

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Evaluation of UNOSAT Rapid Mapping Services

Contents

1. Background.....	1
2. Purpose of the Evaluation	2
3. Scope of the evaluation.....	3
4. Evaluation criteria	3
5. Key Evaluation Questions.....	3
6. Evaluation Approach and Methodology.....	4
Data collection methods	5
7. Guiding Principles and Values	6
Gender and human rights.....	6
8. Timeframe, work plan, deliverables and review	6
9. Communication/dissemination of results	7
10. Professional requirements/qualifications	8
11. Contractual arrangements	8
12. Evaluator Ethics	8
Annexes:	8

1. Background

The United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) is a principal training arm of the United Nations, with the aim to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations in achieving its major objectives through training and research. UNITAR programming covers a number of thematic areas, including support for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; multilateral diplomacy; public finance and trade; environment, including climate change, environmental law and governance, and chemicals and waste management; peacekeeping, peacebuilding and conflict prevention; decentralized cooperation; and resilience and disaster risk reduction.

The UNITAR Operational Satellite Applications Programme (UNOSAT) is a technology-intensive programme delivering imagery analysis and satellite solutions to relief and development organizations within and outside the United Nations, with the aim to contribute to decision-making in areas such as humanitarian relief, human security and strategic territorial and development planning. The UNOSAT Rapid Mapping Service provides satellite image analysis during humanitarian emergencies, including natural disasters and conflict situations. The service has been created to meet the demand of United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and other humanitarian agencies

and NGOs part of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee on humanitarian coordination hosted by the UN ([IASC](#)) for rapid mapping and satellite derived analysis in wake of disasters and complex emergencies. With a 24/7 year-round availability to process requests, UNOSAT delivers satellite imagery derived maps, reports and data ready for direct inclusion in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) according to needs.

Typical situations for which the Rapid Mapping Service is activated include floods, earthquakes, storms, landslides, volcanoes, oil spills, chemical waste, refugee and Internally Displaced Person (IDP) camp mapping, conflict damage assessment and situation analysis. Requests for rapid mapping in complex emergencies are increasing, and often include monitoring situations over time and thus requires additional support from UNOSAT as compared to a typical sudden onset natural disaster. The evolution of IDP situations and assessments during conflict situations are examples of this. However, natural disasters still represent significant activities at UNOSAT, in particular floods, which often include the need for monitoring over time. The capacity of providing frequent imagery analysis updates as situations unfold has become one of the key features of UNOSAT rapid mapping and shows that the service is fully operational and predictable. UNOSAT benefits from a variety of sources for its satellite imagery: Free and open source, commercial vendors, International Charter Space and Major Disasters (natural and technological disasters only), in-kind donations.

Requests for rapid mapping services may be submitted by United Nations entities, governments, the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (ICRC and IFRC), international and regional organizations and humanitarian non-governmental organizations. The service is free of charge for UN sister agencies and humanitarian entities operating in line with UN policies.

Rapid mapping products include maps, GIS-ready data (for example flood extents, damage assessments), statistics and reports.

2. Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to provide evidence that the UNOSAT Rapid Mapping Service is providing effective and efficient support for evidence-based decision-making to clients engaged in humanitarian and conflict related work. The evaluation should not only assess rapid mapping performance, including how timely the mapping services are provided and to what degree and how the satellite derived maps and other products have enhanced on-the-ground humanitarian work, but it should also seek to answer the 'why' question by identifying factors contributing to (or inhibiting) the successful achievement of results.

The purpose of the evaluation is also to provide recommendations and lessons-learned on strengthening the Rapid Mapping Service, including identifying what methods or approaches work well and why, since rapid mapping will likely continue to play an important role in the Institute's strategy to respond to disasters and humanitarian emergencies. In this sense, the results from this evaluation will contribute to guiding not only the future contours of the service, but also project related work requested by donors and other stakeholders. Following the finalization of the evaluation report, the use of the evaluation will be promoted by sharing it internally within UNITAR, and externally with donors and other project partners.

3. Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will focus on the rapid-mapping service provided from 1 January 2016-31 December 2017. Based on consultations with UNOSAT, the evaluator will sample rapid mapping interventions for enquiry.

4. Evaluation criteria

The evaluation will assess the service against the following criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

- **Relevance:** Is rapid mapping contributing to providing better information for informed decision-making in situations of natural disasters and conflicts and is the approach taken through the projects relevant to the requesting party's needs and priorities?
- **Effectiveness:** To what extent have rapid mapping services (products) enhanced produced outcome level changes, such as enhancements in decision-making or strengthened field coordination in humanitarian work?
- **Efficiency:** How cost efficient were the outputs produced? Were there alternative, less resource-intensive means to produce the outputs?
- **Impact:** What cumulative and/or long-term effects have been produced from the rapid-mapping initiatives, including positive or negative effects, or intended or unintended changes as a result from the service?
- **Sustainability:** To what extent are the planned results likely to be sustained in the medium to long term? How sustainable is the service?

5. Key Evaluation Questions

The following questions are suggested to guide the evaluation:

Criterion	Key evaluation questions
Relevance	<p>To what extent are the rapid mapping services, as designed and implemented, suited to the institutional needs and priorities of the respective partner institutions working in the area of humanitarian assistance and protracted conflict?</p> <p>To what extent are the objectives of the rapid mapping still valid?</p> <p>Are the activities and outputs of the rapid mapping services consistent with the requesting party's goals and objectives?</p> <p>Are the activities and outputs of the rapid mapping consistent with the intended impacts and effects?</p> <p>To what extent is rapid mapping in line with UNITAR's mandate and strategic objectives?</p>

Effectiveness	<p>To what extent have the rapid mapping initiatives achieved the planned objectives and results to provide better information for informed decision-making in situations of natural disasters and conflict?</p> <p>What factors may have influenced the achievement (or non-achievement) of the objectives?</p> <p><i>How effective has UNITAR support been following the delivery of rapid mapping services to support the analysis/interpretation capacities of maps?</i></p>
Efficiency	<p>To what extent have outputs been produced in a cost-efficient manner (e.g. in comparison with alternative approaches)?</p> <p>Were objectives achieved on time and was rapid-mapping delivered immediately in emergency situations?</p> <p>Were there alternative, less resource-intensive means to produce the rapid mapping?</p> <p>To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of the mapping?</p>
Impact	<p>What real difference have the rapid mapping initiatives made to the partners' work in humanitarian assistance and to the end beneficiaries?</p> <p>What cumulative effects have the rapid mapping initiatives made to the partners' work in humanitarian assistance and to the end beneficiaries?</p> <p>What has happened as a result of the rapid mapping?</p> <p>How have the end-users benefitted from Rapid Mapping Services?</p>
Sustainability	<p>How sustainable is the Rapid Mapping Service in the long term given its business model?</p> <p>To what extent have the rapid mapping initiatives contributed to better humanitarian assistance in the long term?</p> <p>What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the rapid mapping initiatives?</p>

6. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The evaluation will be undertaken by an international consultant under the overall responsibility of the UNITAR evaluation manager. The evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with the UNITAR Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework and the Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group.

The evaluation should follow a participatory approach and engage a range of project stakeholders in the process. Data collection should be triangulated to the extent possible to ensure validity and

reliability of findings and draw on the following methods: comprehensive desk review, including a stakeholder analysis; surveys; key informant interviews; focus groups; and field visits (to selected countries). These data collection tools are discussed below.

The evaluator should engage in quantitative and qualitative analysis in responding to the key evaluation questions and present the findings qualitatively or quantitatively as most appropriate.

Data collection methods (suggested)

Comprehensive desk review

The evaluator shall review requests for assistance; rapid mapping products, including maps and analytical reports; any self-evaluations that UNOSAT may have undertaken; and other documents as may be needed.

Stakeholder analysis

The evaluator will identify the different stakeholders involved in the various rapid mapping initiatives. Key stakeholders include, but are not limited, to:

- The requesting partner organizations and staff;
- The donors (if not the same as above);
- UNOSAT personnel involved in mapping services;
- Other stakeholders as appropriate.

Survey(s)

With a view to maximizing feedback from the widest possible range of stakeholders, the consultant shall develop and deploy a survey(s) following the comprehensive desk study to provide an initial set of findings and allow the evaluator to easily probe during the key informant interviews.

Key informant interviews

Based on stakeholder identification, the evaluator will identify and interview key informants. The list of focal points for each initiative will be provided.

Focus groups

Focus groups should be organized with selected project stakeholders to complement/triangulate findings from other data collection tools.

Field visits

Field visits will be organized to enable the evaluator to engage in first-hand observation, focus group discussions and interview key informants if this proves useful. If any, the venue(s) of the field visits will be determined following the desk review.

Identify and interview key informants

If it proves necessary, the evaluator will undertake two to three field visits, depending on the number of initiatives covered by each visit. Based on the stakeholder analysis, the evaluator will identify national informants, whom he/she will interview during each mission. The list of initiative partner and contact points will be provided.

7. Guiding Principles and Values

Gender and human rights

The evaluator should incorporate a human rights and gender perspective in the evaluation process and findings, particularly by involving women and other groups subject to discrimination. All relevant data collected shall be disaggregated by sex and be included in evaluation report.

The guiding principles for the evaluation should respect transparency, engage stakeholders and beneficiaries; ensure confidentiality of data and anonymity of responses; and follow ethical and professional standards.

8. Timeframe, work plan, deliverables and review

The proposed timeframe for the evaluation spans from December 2017 to May 2018. An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.

The consultant shall submit a brief evaluation design/ question matrix following the comprehensive desk study and stakeholder analysis. The evaluation design/ question matrix should include a discussion of the project objectives and development context, and comment on or, if required, propose revisions to the suggested evaluation questions or data collection methods. The evaluation design/ question matrix should indicate any foreseen difficulties or challenges in collecting data and confirm the final timeframe for the completion of the evaluation exercise.

Following data collection and analysis, the consultant shall submit a zero draft of the evaluation report to the evaluation manager and revise the draft on the basis of comments made by the evaluation manager.

The draft evaluation report should follow the structure presented under Annex I. The report should state the purpose of the evaluation and the methods used, and include a discussion on the limitations to the evaluation. The report should present evidence-based and balanced findings, including strengths and weaknesses; consequent conclusions and recommendations; as well as lessons to be learned. The length of the report should be approximately 30 to 40 pages in length, excluding annexes.

Following the submission of the zero draft, a draft report will then be submitted by the evaluation manager to UNOSAT.

UNOSAT will review and comment on the draft report and provide any additional information using the form provided under Annex II by 7 May 2018. Within two weeks of receiving feedback, the consultant shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission 21 May 2018.

Indicative timeframe: December 2017 – May 2018

Activity	Dec. 17	Jan. 18	Feb. 18	March 18	Apr. 18	May 18
Evaluator selected and recruited						
Initial data collection, including desk review, stakeholder analysis						
Evaluation design/ question matrix						
Data collection and analysis, including survey(s), interviews, focus groups and field visits						
Draft evaluation report consulted with UNITAR evaluation manager and submitted to the UNOSAT						
UNOSAT reviews draft evaluation report and share comments and recommendations to consultant via the evaluation manager						
Evaluation report finalized and validated by Evaluation manager						

Summary of evaluation deliverables and indicative schedule

Deliverable	From	To	Deadline
Evaluation design/ question matrix	Consultant	Evaluation manager/ UNOSAT	24 January 2018
Comments on evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluation manager/ UNOSAT	Consultant	31 January 2018
Zero draft report	Consultant	Evaluation manager	26 March 2018
Comments on zero draft	Evaluation manager	Consultant	9 April 2018
Draft report	Consultant	Evaluation manager/ UNOSAT	23 April 2018
Comments on draft report	UNOSAT	Evaluation manager/ consultant	7 May 2018
Final report	Consultant	Evaluation manager/ UNOSAT	21 May 2018

9. Communication/dissemination of results

The final evaluation report will be shared internally within UNITAR and externally, via the UNITAR online repository of evaluation reports. The report will also be uploaded on the online repository of evaluation reports of the United Nations Evaluation Group.

The language of the report is English.

10. Professional requirements/qualifications

The consultant should have the following qualifications and experience:

- Advanced university degree or equivalent in social sciences or relevant discipline or field;
- At least 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluations in the fields of humanitarian programming, protracted conflict or similar areas. Experience undertaking evaluations related to technology based programming (e.g. GIS), rapid-mapping or satellite imagery would be a strong asset;
- Field work experience in developing countries;
- Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience using a variety of evaluation methods and approaches;
- Excellent writing skills;
- Strong communication and presentation skills;
- Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility; and
- Availability to travel.

11. Contractual arrangements

The consultant will be contracted by UNITAR and will report directly to the Manager, Performance and Results Section ('evaluation manager'). The consultant should consult with the evaluation manager on any procedural or methodological matter requiring attention. While the consultant is responsible for planning any meetings, organizing online surveys and undertaking arrangements for other data collection tasks, UNITAR will support the consultant with regard to logistical and administrative arrangements in connection with any travel that may be required with the field visits (e.g. travel, accommodation, visas, etc.).

12. Evaluator Ethics

The selected evaluator should not have participated in any of the project's selected for this assignment or have a conflict of interest with any project or programme related activities. The selected consultant shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct under Annex III prior to initiating the assignment.

How to Apply

Interested individuals are requested to submit an expression of interest including a cover letter and CV or P11 form curriculum vitae to evaluation@unitar.org by 20 December 2017. Please indicate in the subject line "**Evaluation of UNOSAT Rapid Mapping Services**".

Please note that only candidates who are under serious consideration will be contacted.

Individuals who have worked for UNOSAT or who may have a conflict of interest are not eligible for the assignment.

Annexes:

I: Structure of evaluation report

II: Audit trail

III: Evaluator code of conduct

Annex I: Structure of the Evaluation Report

- i. Title page
- ii. Executive summary
- iii. Acronyms and abbreviations
- 1. Introduction
- 2. Description of UNOSAT Rapid Mapping Services, objectives and context
- 3. Theory of change/design logic
- 4. Methodology and limitations
- 5. Evaluation findings based on criteria/principal evaluation questions
- 6. Conclusions
- 7. Recommendations
- 8. Lessons
- 9. Annexes
 - a. Terms of reference
 - b. Survey/questionnaires deployed
 - c. List of persons interviewed
 - d. List of documents reviewed
 - e. Summary of field visits
 - f. Evaluation question matrix
 - g. Evaluation consultant agreement form

Annex II: Evaluation Audit Trail Template

(To be completed by UNOSAT to show how the received comments on the draft evaluation report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final evaluation report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final evaluation report.)

To the comments received on (date) from the Evaluation of UNOSAT Rapid Mapping Services: 2016 – 2017

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft mid-term evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft mid-term evaluation report	Evaluator response and actions taken

The evaluator:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. He/She should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Is responsible for his/her performance and his/her product(s). He/She is responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form¹

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

¹www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct