

**TOR- 00253668**

**Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation of “ECHO HIP Project” (December 2022 to November 2023)**

**1. Introduction**

DRC has worked in Türkiye since 2013, intending to enhance the capacities and self-reliance of refugees and affected host communities. DRC operates a Country Office in Hatay and field offices in Hatay, Şanlıurfa, Kilis and Kahramanmaraş. DRC’s strategic vision is to enhance the protective environment for refugees in Türkiye in collaboration and, where appropriate, partnership with the government, civil society, refugees and host communities.

Türkiye, being the largest refugee-hosting nation globally, currently provides shelter to more than 4 million refugees and asylum seekers. Although the majority of these refugees are Syrian (approximately 3.32 million registered as of June 2023), Türkiye also accommodates a substantial number of refugees (over 318 thousand as of mid-2022) from other countries including Afghanistan, Ukraine, and Iraq. In dealing with the prolonged Syrian crisis, the Turkish government has assumed a leading role in addressing the refugee situation by adapting its institutional structure and approach.

To bridge the gaps in the response and meet the ongoing needs of affected populations, DRC (Danish Refugee Council) is currently running protection programs funded by ECHO, SDC, DANIDA, and public donations. These programs aim to collectively support the achievement of DRC's Protection Strategy objectives.

DRC's strategic vision is focused on ensuring that all individuals affected by displacement - refugees, migrants, and vulnerable host communities - can fully exercise their rights under national and international legal frameworks. The ultimate goal is to assist them in attaining durable solutions. Recognizing the protracted nature of the humanitarian situation in Türkiye, DRC places particular emphasis on the displacement and recovery phase. Moreover, the organization acknowledges that the government of Türkiye leads the protection response, and the vast majority of refugees are residing within host communities (98%).

In accordance with the aforementioned vision, DRC has executed a protection program, financially supported by ECHO, in collaboration with Refugee Rights Türkiye (RRT) and Support to Life (STL) across several Turkish regions including Sanliurfa, Kilis, Hatay, Adana, Edirne, and Istanbul. The primary focus of the program is to address the risks faced by refugees in Türkiye through sharing essential information, delivering specialized services, conducting research on crucial protection-related topics, and enhancing the capabilities of key stakeholders in responding to the protection challenges faced by the displaced population. The program was initiated on December 1, 2022, and is scheduled to conclude on November 30, 2023. DRC intends to conduct an external evaluation to assess the program's accomplishments based on the OECD DAC criteria. The resulting evaluation report will be shared with ECHO, DRC program units, and implementing partners.

RRT, a prominent NGO, is devoted to offering legal information and assistance to asylum seekers and vulnerable migrants in Türkiye. Headquartered in Istanbul, RRT operates in Izmir and Edirne, which are significant transit locations and is currently in the process of establishing a new office in Van to cater to Afghan and Iranian refugees in the border provinces.

STL, on the other hand, focuses on supporting disaster-affected communities to meet their fundamental needs and rights, primarily through community-based initiatives. Having been operational in Türkiye since 2005, STL has been at the forefront of programs supporting refugees since 2012, with its headquarters in Istanbul and offices located in İstanbul, İzmir, Mersin, Adana, Hatay, Şanlıurfa, Diyarbakır, Mardin, and Batman.

The principal objective of the project is: **Improved access to rights and services for displaced populations in Türkiye, through information dissemination, specialised protection services and collaboration with local stakeholders.** To achieve this objective, DRC and local partners have provided direct protection services e.g. GBV case management, Legal case management, Individual Protection Assistants (IPA), Legal counselling, Awareness Raising Sessions, Psycho-Social Support (PSS) and referrals to external specialized service providers. In addition to this, DRC and partners conducted research on protection-related topics, collated protection data into advocacy products, led advocacy meetings and roundtable discussions, and provided capacity building to local actors to implement protection services.

The specific objective of the action is measured through three outcome indicators:

- Percentage of beneficiaries reporting that humanitarian assistance is delivered in a safe, accessible, accountable and participatory manner
- Percentage of refugees reporting being satisfied with the protection services they received
- Percentage of beneficiaries reporting mitigated protection risks following project interventions
- Percentage of targeted beneficiaries reported increased knowledge about rights, entitlements and available services by the end of the project
- Percentage of awareness-raising sessions delivered by Community Committees formed by DRC in Sanliurfa, Kilis and Hatay

The Programme was initially designed into four results, each focusing on a different aspect of the protection programming and each result is measured through a set of output indicators:

**Result-1: Increased knowledge of and appropriate information on risks, rights, entitlements and available services**

- 1.1 Number of persons with increased/appropriate information on relevant rights and/or entitlements
- 1.2 Number of persons reached by the implementation of specific GBV prevention measures
- 1.3 Number of girls, boys, men and women who receive general protection information sessions and community events.
- 1.4 Number of community focal points trained on protection topics
- 1.5 Number of individuals reached by GBV key messaging activities
- 

**Result-2: Improved well-being and safety, reduced risks and immediate threats, through specialized protection services**

- 2.1 Number of persons who receive an appropriate response to GBV
- 2.2 Number of persons who obtain appropriate documentation/legal status
- 2.3 Number of those who received protection services (IPA, Legal CM, legal counselling)
- 2.4 Number of external referrals made

- 2.5 Number of people reached through PSS sessions (serialized and drop-ins)
- 2.6 Number of persons who have received detention visits by the end of the project

Result-3: Evidence generation on the protection risks of displacement-affected people and dissemination of key programmatic and policy recommendations with stakeholders

- 3.1 Number of Protection Information Management (PIM) products enabling evidence-informed action for quality protection outcomes produced
- 3.2 Number of advocacy products produced and disseminated and/or number of meetings/events held

Result-4: Strengthened technical capacity of relevant stakeholders to better respond to protection risks of the affected population

- 4.1 Number of participants showing increased knowledge of the protection subject in focus (70% of the target)
- 4.2 % of targeted actors self-report improved capacity to provide effective protection services.

However, after the devastating earthquake on 6<sup>th</sup> February 2023, the grant was subjected to a modification and new results were added to adapt the programme to respond to the situation. This included the addition of activities including Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA) for Basic Needs, CVA for Shelter and Temporary Settlement Support (TSS). Accordingly, two more results were added:

Result-5: The affected and displaced population receive adequate assistance to meet their basic needs, including shelter

- 5.1 Number of individuals who received basic needs voucher assistance
- 5.2 Number of individuals who received vouchers to access basic, safe and dignified shelters solutions

Result-6: Persons affected by the earthquake staying in informal settlements are enabled to manage and improve their living conditions, dignity and safety.

- 6.1 Number of individuals living in informal sites benefitting from the distribution of Site Safety Materials
- 6.2 Number of individuals living in informal sites benefitting from Quick Impact Projects

## **2. Scope of Evaluation**

DRC Türkiye aims to carry out an external evaluation with the main goal of gathering evidence to enhance DRC's Protection Programming. The objective is to ensure that the interventions of the program are well-suited to the current context and that the overall performance of the program is satisfactory, effectively contributing to its intended outcomes.

During the evaluation process, besides assessing the program's performance, DRC will also focus on capturing valuable lessons learned and identifying best practices as part of its continuous learning efforts. The evaluation's scope will be determined using the OECD-DAC criteria, which include

Relevance, Effectiveness, Impact, Efficiency, Sustainability, and Coherence. Detailed information on each criterion can be found in section H.

### **3. Specific objectives of the evaluation:**

- a) To assess the performance of the programme against key evaluation criteria (OECD DAC) for all the Programme activities implemented by DRC and partners.
- b) To assess the programme implementation concerning information sharing, participation, and accountability to the affected population
- c) To identify lessons learned and best practices in programming implemented by DRC and partners;
- d) To identify and assess key internal and external factors that have contributed to, affected, or impeded the achievements of the Programme, and how DRC and the partners have managed these factors.
- e) To identify and validate unintended impacts of the programme (if any) and suggests recommendations to address them.
- f) To provide recommendations based on findings for DRC, its implementing partners, ECHO and other relevant stakeholders, etc.

### **4. Evaluation criteria and key questions to be addressed**

DRC will conduct the evaluation considering the following six criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Impact, Efficiency, Sustainability and Coherence.

#### **Relevance/Appropriateness**

Is the intervention doing the right thing?

- To what extent the affected communities were involved in the design and decision-making processes of the programme? How actively?
- To what extent the programme objectives and interventions/response modalities were relevant to the needs of affected populations, context-specific and ECHO mandate in Türkiye?
  - How needs-based, context-adapted, and capacity-conscious was the design of the programme?
  - How relevant was the capacity building to the identified gaps?
  - How responsive were programme activities to the needs of different targeted groups, e.g. male and female, in targeted communities (if possible, please distinguish between gender, age, nationalities (Syrians and Non-Syrians) refugees and migrants) given their circumstances and priorities?
  - How accessible was the programme to different segments of the targeted population, including persons with disabilities, elderly individuals, and marginalised groups?
- To what extent the activities and outputs of the programme were consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- To what extent have the key contextual changes, threats and opportunities that arose during implementation influenced and informed programme implementation?
- How appropriate were programme participants' participation and complaints and feedback mechanisms to the context?
- How and to what extent were monitoring and research findings used to inform decision-making and the improvement of programme implementation by DRC and partners?

### Coherence

How well does the intervention fit?

- To what extent does the programme complement existing interventions in country programme as well as government policies and strategies?
- To what extent was the programme coordinated with other relevant actors?
- To what extent did DRC foster collaboration and coordination between actors?
- To what extent were local capacities developed or strengthened by DRC through the programme?
  - What was the added value of DRC to its partners' implementation?
- To what extent were government stakeholders consulted in the implementation of the programme, and how was it coordinated with them to improve complementarity and coverage?
- To what extent were mechanisms for sharing information and lessons learned with other actors used and whether they were effective?
- What are the synergies and interlinkages between the programme and other interventions carried out by DRC Türkiye?

### Effectiveness

Is the intervention achieving its objectives?

- To what extent were the programme objectives achieved?
  - What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- How effective were programme modalities (CM, IPI, PSS, GBV, Awareness Raising conducted for all programme activities and Legal support) as well as the referral mechanisms?
- To what extent did the programme integrate considerations between sectors (from livelihoods to protection and vice versa)?
- How well did DRC's partnership approach work and how well were the partners' capacity gaps to deliver assigned protection interventions addressed through organisational capacity development?
- To what extent the protection staff structure and the overall management structure were appropriate to deliver an effective protection response?
  - What are the recommendations in terms of structure for similar programmes?
- How were programme participants selected and were they informed of the selection criteria or participation in the programme?
  - How effective were the selection criteria in reaching the most vulnerable populations?
- Were there any risks inherent to the duration of the programme, either in the course of or towards the end of the intervention?
- To what extent was the programme able to respond to unforeseen challenges and opportunities? E.g., February earthquake.

### **Efficiency**

How well are resources being used?

- To what extent the interventions were cost-efficient and were the objectives achieved timely?
  - What are the indicators that show the programme was implemented most efficiently compared to alternatives?
- How efficient were the management structures and the implementation modalities in terms of timeliness of delivery and cost-effectiveness of the interventions?
- To what extent the MEAL and Information Management tools used by DRC and partners were efficient for this programme?
- To what extent was the programme implemented based on the best use of existing resources/capacity; e.g. the capacity of the partners and the internal capacity and expertise of DRC itself?
  - What key limitations existed on this front?
  - What could DRC's future programmes do to increasingly develop and invest in existing resources?
  - What cost-effective alternatives could have been used?

### **Impact**

What difference does the intervention make?

- What are the most significant changes/impacts of the programme in the lives of targeted populations?
  - Analysis of programme contribution to any observed impact (intended, unintended, positive, negative) and analysis of what other actors and factors contributed to the impact.
- What were the intended and unintended effects of the programme, and how do they relate to the principal objective?
- Did all intended target groups benefit equally from interventions as per their needs?
- To what extent did the programme consider and mitigate potential negative impacts on social conflict dynamics in the target area?

### **Sustainability**

Will the benefits last?

- To what extent are the changes made by the programme likely to continue after donor funding ceases?
  - How did the programme plan and implement an adequate transition and exit strategy that ensures longer-term positive effects and reduces the risk of dependency?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme?
- To what extent are the local communities and stakeholders more resilient (in line with the programme results) than before?

## 5. Methodology

DRC is committed to carrying out an external evaluation of the ECHO-funded Protection Programme in line with the principles of ethics in evaluation, i.e. Integrity, Accountability, Respect and Beneficence. DRC considers engaging the programme participants and stakeholders in line with the OECD DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation. DRC would like the evaluation team to use qualitative and quantitative methods using both primary and secondary data collection techniques for this evaluation. The evaluation firm/individual consultant is expected to develop a detailed and robust methodology upon their selection (to be approved by DRC Türkiye) to generate a representative sampling size and credible findings. The evaluation methodology should also make use of existing monitoring and research studies data already generated by the DRC Türkiye and its partners.

The evaluation is expected to be conducted in the field (Hatay, Maras, Kilis, Sanliurfa, Adana and Istanbul) while it will also allow 20-30% of remote data collection as it is found necessary by the selected consultancy and approved by DRC. The samples will be taken based on the nature of the specific interventions within the programme and the tools will be designed to reflect relevant target groups accordingly.

DRC expects the evaluation methodology to be highly participatory and inclusive, reflecting the programme's commitment to Age, Gender and Diversity. As such, evaluation tools should seek to reflect the opinions of men, women, non-binary and other gender identities, people with disability, different age groups, and various nationalities, locations etc.

Thus, it requires the consultant(s) to be experienced in participatory approaches to learning and inquiry, especially in seeking the views and perceptions of key stakeholders that include:

- Targeted groups/affected populations
- Partners and actors directly involved in the programme at different levels
  - The implementing partners
  - Community leaders (if applicable) and representatives of people of concerns, including for populations living in temporary sites and settlements
  - Local authorities
  - ECHO representatives
  - Protection Technical Working Group Lead in the region
  - Cash-Based Interventions Technical Working Group
  - TSS Sector
- DRC staff involved in the implementation of the programme

In addition, the following should be taken into consideration:

- That the method(s) and the approach chosen are relevant to the objective of the evaluation
- That the individuals to be consulted during the evaluation are relevant to the focus of the evaluation
-

- That the method(s) and the approach chosen allow for source and method triangulation of findings
- That the data which is not used in the evaluation report is not collected.
- That the method and approach chosen are ethically sound and culturally sensible, and
- Data privacy and security are the sole responsibility of the contractor.

Note: Individual consultants or firms who are operational and aware of the local context in Türkiye will be given priority.

## **6. Timeframe of evaluation**

The evaluation will be carried out between 01/10/2023 to 30/11/2023 the final report submitted to DRC as per the agreed timeline within the contractual obligation. The exact dates will be negotiated with the final selected firm or consultants. Deadlines agreed with the selected consultants/firms will be non-negotiable.

## **7. Reporting**

The selected consultant or firm will report directly to the MEAL Manager and Head of Programme and will work closely with Area Manager, Protection Coordinator, Protection Programme Managers, and Emergency Programme Managers in targeted locations throughout the evaluation process.

## **8. Evaluator's qualifications and expression of interest**

The evaluation consultant or firm should have the following expertise and skills:

- Extensive expertise in evaluations of complex programmes in a humanitarian context and a minimum of seven years of experience in conducting complex evaluations on protection programming consisting of case management, GBV response and PSS activities;
- Proven experience in conducting evaluations for protection programmes with international humanitarian organisations in Türkiye
- Proven experience in the use of quantitative and participatory qualitative methods for data collection and analysis including field and remote data collection and field and remote management of evaluation;
- Knowledge of ICT tools for mobile data collection;
- Excellent writing and communication skills in English;
- Post-graduate university degree in social sciences or another relevant academic discipline
- Understanding of data collection ethics including GDPR (Global Data Protection Regulations) and KVKK (Kişisel verileri koruma Kanunu)

The following are desirable:

- Proficiency in Arabic and/or Turkish
- Familiarity with DRC programmes and operations in the middle east especially Türkiye.



## **9. Expected outputs /Evaluation deliverables**

The following are the expected deliverables of the evaluation:

- a) Inception Report: The inception report (max 10 pages) will be submitted to DRC 15 days after signing the contract with a clear evaluation methodology, timeline and data collection tools (as annexes). The inception report will need to be authorized by DRC before data collection starts.
- b) First Draft of Evaluation Report: Consultant/Firm will prepare the first draft evaluation report in English and will share it with DRC (25 to 30 pages max excluding annexes, including an executive summary not exceeding 2 pages and recommendations). Feedback from DRC will be provided within one (1) week after the submission of the draft report. Minimum guidelines on the evaluation report:
  - The report should systematically answer the key questions posed;
  - It should fairly and clearly represent the views of the different actors/stakeholders; as evidence of the change and participation
  - It should give the conclusions of the evaluator in a way that is clear and substantiated by the collected evidence.
- c) Evaluation Management Response Plan: The evaluation team will include all key findings in the management response plan for the team to prepare a management response plan to be presented in the debriefing meeting by the DRC team. DRC will share the management response plan template.
- d) Evaluation Debrief Meeting: A remote or in-person debrief meeting will be conducted by the selected firm or consultant to present the draft findings of the evaluation, and to give feedback to extended SMT.
- e) Final Draft Evaluation Report: A final draft of the evaluation report will be shared within 7 days after the debriefing meeting with DRC and partner staff. It will include changes/modifications, agreed upon between DRC and the consultant/firm.
- f) Lessons Learned Note and Quality of Evidence Checklist: Two separate annexes will be prepared along with the final evaluation report, i.e. DRC lessons learned note and BOND principles and checklist for assessing the quality of evidence. DRC will share the templates for both annexes.

## **10. Payment**

Overall bids will be evaluated based on technical and financial proposals demonstrating “Best Value for Money” and a strong technical description. Payment will be tied to the submission of evaluation deliverables. Payment will be done in two instalments, 30% after the submission of the inception report and approval by DRC, and 70% upon DRC’s approval of the final evaluation report including all annexes.

Note: Upon signing of a contract, a final timeline of evaluation deliverables will be agreed upon and a final payment schedule will be specified by DRC.

Cost to be included in the offer: All interested consultants and firms should include technical and non-technical costs (such as boarding and lodging etc.) in their respective financial proposals. DRC will not be responsible for covering or reimbursing any boarding and lodging costs.

DRC will provide local transportation to the evaluation team during the evaluation, however, flights and accommodations should be booked and paid to the evaluators/firm.

The relevant invoices should be issued & paid in Turkish Lira (TRY) only. The USD/TRY conversion rate should be referenced from TCMB's (Turkish Republic Central Bank) "Banknote Buying" rate of invoice issuance date & hour.

**Note:** The proposed budget may be subject to further discussion and negotiations.

### **11. Codes of Behavior**

The evaluation process will be directed by DRC's policy for the ethical conduct of evaluation guiding the evaluation team through careful considerations of the key ethical implications at every stage of evaluation. DRC is also a member of ALNAP (The Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action) and as such ALNAP's Evaluation of Humanitarian Action Guide is a core reference when conducting evaluations. The selected consultant or firm will be asked to sign and adhere to the DRC's Code of Conduct.

### **12. Disclosure**

Under the terms of reference, the consultant/firm is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of DRC. All data collected as part of this consultancy belongs to DRC and public dissemination of the data and evaluation products can only be done with the written consent of DRC.

### **13. Bid submission**

You must submit one original of the RFQ Bid Form in a sealed envelope, clearly marked with the RFQ number and the Bidders name. The bid can be delivered directly to the tender box, mailed or delivered by courier services, or alternatively send by email to the following dedicated, secure & controlled email address.

#### **Request for Clarifications**

- **Email Address:** [hueseyin.kaplan@drc.ngo](mailto:hueseyin.kaplan@drc.ngo)
- **Deadline for Request for Clarifications:** 29 AUGUST 2023, 1500 TK Time

#### **BID SUBMISSION**

- **Email Address:** [rfq.tur.cot@drc.ngo](mailto:rfq.tur.cot@drc.ngo)
- **Deadline for Request for Clarifications:** 31 AUGUST 2023, 1700 TK Time

**THE RFQ BID FORM CANNOT BE EMAILED TO ANY OTHER DRC EMAIL ADDRESS THAN ABOVE**

The sealed envelope must be deposited into the DRC Tender Box at the address stated on page one before the RFQ Closing Date and Time. It is the Bidders responsibility to ensure that the sealed envelope is deposited into the Tender Box.

Any bids not received on the official DRC Bid Form, or in a sealed envelope, or in dedicated secure email box provided by DRC may be disqualified for non-compliance with these RFQ Instructions. All Bids received in pencil will be disqualified. Any bids received after above given deadline (hardcopy and/or email) should be disqualified.

Interested teams or consultants should submit an expression of interest and updated CVs and other documents listed below;

### **Administrative Documents to be Submitted & Essential Criterias**

- Bidder's main line of business activity shall be protection, education, research or consultancy (DRC has the right to request further documentation such as trial balance).
- Financial statement of 2021 and 2022.
- Please provide the necessary documentation for proof of your registration in-country (Trade Registry Gazette, Chamber of Commerce Registration, Tax Documentation, Circular of Signature for signatory person for the offer submitted).
- Full compliance with DRC standard policies/documents below;
  - Please make sure to fill the Supplier Registration Form (Stamped, filled, signed.)
  - Supplier Code of Conduct (Stamped and signed)
  - General Conditions of Contract (Stamped and signed.)
  - Information Notice Regarding Processing of Personal Data of Supplier Officials (Stamped and signed)

### **Technical Documents to be Submitted**

- A cover letter of no more than 2 pages introducing the evaluator/the consultancy firm and how the past experiences, skills and competencies meet the expected qualifications, with concrete examples. Please also use this cover letter to indicate the consultants'/firm's availability for the proposed period.

Note: As stated above the evaluation should start in October 2023 and the final evaluation report should be submitted to DRC by the end of November 2023.

- An outline/technical proposal of no more than 10 pages of the proposed process including:
  - Key considerations for this evaluation;
  - Proposed methodology
  - Indicative work plan with realistic deadlines
- CVs of the proposed evaluation team including Evaluation Lead, Quality Assurance Coordinator, Field Coordinator and Reporting Manager (at least 4 updated CVs each separately and each no longer than 3 pages with a focus on the last 10 years' assignments)

The consultant/firm can share the CVs of data collection teams, enumerators etc. which will be appreciated.

- Two reference letters/feedback from previous clients showing the firm conducting a final evaluation for a protection programme (non-protection reference letters will not be evaluated)
- A one-page budget of the offer, covering all major anticipated technical and non-technical costs;
- Two sample reports from previous evaluations conducted for protection programmes (non-protection examples will not be evaluated)

## 14. EVALUATION OF BIDS

### Technical Evaluation (80% weightage)

#### Part 1:

The submitted proposal will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

TECHNICAL CRITERIA #	TECHNICAL CRITERIA	WEIGHTING IN TECHNICAL EVALUATION
<b>1</b>	<b>Quality of an outlined methodology presented by the evaluation firm or consultant</b>	<b>40 points</b>
1.1	Proposed methodology with due consideration given to all key elements in the ToR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposed data collection methods</li> <li>- Sampling methodology</li> <li>- Diversity and inclusion considerations</li> <li>- Data management approach</li> </ul>	30 points
1.2	Action plan with realistic deadlines. Should go in line with ToR requirements	5 points
1.3	Presentation of the methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarity</li> <li>- Reflecting the ToR requirements</li> <li>- Understanding of the context</li> </ul>	5 points
<b>2</b>	<b>Previous experience in the fulfilment of similar programmes</b>	<b>15 points</b>
2.1	Quality of sample reports from previous evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Example 1</li> <li>- Example 2</li> </ul>	7.5 points
2.2	Relevant feedback/reference from at least two previous clients <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reference letter 1</li> <li>- Reference letter 2</li> </ul>	7.5 points
<b>3.</b>	<b>CV quality for staff performing the evaluation</b>	<b>15 points</b>

#	CV of a minimum of four evaluation management team members with matching qualifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluation Team Leader (5 points)</li> <li>- Evaluation Quality Control Coordinator (5 points)</li> <li>- Evaluation Coordinator in the field (5 points)</li> <li>- Evaluation Reporting Manager (5 points)</li> </ul>	
<b>Total technical evaluation score part 1</b>		<b>70</b>

The minimum passing technical score shall be 55 out of 70

**Note:** Bidders who passed the technical evaluation part 1 will be invited for an interview (in person or remotely). The interview will be evaluated as per the following criteria:

PRESENTATION POINTS RELATED TO EVALUATION	MAXIMUM SCORING POINTS
English language skills of key evaluation management team members	5
Presentation of the proposed methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarity</li> <li>- Flexibility</li> <li>- Reflecting the ToR</li> <li>- Understanding of the context</li> </ul>	10
Ability to address the panel members' questions and concerns	5
Ability/expertise to evaluate the programme target areas	5
<b>Total technical evaluation score part 2</b>	<b>30</b>

Note: documents combined all in one or two files will not be evaluated.

**Financial Evaluation (20% weightage)**

- Only all 'Technically Responsive' bids will be taken into consideration of financial evaluation
- Financial proposals should be sent in US Dollar (USD) and with a detailed budget breakdown.
- Proposals should be all inclusive (VAT, any other related tax, administrative & logistical costs etc shall be included and detailed)