



Policy Development and Evaluation Service (PDES)

TERMS OF REFERENCE

EVALUATIVE REVIEW OF UNHCR's ENGAGEMENT WITH HOST COMMUNITIES IN REFUGEE SITUATIONS

Key Information at glance about the evaluation	
Title of the exercise:	Evaluative review of UNHCR's engagement with host communities in refugee settings
Type of exercise:	Strategy and policy evaluative review
Evaluation commissioned by:	UNHCR Policy Development and Evaluation Service
Evaluation manager's contact:	Guido Ambroso, ambroso@unhcr.org

These Terms of Reference are for an Evaluative Review of UNHCR's engagement with host communities in refugee situations, commissioned by the UNHCR Policy Development and Evaluation Service (PDES). The time-frame for this exercise will be a start date two months after the call for proposals and duration of seven months. It will be global in scope and will involve travel/fieldwork to five or six selected country operations that will be used as case-studies.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction to the Evaluative Review.....	3
2. Overall purpose and rationale for the Evaluative Review.....	4
3. Scope of Work	5
4. Tentative key questions and sub-questions and relevant OECD-DAC criteria.....	6
5. Main methodological approach and information sources.....	8
6. Work Plan, deliverables and organization and conduct of the exercise.....	9
7. Evaluation team and qualifications.....	10
8. Selection process and procurement.....	11

1. Introduction to the Evaluative Review

Though UNHCR's mandate focuses on refugees and other persons of concern, UNHCR has been engaging with "host" or "local" communities since the 1980s mainly in the context of facilitating the attainment of durable solutions, but later on also to achieve "peaceful coexistence", "social cohesion" and "preserving the asylum space". Over the years there have been several studies and initiatives on the so-called relief to development gap¹, but there have been no evaluations or assessments of UNHCR's interventions for host communities and their relationship with the protection, assistance and solutions needs of refugees.

According to a UNHCR definition² "A host community refers to the country of asylum and the local, regional and national governmental, social and economic structures within which refugees live. Urban refugees live within host communities with or without legal status and recognition by the host community. In the context of refugee camps, the host community may encompass the camp, or may simply neighbour the camp but have interaction with, or otherwise be impacted by, the refugees residing in the camp".

While a sketch of a literature review and a bibliography (which will be deepened and systematized as part of this exercise) is contained in Annex I, the following is a summarized timeline of initiatives mainly aimed at linking relief with development assistance but with a strong component of assistance to host communities.

Timeline of initiatives and programmes targeting the transition between relief and development with a strong assistance to host communities component

- *Refugee Aid and Development*. 2nd International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa (ICARA II of 1984) and in the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Central America (CIREFCA of 1989).
- *Brookings Process*, 1999.
- *Quick Impact Projects (QIPs)*, from 1991 onwards, targeting mainly communities hosting refugees and returnees.
- *Framework for Durable Solutions*, 2003. Placed in the context of the Agenda for Protection (also issued in 2003), it was divided into three components: Development Assistance to Refugees (DAR); Development through Local Integration (DLI) and Repatriation, Reintegration, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction ("4Rs").
- *Protracted Refugees Situation Initiative*, 2008. Targeted the Afghani refugees in Pakistan and Iran; Myanmar (Rohingya) refugees in Bangladesh; long-standing Eritrean refugees in eastern Sudan; Croatian and Bosnian refugees in Serbia and long-standing Burundian refugees in Tanzania.
- *Transitional Solutions Initiative*, 2010. Targeted refugees in Nepal and eastern Sudan and IDPs in Colombia.

¹ See further under Annex I for a brief overview of selected literature and a selected bibliography.

² UNHCR-NGO Toolkit for Practical Cooperation on Resettlement. Community Outreach, available @ <http://www.unhcr.org/protection/resettlement/4cd7d1509/unhcr-ngo-toolkit-practical-cooperation-resettlement-community-outreach.html>

- *Refugee Coordination Model*, 2013. Global in scope. Though not targeting mainly the relief to development nexus, it specifically highlights the importance of responding to the need of host communities to preserve the asylum space and social cohesion.
- *Solutions Alliance*, 2014. Global in scope.
- The UNHCR *Results Framework* (see further in Annex I) captures only part of UNHCR's engagement with host communities, particularly under the objective "peaceful coexistence with local communities promoted".
- UNHCR-UNDP 2015 Regional Memorandum of Understanding
- Partnership with the World Bank Group.
- Regional Refugee & Resilience Plan in Response to the Syria crisis (2015 & 2016)

2. Overall purpose and rationale for the Evaluative Review

This Evaluative Review has been initiated by the UNHCR Policy Development and Evaluation Service (PDES) in consultation with relevant stakeholders.

While there have been many studies and initiatives on the so called relief to development gap³, there have been no evaluations or systematic assessments of UNHCR's policy or interventions for host communities and their impact (or lack thereof) on refugees' protection, assistance and solutions needs.

The overall purpose of this Evaluative Review (ER) is oriented to knowledge and learning rather than accountability.

The primary objectives of this ER will be (1) document which type of programmes, projects or approaches initiated and implemented or advocated by UNHCR for host communities, have been deployed; (2) to assess the degree to which UNHCR's policies, operational and programmatic guidance support a coherent approach towards engagement with host communities; (3) identify policy and operational gaps in UNHCR's current practice, and make recommendations to address them, taking into particular account the following goals:

1. Peaceful coexistence/social cohesion
2. Durable solutions
3. Asylum/protection space⁴

The users of the Evaluative Review will be UNHCR policy makers at HQs and Representatives and senior UNHCR officials in Country Offices who are confronted on a

³ See for example J. Crisp, "Mind the Gap" (*op cit.*) and B. Deschamp and S. Lohse "Still minding the gap? A review of efforts to link relief and development in situations of human displacement, 2001-12", UNHCR, available @ <http://www.unhcr.org/512cdef09.html> or A. Betts, "Development Assistance and refugees: towards a North-South grand bargain?", 2009 Refugees Studies Centre, University of Oxford.

⁴ Ann Evans Barnes mentioned that in UNHCR the term protection space is not clearly defined and proposed the following definition: "an environment which enables the delivery of protection activities and within which the prospect of providing protection is optimized" ("Realizing protection space for Iraqi refugees: UNHCR in Syria, Jordan and Lebanon", *New Issues in Refugee Research No. 167*, January 2009, UNHCR. We may add that asylum/protection space includes fair and efficient refugee status determination, legislative and administrative frameworks allowing refugees the full enjoyment of their rights including elements such as the right to work, to own property and freedom of movement.

regular basis with the need to assist host communities in refugee settings. The findings, good practices, lessons learned and recommendations should help them to better strategize and to formulate a coherent policy and operational guidance on how to best engage with host communities to maximize positive impact for refugees. The findings of the report will be synthesized and disseminated.

3. Scope of work

The scope of the ER will be UNHCR's assistance to host communities primarily in refugee settings in camps, rural settlements or urban contexts at the onset of a refugee emergency or in longer-term, protracted situations. Though the focus will not be on IDPs or returnees, it is not uncommon to find refugees mixed with IDPs and even repatriated refugees which may be part of the "host communities".

The aim will be to find out the extent to which UNHCR is equipped with appropriate and consistent policies, strategies and programmatic approaches to engage with host communities and for what purpose rather than the impact (negative or positive) of the presence of refugees on host communities or asylum countries.

The ER will need to take into account a wide range of stakeholders, such as persons of concern, UNHCR officials, government officials, UN and other development agencies' officials, donors (both from humanitarian and development branches) and members of host communities and civil society living in proximity of refugee populations⁵.

In terms of time-frame while the literature review / desk study will go back to the early 2000s (or even '90s, if relevant), the main focus will be on projects, programmes, approaches or initiatives that took place in the last 4-5 years. In geographical terms the focus will be on countries in Africa, the Middle East, Asia and possibly Latin America and Europe.

The ER will need to include a robust evaluability component. For the purpose of this exercise an Evaluability Assessment can be described, according to the OECD-DAC definition⁶, as "the extent to which an activity or a program can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion and calls for the early review of a proposed activity in order to ascertain whether its objectives are adequately defined and its results verifiable."

A fully-fledged Theory of Change placing UNHCR's interventions for host communities in a results chain aiming to attain UNHCR's institutional goals will need to be reconstructed and/or developed. The socioeconomic context, including elements such as the ethnic/cultural proximity or distance between refugees and host communities, whether it a camp or a non-camp situation, governmental and public opinion attitude towards refugees, should be duly taken into consideration. The main limitation is that data and information is scattered and need to be systematized. Logic models and theories of change will need to be reconstructed. As a result the exercise is designed as an Evaluative Review instead of a fully-fledged Evaluation, but, depending on the results of the Evaluability Assessment, it might later be upgrade to a full "evaluation".

⁵ A detailed stakeholders analysis will inform the choice of which sub-groups, such as trade unions, will be included in the Evaluative Review.

⁶ Available @ <http://www.oecd.org/development/peer-reviews/2754804.pdf>

4. Tentative key evaluation questions and sub-questions and relevant OECD-DAC criteria

The following are the tentative key evaluation questions and sub-questions, grouped under selected OECD-DAC criteria. These questions may be modified, dropped or replaced at the end of the Inception Phase.

Relevance/appropriateness

- To what degree did UNHCR country operations plan specifically for the support of host communities in an informed manner?
 - Was there a needs assessment including host communities as well as refugees and other persons of concern and how were projects for host communities identified and designed?
 - Do UNHCR offices include host communities in consultations for longer-term planning?
 - What was the main purpose/objective of these projects (designed as part of a holistic long-term strategy or to mitigate local tensions and address short-term goals)?
 - How were actions with host communities designed to work towards durable solutions for refugees?
 - Was there sufficient institutional capacity to conduct a relevant and appropriate response?

Coherence

- To what extent did UNHCR have an (internally) coherent policy or strategy to deal with host communities and were the policies and activities of relevant actors consistent with those of UNHCR?
 - How were actions aligned with government structures and planning and budget processes?
 - Were there notable internal or external policy gaps hindering coherence?
 - What factors facilitated or hindered coherence of action between relevant actors?
 - To what extent were lessons from past experiences taken into account in the design of new initiatives?
 - Are there suitable monitoring tools and indicators to capture UNHCR's involvement with host communities in refugee settings?

Coordination

- What strategic, programmatic or other joint-actor mechanism was used to coordinate the action of UNHCR and other actors?
 - With what actors (e.g. UN, central or local government, NGOs, local civil society, private sector) did UNHCR coordinate the assessment, analysis and design of specific projects or initiatives?
 - With what actors (e.g. UN, central or local government, NGOs, local civil society, private sector) did UNHCR coordinate the implementation and monitoring of specific projects targeting host communities?
 - Was the choice of partners based on an assessment of their comparative advantage?

- To what extent did UNHCR assess the capacity of other agencies to address the sustainability of projects benefitting host communities (e.g. long-term support costs)?
- Were the projects funded directly by UNHCR or by other actors (e.g. other UN agencies or NGOs, One UN Funds or Clusters funds, multilateral banks or private sector)?

5. Main methodological approach and information sources

The ER will employ a mixed-method approach including qualitative and quantitative methods.

Phase 1 (Inception) will involve an extensive literature/document review, including an analysis of the existing data from the indicators achievement report and narrative country reports (data will be provided by the Evaluation Manager), the design and (time permitting) the implementation of a survey/questionnaire to be sent to the main Country Offices in the selected operations, and structured interviews with key stakeholders at UNHCR HQs. The tentative evaluation questions as well as the evaluation methodology and scope will be refined in preparation for Phase 2. Data from different sources will be triangulated.

This phase will have a strong evaluability component, i.e. it will attempt to find out if there is enough data and information to carry-out the evaluation in a reliable and credible fashion. In particular it will try to reconstruct or develop plausible elements of logic models, programme attributes, and implicit or explicit theories of change that underpin UNHCR's interventions, including advocacy, in favour of host communities. The main product, an Inception Report together with an evaluation matrix, should not only try to examine the interventions' logic and theories of change (or lack thereof), but also clarify, refine or change the tentative evaluation questions listed above as well as the scope and methodology. It will also identify, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, scoping criteria to select five or six "representative" case studies (tentatively two in Africa, one in the Middle East, one in Asia, one in Latin America and one in Europe) to be considered for the second phase which will also involve fieldwork. Depending on the results of the Evaluability Assessment the exercise may be upgraded to a fully-fledged "Evaluation".

After the completion of Phase 1 (Inception) and according to the results of the evaluability assessment, Phase 2 will involve fieldwork in the 5-6 countries selected in Phase 1 and the implementation of the survey targeting selected UNHCR Country Offices. The fieldwork will involve semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders from UNHCR, UN, NGO, civil society members, donors and government counterparts, and focus discussion groups with refugees and host communities. The possibility of carrying out surveys among persons of concern (refugees and members of host communities) during the fieldwork phase will be explored during the inception phase. Data will be further verified and triangulated in preparation for the final report. A fully-fledged Theory of Change placing UNHCR's interventions for host communities in a results chain aiming to attain UNHCR's institutional goals will be an essential feature of the report. Furthermore the evaluators will have to ensure that the recommendations are based on evidence, well-crafted, realistic and implementable with an emphasis on quality rather than quantity.

Considering the exploratory nature of this ER, also the methodology may include experimental elements and could be of an iterative nature.

6. Evaluative Review Work Plan, deliverables and organization and conduct of the exercise

PDES estimates that the ER exercise will last approximately 7 months. The following is the indicative/tentative time-frame:

Activity	Indicative Time Frame
TORs finalized and call for proposals issued.	Day 1
Expression of interest and evaluation of bids	End of Month 1 / Preliminary Phase
Recruitment of consultants and finalization of contracts	End of Month 2 / Preliminary Phase
Beginning of consultancy and of desk/literature study and 3 day trip to Geneva for consultations with PDES and interviews with other key UNHCR stakeholders.	End of Month 1 /Consultancy Phase 1
Interim de-brief at HQs and finalization of the Inception Report, and evaluation matrix	End of Month 2 /Consultancy Phase 1
Fieldwork/country visits (up to 2 per sub-team of 2-3 consultants)	End of Month 5 / Consultancy Phase 2
Final debrief at HQs and first draft of final report	End of Month 6
Second and last draft of final report (incorporating – as appropriate – comments from stakeholders).	End of Month 7 (Note: this will involve a max. of one week of work after receiving comments)

The main deliverable of Phase 1 (Inception) which will last up to two months will be an Inception Report (indicatively 20-30 pages plus Annexes) together with an evaluation matrix. It should include the following components:

1. A preliminary stakeholder analysis to identify priorities and areas of concern to stakeholders,
2. An analysis of the results frameworks and implicit or explicit logic models and theories of change included in an evaluability assessment.
3. An analysis of monitoring tools.
4. A refinement of the evaluation questions and methodology, particularly the creation of a comparable method of data collection for the possible case studies in Phase 2.
5. An evaluation matrix, setting out how each of the evaluation questions will be answered (criteria, proposed methods and data sources)
6. A detailed schedule of activities and deliverables, designating who has responsibility for each.

7. An agreement with PDES and other stakeholders on the 5-6 countries to be considered for fieldwork.
8. The deliverables will also include an interim debriefing/presentation at UNHCR HQs Geneva of an interactive nature.

In Phase 2 the evaluation team will be reinforced and tentatively split in two teams covering 3 country operations each. The fieldwork in each country should last approximately one week and should be concluded with an informal debriefing session for the Country Office. Besides answering the evaluation questions, this phase should also develop an overall theory of change for UNHCR's interventions with host communities and finalize the mapping exercise of (1) the types of programmes, projects or approaches initiated or implemented by UNHCR for host communities and see how they fit in the ToC and (2) of stakeholders (internal or external) . Phase 2 should last 4 or 5 months including the country visits and the preparation of the final report. Prior to the finalization of the report a formal debriefing will be held at HQs.

The main deliverable of Phase 2 will be a Final Report (indicatively of 50-60 pages, plus Annexes and Executive Summary) including a data collection toolkit (as Annex) showing the evidence base, a fully-fledged Theory of Change, key findings and recommendations (including suggest methods for systematic tracking, monitoring and assessing projects primarily benefitting host communities within UNHCR's Results Framework). An evaluation brief and a PowerPoint presentation of the findings should also be provided and presented at the UNHCR HQs as soon as the final report will be accepted by PDES. The structure of the Final Report will be agreed during the inception phase.

After acceptance of the report by PDES and the HQs presentation, the report will be circulated for comments by internal stakeholders (DPSM, DIP, Regional Bureaus and Country Offices whose operations will feature prominently in the report). The time-frame for comments is two weeks, but it is normally stretched to three weeks, considering that some actors may be engaged in emergencies. During this period the evaluation team will not have to work and this time should not be charged to the contract. It is estimated that the work of considering the comments, incorporating them in the report as appropriate and documenting in a matrix why certain comments were retained or not, will last one week.

The ER will be undertaken by a team of qualified independent consultants including a Team Leader (indicatively two expert consultants plus two research assistants for Phase 1; four expert consultants and four research assistants for Phase 2) who are familiar with these issues. They will work closely with a staff member from PDES who will be the Evaluation Manager. The exercise will be carried out in close consultation with the UNHCR Division of Programme Support and Management and the Division of International Protection and concerned regional Bureaus.

Norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group will be applied. The guidelines and methods set by the *Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action* (ALNAP) should also be followed.

An Advisory Group will be convened to guide the process, including providing substantive and technical feedback on drafts of the Inception and Final reports. This group will include primarily staff from the UNHCR Division of Programme Support and Management (DPSM) and the Division of International Protection (DIP), but also from interested Regional Bureaus.

Members of the Advisory Group will be asked to:

- a) Review and comment on the draft inception report which will include the evaluation matrix with a view to validating or refining the scope, questions and methodology of the evaluation (inception phase).
- b) Provide suggestions to identify potential materials and resources to be reviewed and key contacts to be considered for key informant interviews (inception phase).
- c) Review and comment on the data collection and data analysis instruments that will be developed by the external evaluation team (inception phase).
- d) Review and comment on the draft evaluation report and validate emerging findings and conclusions (evaluation finalisation stage).
- e) Advise on the focus and actionability of the evaluation recommendations that will form the basis of the Management Response to the evaluation (final stage).

A PDES Evaluation Manager will be at the disposal of the evaluation team and assume responsibility for providing available Country Operations Plans and indicators monitoring data, arranging interviews at HQ levels, arranging field visits, liaising with the Advisory Group and focal points at Field Representations, and consolidating comments on the inception and final reports. The Evaluation Manager will remain in close contact with designated focal points in the field to ensure smooth mission arrangements to all the designated locations. UNHCR Country offices will designate focal points that will assist the PDES Evaluation Managers and the evaluation teams with logistical and administrative arrangements. The Evaluation Manager will also share with the evaluation team a Quality Assurance/Guidance package for evaluations that is being finalized and piloted by PDES.

7. Evaluation team and qualifications

UNHCR's Evaluation Policy emphasizes independence, credibility and utility. The conduct of this exercise shall conform to UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.

The entity awarded the contract will be expected to deploy sufficient expertise to carry out the evaluation. Familiarity with the UNHCR's mandate and operations as well as with the United Nations development system is of particular importance.

The ER team will include the following expertise and skills (particularly relevant for the Team Leader):

Functional Requirements for Individual Team Members

- ✓ Extensive expertise in designing and implementing evaluations of complex programmes.
- ✓ Extensive evaluation experience in humanitarian and development approaches and programmes.
- ✓ Previous experience with evaluability assessments.
- ✓ Institutional knowledge of UNHCR and the UN architecture.
- ✓ Extensive experience in conveying complex evaluation analyses clearly and compellingly, including through the use of clear graphics and visual media.
- ✓ Knowledge of a wide range of evaluation methods and techniques and in particular of surveys/questionnaires.
- ✓ Excellent writing and communication skills in English (knowledge of French, Spanish or Arabic would be an advantage).

- ✓ Post-graduate university degrees (at least for the Team Leader, a minimum of first degrees for the other team members) in social sciences or relevant academic discipline.

Corporate Requirements

- ✓ Published evaluations and evaluability assessments that cover similar issues and proven ability to carry out research in multiple countries.
- ✓ Ability to commit a research team to this evaluation for up to six months.
- ✓ Proven ability to gather, compare and translate complex data through mixed methods
- ✓ Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

8. Selection process and procurement

Technical Proposal

Respondents to this call for proposals should submit a technical proposal emphasizing:

- a. a general strategy and approach;
- b. proposed ER methods and tools;
- c. a plan to organize the ER

PDES estimates that the ER can be executed by a team of indicatively two expert independent consultants plus two research assistants for Phase 1, four expert independent consultants and four research assistants for Phase 2 with the right mix of skills and expertise. One member of the team should be identified as Team Leader. However, bidders reserve the right to vary team size, with proper justification for allocation of work and cost.

The technical proposal should be concisely presented and structured in the following order to include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following information:

A description of the company with evidence of capacity to perform this evaluation, including:

- ✓ Samples of other evaluations, evaluability assessments or research that pertains to forcibly displaced populations, refugee protection, and transition from relief to development;
- ✓ Company profile, registration certificate and last audit reports;
- ✓ If a multi-location company, please specify the location of the company's headquarters, and the branches that will be involved in the project work;
- ✓ Three or more references, with contact information.

PDES may contact referees for feedback on services provided to them by bidders.

There is no minimum or maximum length for the technical proposal. However, sufficient detail and clarity are required. The proposal should stipulate the level of effort to be committed by the different team members in each phase of the deliverables referred to in the timeline. The same information should be featured in the financial proposal – costs should be clearly associated with the deliverable. Bidders may be asked to provide additional information at the proposal assessment stage.

Specific requirements

In addition to whatever other approaches and methods are proposed, the following specific items must be present in the bidding documents:

- ✓ Presentation of a work plan in all phases along the time lines presented above;
- ✓ Details on the overall design and data gathering methods to be used;
- ✓ Details of team members' relevant qualifications and the basic information about the organization submitting the bid;
- ✓ The level of effort (full-time or part-time) for all team members in both the technical (without price) and financial proposals (with costs). The stated level of effort by the Team Leader and main consultants should be commensurate with the needs of this project (i.e. not just for a few days).

Please provide CVs of all proposed team members for this ER. Personnel should have the qualifications outlined above.

While all contents of the technical proposal are important, special attention will be paid to the composition and strength of the proposed team, and the rigor of the proposed methodology. These two elements account for 60 percent of the points awarded for the technical proposal. The proposed work plan, proposer's capacity, and sample report will account for the remaining 40 percent.

Cost Proposal

Bidders must submit a firm-fixed price bid in US Dollars. The quotation will not be subject to revision unless officially invited to re-submit by UNHCR. All prices/rates quoted must be exclusive of all taxes as UNHCR is a tax-exempt organization. Bidders will suggest a payment schedule, linked to contract milestones (it is however recommended to submit a schedule of three tranches, i.e. one after the submission of the Inception Report, one after the submission of the first draft of the Final Report and one after the final draft of the Final Report, incorporating valid comments). All costs will be fixed, except for travel (including daily subsistence allowance at the applicable UN rate) to selected destinations, which will be on a cost-reimbursable basis. The budget should be presented in three categories: personnel costs, project costs, and overhead costs.

Personnel costs should include classification (i.e. job title/function) and rates for team members; duration of work for each. This information may be contained within a table showing expected level of effort per team member, by phase. The level of effort must be

visible in both the technical and the financial proposals. If the country visits envisaged above are changed due to security or other constraints, the contract may be modified to reflect this.

Vendor Registration Form

If your company is not already registered with UNHCR, please complete, sign, and submit with your Technical Proposal the Vendor Registration Form (Annex 2).

Applicable General Conditions

Please indicate acknowledgement of the UNHCR General Conditions of Contract for the Provision of Services by signing this document (Annex 3) and including it in your submitted Technical Proposal.

Awarding the contract and payment

UNHCR will award the contract after considering both technical and cost factors, on the principle of best value-for-money. Payment will be made only upon UNHCR's acceptance of the work performed in accordance with agreed schedule of payment and/or contract milestones. The terms of payment are net 30 days, after receipt of invoice and acceptance of work. Where the need arises, earlier payment may be negotiated between UNHCR and the contracted institution, on the terms indicated in the contract.

The technical offer will be evaluated using the following criteria and percentage distribution: 70% of the total score

Company Qualifications:

- ✓ Capacity to undertake contract
- ✓ References
- ✓ Proven track record of providing evaluations and evaluation services on complex humanitarian issues

Proposed Services:

- ✓ General strategy and approach to the evaluation
- ✓ Proposed evaluation methodology and tools to be used
- ✓ Proposed organization of work

Personnel Qualifications:

- ✓ Suitability and experience of the proposed team

Some technical criteria will be subject to minimum passing scores; if a bid does not meet these scores it will be deemed technically non-compliant and will not proceed to the financial evaluation.