounted for.

7. The right to seek asylum is a basic human right. Anyone in need of international protection must be able to access asylum. Still, the decision to embark on the long and dangerous journey to Europe is multi causal —whether it is to claim asylum or to escape hardships at home or in a transit country- is life-changing, not only for the traveller but for their entire family. While refugees and migrants may know that the journey is dangerous, many do not understand the full extent of risks and suffering that lie ahead of them when they decide to leave whether it is the risk of falling prey to traffickers, extreme hardship, detention and in some cases, sexual and gender based violence.

Project Background

8. UNHCR launched the Telling the Real Story (TRS Phase 1) awareness raising campaign in 2015, as part of a global initiative aimed at providing truthful and trustworthy information. The purpose was to empower target audiences (asylum-seekers, refugees and people on the move) to make informed decisions about their future; decisions based on facts rather than on smugglers' and traffickers' narrative or misinformation from the diaspora. TRS has incorporated the provision of information on complementary pathways (should they be available) and the provision of information on local solutions in the countries of first asylum.

9. A final review of TRS Phase 1 was conducted and the findings used to inform scale up through Telling the Real Story 2.0 in 2018. It addresses four mixed migration flows into Europe that have been of particular significance either for their longevity (Somalis and Eritreans) or for their large numbers in recent years (Syrians and Nigerians).

10. People travelling from West Africa as well as from the Horn of Africa and Middle East have a diverse range of reasons for moving to northern Africa, Libya and crossing to Europe. Some are fleeing persecution and human rights violations, others are seeking better education or employment opportunities, including to provide support to family members in their home country. Some are victims of trafficking.

11. For persons of concern to UNHCR, reasons for undertaking these dangerous journeys include primarily the lack of effective protection in countries of origin, first asylum and transit, challenging reception conditions, lengthy refugee status determination procedures, lack or insufficient livelihood and resilience support, and limited access to
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solutions such as resettlement, complementary pathways (i.e. labour mobility, scholarship and family reunification) in third countries. Inadequate security, protection, livelihood and educational opportunities are certainly important pull factors.

12. TRS 2.0 is aimed at scaling-up existing initiatives from TRS Phase 1 and implementing new activities through the provision of truthful and trustworthy information in order to empower target audiences (asylum-seekers, refugees and people on the move) to make informed decisions about their future based on facts rather than on smugglers’ and traffickers’ narrative and misinformation from the diaspora.

13. The campaign reaches Somalis, Eritreans, and Nigerians located in the countries of origin, in first countries of asylum, in transit and in the diaspora in Europe. The campaign plugs into each group’s habitual communication patterns and beliefs; It is focussed on the collection and dissemination of testimonies from inside the communities. Testimonies give an account beyond the dangers on route of what is expected once on the other side showing the reality, somehow demystified, of the arrivals at the destinations so that individuals in the short, medium and long term are able to make an informed decision as to whether it is worth making the journey.

14. Whilst social media reaches the wider community members in their languages, outreach methodologies on the ground and in the field are tailored to demographics, communication channels that the communities’ access and disseminated through sources that are trusted.

15. The project utilises highly inclusive and participatory approaches that draw on inputs from all sectors in the targeted community including diaspora in Europe; celebrities, community leaders and religious figures in countries of first asylum; and, refugees themselves. This approach is intended to build and strengthen trust over time, allowing members of the community to actively co-design activities, provide advice, and engage in the project that go beyond being passive recipients of CwC messages.

16. Currently, the project is implemented in Somalia (Somaliland), Ethiopia, Sudan, Nigeria, Egypt and to the diaspora in Europe.

17. The project design is based on extensive preparatory research about knowledge gaps, decision making patterns, influencers in the communities and trusted sources of information. The project’s theoretical framework uses the modified A-I-D-A (Attention-Interest-Discourse-Attitude change) model of campaigning which works on the hypothesis that attitude change is best achieved not by imposing messages from outside but by encouraging community to community discourse.

18. TRS 2.0 is being implemented from April 2018 to June 2020 and is funded by the European Union (EU) with an overall project budget of EUR 3 million. The project is aimed at:

- Countering the narrative of smugglers – through testimonies from the communities;
- Triggering and intra community discourse through the use of testimonials in community outreach activities on the dangers of trafficking;
- Contributing to reframing the narrative on life in Europe, debunking myths and providing trustworthy information – through enhanced outreach, including via social media, e-platform and direct engagement in transit countries;
- Contributing to overcoming widespread scepticism towards institutional information sources;
- Providing a platform for cooperation and synergy among different partners that work along refugee and migrant travel routes; and,
- Providing information on complementary pathways that exist in the countries of first asylum and referral to protection and assistance systems in place along the route.
19. TRS 2.0 directly reaches approximately 70,000 persons of concern a year through face to face discussions. In addition, an estimated 216,000 are reached through indirect sessions run by refugee outreach volunteers trained by TRS. The TRS Facebook pages reach the target audiences in countries of origin, asylum and transit in the language of the communities, with an average of 8.5 million persons per year with some posts expected to reach hundreds of thousands within a few hours.

**Purpose and Scope**

20. The final evaluation of TRS 2.0 is being has both an accountability and learning purpose. The evaluation will fulfil UNHCR’s commitments to the EU as per the project agreement, as well as providing important lessons learned for UNHCR in replicating and/or scaling up CwC initiatives of this kind in the context of the organisation’s regionalisation.

21. Building on Phase 1, TRS 2.0 was intended to evolve in line with the information needs of targeted persons on the move, across a number of geographic contexts, utilising technological developments wherever possible. This approach, along with the real time adaptation CwC messages through consultation with targeted communities in their native languages, has been intended to reach the maximum number of persons of concern. The extent to which these intended objectives have been successfully reflected in the design and implementation of TRS 2.0 would benefit from further independent reflection and analysis.

22. Given the two-year time frame of TRS 2.0, and the multitude of push and pull factors behind people’s decision to move, this evaluation is not expected to reflect on, or measure, project impact through attitude or behaviour change.

23. As such, UNHCR is commissioning a process evaluation to understand whether TRS 2.0 has been designed and implemented as intended, and to help explain how the project has generated results at the output, and to the extent possible, outcome level.

24. Whilst the evaluation should reflect on the key evaluation questions across all targeted geographic settings and population groups, more in depth engagement with targeted persons of concern will be possible in Benin City (Nigeria), Khartoum (Sudan), Addis Ababa (Ethiopia), Jijiga (Ethiopia), Hargeisa (Somalia), Germany, Italy, Denmark, Malta and Sweden - the latter five locations are included to allow for engagement with the main diaspora groups that the project has contact with.

25. The primary users of the evaluation will be UNHCR's Division of External Relations (DER) in Geneva, the EU, and other stakeholders in UNHCR engaged in the development of strategies for communicating with communities and accountability to affected populations more broadly; specifically, UNHCR’s Division of International Protection (DIP), Innovation Service, Global Data Service and regional Bureaux.

**Objectives**

26. The objective of this evaluation is to critically assess the appropriateness, the effectiveness and efficiency, the relevance of TRS 2.0 since its implementation in July 2018. Taking into considerations the above-mentioned criteria, this will also include identifying and underlining the key internal and external factors, opportunities or barriers affecting implementation.

27. The evaluation will critically assess how the TRS 2.0 have been designed and implemented, which should include a review of the underlying theoretical framework as well as its alignment with relevant UNHCR Country Operation Plans (COPs) and operational strategies. This will also include assessing the appropriateness of TRS 2.0 targeting approaches, and the relevance of identified information needs and selected
CwC approaches and mechanisms over time and across settings, and the **effectiveness** and **efficiency** of delivery. In addition, the evaluation will assess how **appropriately** and **effectively** TRS 2.0 engaged with targeted persons of concern and adapted over time.

28. The evaluation should identify **key lessons** and **good practice** to help replicate and/or scale up similar UNHCR CwC initiatives in other country operations and regions.

**Key Evaluation Questions**

29. This evaluation seeks to address the following key evaluation questions (KEQs) and proposed sub-questions, which are expected to be further refined during the inception phase:

**KEQ 1: To what extent was TRS 2.0 implemented as intended over time and across settings?**
- How appropriately was TRS 2.0 designed to achieve the intended objectives?
- How efficiently and effectively did TRS 2.0 inputs translate to intended outputs over time and across settings?
- What, if any, unanticipated opportunities or barriers to implementation emerged? If observed, how - and to what extent - were they capitalised on or overcome?

**KEQ 2: What, if any, observed results did TRS 2.0 generate over time and across settings, and how were these achieved?**
- What, if any, unintended results – both positive and negative – of TRS 2.0 have emerged?
- To what extent did target populations positively respond to, and actively participate in, TRS 2.0 over time and across settings?
- What elements of the communication campaigns and messages did target populations find most useful and informative in their respective settings, and why?

**KEQ 3: What generalisable lessons can be found to inform the design and implementation of future UNHCR CwC related activities and interventions?**
- To what extent, and in what ways, did TRS 2.0 contextualise communication campaigns and messages for a range of target audiences across settings?
- To what extent do CwC activities implemented through TRS 2.0 interface with and ‘leverage’ the wider UNHCR country operation in each setting, and vice versa?
- What were the key contributing and constraining factors influencing TRS 2.0 implementation and the achievement of observed results over time and across settings?

**Methodology**

30. UNHCR welcomes the use of evidence-based, diverse, participatory and innovative evaluation methods and approaches. The evaluation is expected to employ a robust mixed methodology combining qualitative and quantitative methods, including data collection and analysis, desk review of secondary information and content analysis of relevant background and programmatic data and documents, and direct observations.

31. Qualitative methods should include observation, interviews and focus group discussions (FGD) with a range of key stakeholders including UNHCR, key external stakeholders and targeted populations with a strong Age, Gender and Diversity (AGD) approach.
Data/information from a wide range of sources will need to be triangulated and cross-validated to ensure the credibility of the evaluation’s findings and conclusions.

32. The evaluation will draw upon information collected, and analysed, from a wide range of sources and a representative range of stakeholders. UNHCR will ensure that the Evaluation Team has access to relevant documents and contact details, but the Evaluation Team is expected to arrange and manage their own travel and logistics in-country (including translation/interpretation services) unless UNHCR is required to provide assistance (i.e. in direct access to Persons of Concern or in areas of limited access due to security constraints). Ability to access information in the languages of the communities will be essential for all aspects of desk review and data collection, not solely for the field visits and direct engagement with persons of concern.

33. The Evaluation Team is expected to work in close collaboration with the TRS 2.0 Project team, DER and other relevant units; they will be asked to refine the methodology and key evaluation questions following the initial desk review and key informant interviews during the inception phase.

34. Overall, the evaluation methodology is expected to:
   - Reflect an Age, Gender and Diversity (AGD) perspective in all data collection activities carried out as part of the evaluation – particularly with refugees;
   - Employ a mixed-method approach incorporating qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis tools including the analysis of monitoring data – as available;
   - Refer to and make use of relevant sectoral standards and protection-specific analytical frameworks;
   - Be based on an analysis of:
     - The theoretical framework underpinning the project
     - The quality of evidence that informs the project design
     - Project implementation, including reach, in relation to project design
     - The country and cultural contexts covered in the project
   - Make use of a wide range of data sources for analysis including but not limited to: project monitoring data, mission reports, indicator narrative reports, mid-year and year-end progress reports, relevant assessment reports, social media content, evaluations/reports or mapping exercises which cite or sample TRS examples in order to demonstrate impartiality of the analysis, minimise bias, and ensure credibility of the evaluation’s findings and conclusions; and,
   - Be explicitly designed to address the Key Evaluation Questions, taking into account evaluability, budget and time constraints.

**Evaluation Management and Quality Assurance**

35. This evaluation will be managed by the UNHCR Division of External Relations (DER) who will: (i) manage administrative day to day aspects of the evaluation process; (ii) act as the main interlocutor with the Evaluation Team; (iii) ensure access to required background and supporting documentation; (iv) facilitate communication with relevant local stakeholders to ensure evaluators receive the required data; (v) facilitate communication with relevant stakeholders to ensure technical guidance on content; and (vi) review the interim deliverables and final reports to ensure quality, with inputs from the Evaluation Service and other UNHCR entities as required.

36. DER and TRS 2.0 Project staff will facilitate access to key stakeholders, including UNHCR Persons of Concern and will assist the Evaluation Team with logistical and administrative arrangement, though these are largely expected to be managed by the Evaluation Team themselves.
37. The Evaluation Team are required to sign the UNHCR Code of Conduct, complete UNHCR’s introductory protection training module, and respect UNHCR’s confidentiality requirements.

38. In line with established standards for evaluation in the UN system, and the UN Ethical Guidelines for evaluations (UNEG), evaluations in UNHCR are founded on the interconnected principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility, which in practice call for:
   i. Protecting sources and data;
   ii. Systematically seeking informed consent;
   iii. Respecting dignity and diversity;
   iv. Minimising risk, harm and burden upon those who are the subject of, or participating in the evaluation, while at the same time not compromising the integrity of the exercise.

39. The evaluation is also expected to adhere with the pilot ‘Evaluation Quality Assurance’ (EQA) guidance, which clarifies the requirements expected for UNHCR evaluation processes and products. The Evaluation Manager(s) and Evaluation Service EQA focal point will share and provide an orientation to the EQA at the start of the evaluation. Adherence to the EQA is overseen by the UNHCR Evaluation Service as needed.

40. A Reference Group may be established with the participation of the key internal, and possibly external, stakeholders to help guide the process. Members of the group would be asked to:
   • Provide suggestions to identify potential materials and resources to be reviewed and key contacts to be considered for key informant interviews;
   • Review and comment on the draft inception report;
   • Review and comment on the data collection and data analysis instruments that will be developed by the Evaluation Team;
   • Review and comment on the draft final reports, validate emerging findings and conclusions; and,
   • Advise on the focus of the evaluation recommendations that will form the basis of the Management Response to the evaluation.

41. Upon completion, the final evaluation report will be published on the UNHCR website and will be shared with the Director of the Division of External Relations at UNHCR HQ, with the request to formulate the formal management response. The completed Management Response Matrix will also be made available in the public domain.

**Evaluation Locations**

42. The evaluation is expected to reflect on implementation across all project locations, with direct access to target populations in the following locations: Germany, Italy, Denmark and Malta (diaspora groups); and Khartoum (Sudan), Addis Ababa, Jijiga (Ethiopia), Hargeisa (Somaliland) and Benin City (Nigeria).

43. The selection of the field locations is intended to encompass and reflect the diversity of dissemination and engagement approaches and processes; allow direct access to the communities the project engages with; and, reflect the full geographic spectrum of travel routes. More specifically, field visits to these locations will allow data to be collected directly from persons of concern in the Horn of Africa and Nigeria (Somalis, Eritrean and Nigerians), implementing partners in the field locations set out further below, key UNHCR staff members, celebrities that have been engaged, members of the diaspora, and the project team and other actors who have engaged with the project.
### Expected Deliverables and Evaluation Timeline

44. It is anticipated the evaluation will be completed within six months from April to November 2020 with a 6-weeks inception phase (including Team Leader travel: 2-days in Stockholm with the core TRS project team, and 1-week in Ethiopia to cover Addis Ababa and Jijiga); 14 week data collection, analysis and reporting phase (including a 1-week in Europe and 1-week in Sudan, Somaliland, Ethiopia and Nigeria respectively); and, 4 weeks report writing and finalization phase. The indicative timeline is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Key Deliverable</th>
<th>Indicative Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Inception</strong> including:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Week 1 – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial desk review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-day inception visit by Team Leader to TRS 2.0 Project Team in Stockholm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-week inception visit to Ethiopia by Team Leader (including Addis Ababa and Jijiga)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected key informant interviews (conducted remotely)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQA review on the draft inception report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation for comments and inception report finalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2: Data collection</strong> including:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Week 7 – 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key stakeholder interviews, FGDs, surveys (in country and remotely as required); in depth document review;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visits – 1-week with Diaspora groups in Europe (to include Germany, Italy, Denmark and Malta); 1-week visit to Sudan (Khartoum); 1-week visit to Somaliland (Hargeisa); 1-week visit to Ethiopia (Addis Ababa and Jijiga); 1-week visit to Nigeria (Benin City).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing (remote or in person) on preliminary findings and data collection phase (including discussion of any significant data gaps with key stakeholders)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder feedback on preliminary findings and data collection phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 3: Data Analysis and Reporting including:
- Analysis and write up
- EQA review of draft report, circulation for comments
- Validation workshop (remote or in-person) to discuss stakeholder feedback and validate evaluation findings and discuss conclusions and proposed recommendations

Draft final report (for circulation and comments)
Validation Workshop Powerpoint presentation

Phase 4: Finalisation of evaluation report

Final Evaluation Report (40-50 pages) including recommendations and standalone executive summary (5-10 pages)

Week 13 – 20
Week 21 – 24

45. The final deliverable is the Final Evaluation Report which should comply with UNHCR Policy on Evaluation and the United Nations Evaluation Group’s (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation (June 2016). In line with established standards for evaluation in the UN system, the Code of Conduct for evaluation in the UN system and the UN Ethical Guidelines for evaluations, evaluation in UNHCR is founded on the fundamental principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility. The report shall be guided by and must adhere to these principles to ensure that (a) the report is fit for the stated purposes as set out in these policies; and (b) the report’s findings, conclusions, recommendations and proposed lessons to be learned are viewed with confidence by their intended audience and users within UNHCR, its partners and beyond. The report’s quality will be assessed on the basis of these standards.

46. The UNHCR Head of Evaluation Service is responsible for final quality assurance approval of the final evaluation report.

Required Skills and Experience

47. The evaluation will be undertaken by a team of minimum two independent consultants comprising of a designated Team Leader and at least one team member. Gender balance in the Evaluation Team will be considered during the selection process.

48. The Evaluation Team are expected to demonstrate evaluation expertise, as well as expertise in CwC in humanitarian, and ideally displacement/refugee settings, and knowledge of refugee protection. They should also have knowledge of UNHCR’s protection mandate and operational platform.

49. The Evaluation Team must be willing and able to travel in Europe (Sweden, Germany, Italy, Malta and Switzerland) and to Sudan, Ethiopia, Somaliland and Nigeria including to locations where refugees live. The Evaluation Team will be expected to source and contract local translation services in-country as required.

50. In line with the UNHCR Evaluation Policy, prior to hiring the consultants, any actual or potential conflict of interest will be assessed.

51. Specific requirements for each of the Team Leader and member roles are outlined below:
Evaluation Team Leader:

- A post-graduate or Masters’ degree in social science, development studies, international relations or economics plus a minimum of 12 years of relevant professional experience in humanitarian and/or refugee response settings.
- Minimum of 5 years of evaluation experience with demonstrated ability in mixed research methodologies, qualitative and quantitative data collection, analytical methods and techniques – including statistical analysis - in humanitarian and/or refugee operations. Proven experience with relevant software packages (e.g. Nvivo, Stata, SPSS) desirable.
- Proven experience in evaluation of Communicating with Communities (CwC) is essential, and of protection-related evaluation(s) in humanitarian and/or refugee settings, highly desirable.
- Proven track record in successfully leading an evaluation team and managing fieldwork in humanitarian and/or refugee response environments.
- Knowledge of UNHCR’s protection mandate and operational platform.
- Proven expertise in facilitating participatory workshops involving different groups and participants.
- Experience in generating useful and action-oriented recommendations to senior management and programming staff.

Evaluation Team Member(s)

- A post-graduate or Masters’ degree in social sciences, development studies, international relations, or economics plus a minimum of 5 years of relevant professional experience, ideally in humanitarian and/or refugee response settings, particularly with vulnerable and/or marginalised groups.
- Minimum of 4 years experience supporting quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis for evaluation purposes (preferable) or operational research in humanitarian and/or refugee response settings.
- Demonstrable knowledge and experience of research and/or evaluation of Communicating with Communities (CwC) is highly desirable.
- Good knowledge of humanitarian and/or refugee response programming, relevant analytical frameworks and programming approaches and standards.
- Proven expertise in facilitating participatory workshops involving different groups and participants.
- Excellent communication and presentation skills.

Application Process

52. Applications can be submitted either by an individual consultant or by individuals proposing to work together as a team. It is important to note that payments will be made by deliverable. Indicative budgets should be prepared in line with the expected deliverables and should include any anticipated overhead costs (e.g. interpretation/translation services) and evaluation-specific in-country data collection costs (see ‘Annex A: Indicative Budget’ for template). Travel costs and DSA will be paid separately.

53. Interested candidates – either as individual Team Leader applicants or jointly when applying as a team - should submit a brief (5-10 pages) approach paper outlining how they understand the TOR and proposed methodology. In addition all individuals should
submit a completed Personal History Form/PHF (form downloadable from here), and each submission (individual or team) should include a brief cover letter (2-page maximum) to include availability as per indicative timeline, and an outline of how the applicant(s) match the required skills and experience outlined in these terms of reference. We also request three recent examples of relevant work, and the contact details for three references.

54. Full applications should be submitted electronically to the UNHCR Division of External Relations at luijpers@unhcr.org with the subject line “Application TRS 2.0 Evaluation”. The deadline for applications is midnight Sunday 29 March 2020 (Geneva time).

55. Any clarification questions on the TOR or application process should also be submitted electronically to the UNHCR Division of External Relations at luijpers@unhcr.org no later than midday Tuesday 24 March 2020 (Geneva time).
APPENDIX A: Indicative Budget Template

This template is for an indicative budget only. Travel and DSA costs will be calculated separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1 Deliverables (Final Inception Report)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please list any relevant cost elements e.g. team leader and team member lump sum costs, logistics, translation services, copy editing etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2 Deliverables (Mission Reports, Debrief Powerpoint)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please list any relevant cost elements e.g. team leader and team member lump sum costs, logistics, translation services, copy editing etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3 Deliverables (Validation Workshop Powerpoint, Draft Evaluation Report)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please list any relevant cost elements e.g. team leader and team member lump sum costs, logistics, translation services, copy editing etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 4 Deliverables (Final Evaluation Report and standalone executive summary)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please list any relevant cost elements e.g. team leader and team member lump sum costs, logistics, translation services, copy editing etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST (USD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>