TERMS OF REFERENCE

Anticipatory Action Pilots: Assessment and learning

1.1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

1.1 The Education Cannot Wait (ECW) fund was established during the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016 to help reposition education as a priority on the humanitarian agenda, usher in a more collaborative approach among actors on the ground, and raise additional funding to ensure that every crisis-affected child and young person is in education and learning. ECW is a multi-stakeholder fund that funds education in emergencies and protracted crises (EIEPC). ECWs day-to-day operations are carried out by the Secretariat. The fund is administered under UNICEF's financial, human resources and administrative rules and regulations, while operations are run by the fund's own independent governance structure.

1.2 ECW's mission is to reach with education the most marginalized girls and boys of all ages in all their diversity in emergencies and protracted crises. ECW utilizes three different funding/program modalities that together aim to achieve collective education outcomes for the hardest to reach children and young people: (i) the First Emergency Response (FER) investment window/modality supports education programs immediately in sudden-onset or escalating crises; (ii) the Multi-Year Resilience Program (MYRP) investment window addresses longer-term needs through a multi-year joint program in protracted crises affected countries, enabling humanitarian and development actors to work together; (iii) the Acceleration Facility (AF) focuses on innovation, capacity development and the creation of global public goods for the education in emergency sector to address key priority systemic obstacles.

1.3 The ECW Strategic Plan for 2023-2026 commits ECW to embed Anticipatory Action (AA) in its work and embed Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises (EiEPC) as part of the wider Anticipatory Action ecosystem. At COP28, ECW endorsed the *Getting Ahead of Disaster* Charter committing to allocating financing to AA. In 2024, ECW committed to implementing two Anticipatory Action pilots through the First Emergency Response (FER) Window.

1.4 The FER window responds to the most immediate and urgent education needs as a crisis suddenly occurs or escalates. It provides rapid funding against an inter-agency coordinated proposal and is aligned with inter-agency planning and resource mobilization strategies, such as Flash Appeals and Humanitarian Response Plans. FERs can also be used for Anticipatory Action when a country triggers 'Anticipatory Action' to reduce the impact of disasters and address humanitarian needs.

What is Anticipatory Action?

1.5 Anticipatory Action (AA) is defined as "acting ahead of a predicted hazard to prevent or reduce the impacts on communities before they fully unfold, with the intention to mitigate the impact of the crisis or improve the response"[1]. AA is part of longer-term **Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)** and sits between **preparedness and response** in a window of opportunity between an **early warning** and onset of a disaster.

1.6 Anticipatory Action interventions should always be designed using an inclusive and gender-responsive approach to ensure the specific needs and ideas of girls and boys in all their diversity, people with disabilities and marginalized groups are incorporated.

1.7 Anticipatory Action has three components:
- An agreed trigger, often based on data or information about a hazard,
- An operational plan outlining what will happen in response to the trigger, and
- Pre-defined resources to implement the operational plan.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE ECW ANTICIPATORY ACTION PILOTS

2.1. The pilots will prioritise focused Anticipatory Action, rather than broader preparedness or Disaster Risk Reduction interventions. Supporting Anticipatory Action presents a significant value proposition for ECW, its partners and the wider education sector. This is particularly important because, unlike established practices in preparedness and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), the EiE sector has yet to fully embrace anticipatory approaches.

2.2. The purpose of the pilots is to:
- Demonstrate new approaches on Anticipatory Action in EiEPC settings;

---

[1] Anticipatory action | OCHA (unocha.org)

- Build capacity on Anticipatory Action in EiEPC settings;
- Generate evidence and learning on the benefits of investing early and how to scale up AA;
- Support advocacy, resource mobilisation, policy influencing efforts;
- Provide a proof of concept for future ECW AA programming through the FERs and MYRPs; and
- Influence AA work in the broader EiEPC sector.

2.3. Integration of protection, gender and inclusion is an important component of the pilots recognising that women, girls and the most vulnerable groups can be disproportionately impacted by climate crises.

2.4. The Anticipatory Action pilots will demonstrate ECW unique added value and support in filling the huge gap in Anticipatory Action in EiE.

2.5. The pilots will be aligned with existing coordination structures on Anticipatory Action. This includes the Global Education Cluster (GEC), UNHCR and OCHA. Working with these partners will give us a shared evidence base, demonstrate the role of EiE in Anticipatory Action.

2.6. There will be a strong learning component to track and capture learning and impact of the pilots. This will help to inform our future programming and advocacy (commissioned through this ToR).

Selection of countries

2.7. **Country selection is based on the following factors:**

- **Countries with high climate vulnerability** based on two global climate change databases (ND Gain[2] and UNICEF's Children's Climate Risk Index (CCRI[3]);
- **Countries featuring on ECW's Composite Index** so pilots take place in countries where ECW has existing Multi Year Resilience Programme investments;
- **A mapping of where other Anticipatory Action work is taking place** so the AA pilots can build on and reinforce existing work.

2.8. Four shortlisted countries were invited to share concept notes: Chad, Ethiopia, Pakistan and Somalia. Concept notes were scored against four criteria: 1) Capacity and potential for a viable AA pilot; 2) integration of Protection, Gender and Inclusion in the proposed approach; and 3) in-country partnerships, including diversity and local partnerships. The four concept notes were evaluated and Pakistan and Somalia were selected as the two highest scoring.

Approach and timeline for Pakistan and Somalia

2.9. The identified hazard for both Pakistan and Somalia is riverine flooding.

2.10. Pakistan will plan for two rounds of monsoon season, in Summer 2024 and Summer 2025.

2.11. Somalia will engage a consultant to scope out the approach in Somalia and focus on the Gu and Deyr rains in April and October 2025 respectively.

3. PURPOSE, SCOPE OF WORK AND OBJECTIVES

3.1. The purpose of this learning component is to iteratively improve anticipatory action in EiEPC settings over time, and generate evidence for scale up of anticipatory action in EiEPC and collective anticipatory action. This will help to contribute to the growing evidence base that receiving assistance earlier results in significant improvements to the wellbeing of people affected by disaster

3.2. The learning partner would need to collaborate with pilot countries and partners to capture valuable insights and learning from their AA programmes on:

- **Process** – to document, understand, share and integrate lessons from designing and implementing an AA approach in Pakistan and Somalia through qualitative data.
- **Programme effectiveness and impact** - to understand outputs (support delivered, by when, to how many people at what cost) and document the pilot's contribution to sustaining or improving education access in the context of disaster and to assess the likely impact of AA on the ability of beneficiaries to recover from the crisis.

3.3. The learning partner would also need to:

---

[2] The Notre Dame Global Adaptation Index (ND-Gain) is composed of two key dimensions of adaptation: vulnerability and readiness. Vulnerability measures a country's exposure, sensitivity and capacity to adapt to the negative effects of climate change. Readiness measures a country's ability to leverage investments and convert them into adaptation actions.

[3] The UNICEF Children's Climate Risk Index (CCRI) provides the first comprehensive view of children's exposure and vulnerability to the impacts of climate change. It ranks countries based on children's exposure to climate and environmental shocks, such as cyclones and heatwaves, as well as their vulnerability to those shocks, based on their access to essential services.

- Conduct comparative analysis across the two country contexts to capture lessons learned and recommend ways to improve future Anticipatory Action work in the EiEPC space. Ideally the learning partner should draw on lessons from up to five relevant AA in EIEPC interventions, and recommend how ECW's can learn from these to refine its approach.
- Work with grantees to provide technical assistance and build their capacity to gather reliable baseline and endline data and monitor output and outcome indicators.

3.4. The scope of work should be at national and sub-national levels based on the approach of the pilot.

Scope of the assessment

Process learning

3.5. <u>Objective</u>: To document, understand, share and integrate lessons from designing and implementing an AA approach in various contexts through qualitative data.

3.6. The approach should focus on analysing the programme process (e.g. operational, practical steps followed to develop and implement a coordinated approach to Anticipatory Action). This would focus on:

- <u>The Model</u>: which early warning system / data monitoring were followed, how the EiEPC sector connected with that system, how they connected with OCHA and other actors and aligned to existing frameworks and what governance mechanisms were used;
- <u>The Plan</u>: how the plan was developed, what it focused on, the implementation, communication flow when a trigger was activated, and the specific impact for the education sector;
- <u>The Money</u>: how was the money pre-agreed and disbursed and reached the implementation level in reality (any lessons from that - what worked, what didn't), any links to non-ECW funds in the plan.
- <u>Stakeholder engagement</u>: Assess the effectiveness of multi-stakeholder engagement across sectors. ECW processes are heavily grounded in multi-stakeholder engagement. Establishing an AA approach at country level requires multi stakeholder engagement across sectors and with government agencies, UN agencies, NGOs, communities, and other relevant stakeholders during the AA implementation process.

3.7. An important output of the process learning would be clear operational/practical steps documented to help to respond to learning needs of implementing partners and support replication. Lessons learned and recommended ways to improve future Anticipatory Action work in the EiEPC space should also be captured.

Programme Effectiveness and Impact

3.8. <u>Objective</u>: To use a mixed methods approach to assess programme effectiveness, including cost effectiveness, and impact, with a focus on the ability to sustain or improve education access and/or learning in the context of disasters.

3.9. The approach should focus on analysing programme results, with three inter-connected components with a focus on:

- <u>Effectiveness</u>: by tracking <u>outputs</u> (e.g. support delivered, by when, to how many people at what cost) and their contribution to <u>outcomes</u> (e.g. reducing school disruptions). Programme results data on outputs and outcomes, from grantees' results monitoring should be analysed and triangulated with additional qualitative data including inclusive discussions with a broad set of stakeholders: head teachers, teachers, school administration, parents and students. Qualitative data should be collected through interviews and focus group discussions to examine self-reported beneficiaries' views of the support.

- <u>Cost-effectiveness</u>**:** should be part of the analysis with an assessment of the cost-benefit ratio for the AA projects, and if possible, compared to other non-AA humanitarian responses. This analysis will draw on outcome monitoring data from grantees as well as project finance data. It is therefore critical that the learning partner work with the AA pilot implementing partners and relevant country coordination mechanism to ensure that outcome level data is collected appropriately from the beginning of the programme.

- <u>Impact</u>: One key aspect of learning will be to assess the impact of the Anticipatory Action against the premise of where possible, anticipatory actions may lead to a faster, more efficient, and more dignified humanitarian response, which also may protect development gains. The learning partner should explore opportunities for using a counterfactual approach as part of this impact assessment. Specifically, the partners should examine ways in which

programme, administrative and other data from the crisis context can be used to assess the relative effectiveness of an Anticipatory Action approach. Ideally, this analysis can compare results from the Anticipatory Action pilots with that of another approach (e.g. emergency responses) taken in similar crisis-affected areas within the same country. For the impact assessment, we recommend one clear outcome to focus on, aligned with the desired outcomes of the Anticipatory Action pilots (e.g. reducing school disruptions, continuity of learning). The learning partner can map out interventions and work with grantees and ECW to identify similar interventions that focus on emergency response, rather than Anticipatory Action. In addition to comparing programme results, the learning partner should also use qualitative impact stories in communities that were targeted for the Anticipatory Action pilots.

Technical assistance and capacity building:

3.10.   Support the grantees to design appropriate indicators, establish reliable baseline and endline, assessments and gather disaggregated data that can be easily analysed and compared between contexts. This will help to improve the quality of data collected for analysis.

3.11.   Develop a clear analytical plan for the Anticipatory Action pilots that allows ECW and partners to learn about the process, programme results and likely impact of the pilots, as discussed above.

Comparative analysis and capturing lessons learned:

3.12.   Conduct analysis across the two pilots. Comparison between the two pilot contexts including enabling and disabling factors, such as contextual, process, programme activities (again following the model, plan, money sections).

3.13.   Compare key learning from the above components across Pakistan and Somalia's approaches and make recommendations for the changes (process, programmatic, policy) that ECW should make when implementing Anticipatory Action interventions in a) Pakistan and Somalia; and b) other country contexts?

3.14.   **Capture** lessons learned and ways to improve future Anticipatory Action work in the EiEPC space.

Key questions

3.15.   The process learning and effectiveness and impact assessment should seek to determine the following:

Theme	Questions
Timing	• Did the timing of the intervention in relation to the peak hazard make a difference, for example in addressing the learning needs of affected populations?
Partnership	• What can be learned from the partnership with the government, including how to support a take-up of anticipatory approaches? •
Joint targeting and Accountability to Affected Populations	• To what extent was the level of effective participation from communities ensured by the AA? • Did the approach to targeting lead to better assistance? • How effective were the actions undertaken and modalities adopted in empowering local communities to lead mitigation and anticipatory actions? • Which actions were most valuable and least valuable to local communities and had the greatest effect in safeguarding disruptions to education? • Did the intervention enable community members to take different measures to prepare for/manage the emergency? • What was the level of engagement of community members in the completed anticipatory action and were there differences between engagement from men and boys and women and girls?
Effectiveness of the Anticipatory Actions	• How effective were the actions undertaken in mitigating the impact and consequences of the hazard? • How effective was the early warning? Did the content of the

		messages matter?
		• What losses and damages (direct and indirect, quantified and non-quantified) were avoided as a result of this intervention?
		• How were learning outcomes protected through the interventions as opposed to solely continuity/access?
		• Was there any difference in benefits or impact of the Anticipatory Action for different groups (for example, girls, boys, male and female teachers, children with disabilities, children of different ages/phases of education)?
		• Did the anticipatory approach enable greater localization of the humanitarian response?
		• How effective was the coordination of the AA approach, trigger activation and implementation of actions?
Alignment		• To what extent was there use of AI (Artificial Intelligence) in the implementation of the pilot? If used, how effective was the application of AI?
		• To what extent did the pilots deliver against the three pillars of the Comprehensive School Safety Framework?
		• Beyond mitigating the impact of the flooding, did anticipatory actions positively contribute to improving the response?
Comparative analysis		• What changes (process, programmatic, policy) should ECW make when implementing Anticipatory Action interventions in a) Pakistan and Somalia; and b) other country contexts?
		• How can the anticipatory actions be further improved?

4. KEY DELIVERABLES

4.1. The learning partner will be responsible for the following deliverables:

Item	Description	Timeframe
1	Draft inception report with conceptual framework, draft methodologies as well as updated workplan for executing all activities and questions and planned approach to country engagement.	± 4 weeks after signing the contract
2	Final inception report including the finalized conceptual framework and methodologies and workplan. (maximum 50 pages)	± 8 weeks after signing of the contract
3	Interim findings – capturing learning from the process documentation so far for both countries	March 2025
4	Final report—capturing learning from both process and impact/effectiveness assessment, as well as highlighting enabling factors and barriers across the two contexts.	March 2026
5	Sessions and ongoing support to implementing partners on defining and measuring programme outcomes at beginning of programme and at key points during the duration.	Ongoing
DISSEMINATION MATERIALS		
6	Learning briefs – up to three maximum 3 pages.	To be agreed during inception
7.	Video scripts to be used by ECW for advocacy on AA in education to amplify the successes and/or lessons from the pilot. ECW can provide guidance on format and style.	

4.2. The contract can be terminated or closed if work is not completed based on the deliverables in the contract or ECW no longer needs these services.

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR BIDS
5.1. Technical proposals should be not more than 20 pages single spaced. They should include, as a

minimum, sections on:

Background Analysis: A description of current thinking around how AA can be applied in EiEPC settings, including current success and challenges in operationalizing and measuring progress on AA, referencing relevant work. This should include feedback or refinement of the assessment and learning approach described above.

Approach and Methodology: A description of how the organisation will undertake each of the components of the activity described in the ToR, and achieve related deliverables. This should reference specific data collection and analysis approaches/methodologies used for the process learning, programme results, impact assessments comparative analysis and lesson learning.

Workplan: The workplan in the form of a table or gantt chart should provide an indicative timeline for executing the different activities under each component discussed in the ToR. This should also specify the roles/responsibilities of team members and their level of effort.

Capacity Statement: A description of background and contract management capacity of the organisation. This section should also include biographies of staff who will serve in technical or leadership roles in the project (all biographies should not be more than 4 pages in total). Core tasks, roles and responsibilities, and time input from each of the team members and the team lead are to be clearly articulated in the proposal.

Previous Experience: a minimum of two examples of similar thematic evaluations, research or learning projects completed by the organisation. These should be included as annexes and will not count against the page limit.

5.2. The evaluation of this work will be undertaken by the ECW Secretariat. Proposals will be evaluated against the following criteria:
   a. Clear and feasible technical approach that responds to the learning needs
   b. Organisational expertise
   c. Evaluation expertise using a range of methods, including rapid reviews and action research, ideally in the education in emergencies or humanitarian sector.
   d. Technical expertise and understanding of AA
   e. Ability to work with grantees to provide technical assistance and build their capacity to collect data
   f. Experience of capturing learning from AA activities
   g. Proven expertise in navigating and analysing multiple and conflicting sources of information to make clear, considered and credible judgements and recommendations
   h. Ability to build a team with the required analytical, interpersonal and language skills
   i. Price (20%)

6. RESPONSIBILITIES AND REPORTING
6.1   The Consultancy company(ies) will report to the ECW Chiefs of Education and Strategy, Planning and Accountability.

7. SUBMISSION DETAILS
7.1   **Deadline:** 9 September 2024
7.2   **Subject Line:** ECW Anticipatory Action Assessment and Learning: [Insert Organisation]
7.3   **Email:** rfp@un-ecw.org