

TOR- 00255134

**Terms of References for External Evaluation
for**

Building Resilience through Initiatives Defining Growth Potential of Economic Solutions for Syrians in Türkiye (BRIDGES) 3 (Funded by KfW (German Development Bank))

Programme title	Building Resilience through Initiatives Defining Growth Potential of Economic Solutions for Syrians in Türkiye (BRIDGES) 3
Donor	KfW - Kreditanstalt Für Wiederaufbau (German Development Bank)
Programme location	Türkiye Hatay, Şanlıurfa, Kilis, <i>Kahramanmaraş</i>
Programme duration	1st October 2021 – 31st July 2023 + 3 months extension till 31 October 2023
Evaluation to be conducted in	30 September – 30 November 2023 (Flexible)
Evaluation owner	DRC Senior Management Team (SMT)
Evaluation Manager	MEAL Manager as Evaluation Manager and Head of Programme as the Co-Manager
Evaluation Team	TBD
Type of evaluation	External Final Evaluation
Evaluation Trigger	DRC Evaluation Policy, performance and lessons learned about the programme implemented by DRC and Implementing Partners, contractual obligation
Implementing Partners	Orange, İNGEV, United Work

1. Context

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. DRC, with support from KfW, DANIDA, and SDC, is implementing an economic recovery programme in the southeastern provinces of Türkiye.

The concept of the Economic Recovery programme involves a series of initiatives provided by DRC to assist vulnerable individuals in regaining and safeguarding their economic well-being in the aftermath of a crisis or shock. On a global scale, DRC envisions that all households affected by conflict and displacement in its operational countries can achieve economic well-being, self-reliance, and resilience to shocks, ultimately leading to a sustainable solution. In the Middle East, DRC's strategy for contributing to this global vision involves giving greater consideration to systems of actors that can be utilized, supported, or developed to deliver comprehensive, people-centred interventions that foster self-reliance among displaced populations.

One of the key Economic Recovery (EcRec) programmes that DRC implements is BRIDGES-III funded by KFW started on October 2021 and ends on 31 November 2023 including three months of No Cost Extension (NCE). The programme is implemented in Hatay, Kahramanmaraş, Kilis, Sanliurfa and Istanbul in partnership with local partners such as Orange, INGEV and United Work. As the programme gets close to its end, DRC intends to undertake an external final evaluation to assess the programme's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, impact, and sustainability and more than document key lessons learned to inform decision-making and light the future direction.

Orange is a Turkish registered non-governmental civil society organisation devoted to alleviating the suffering and improving the sustainability mechanisms of conflict-affected populations in Türkiye and Syria. Since its establishment in 2016, Orange has implemented programmes spanning sectors including education, child protection, early recovery and livelihoods, and capacity development. Orange has partnered with DRC since 2016, most recently as a part of BRIDGES 1, BRIDGES 2 and BRIDGES 3. Orange has access to the proposed programme areas in Şanlıurfa, Hatay, Kilis, and Kahramanmaraş provinces through ongoing programmes in partnership with both DRC.

INGEV (Human Development Foundation) was established in 2016 in İstanbul and its mission is to contribute to human development in Türkiye through advocacy, research-based policy recommendations, programme development and implementation. INGEV's targeted support to host community members was expanded to include refugees in 2017 and INGEV successfully launched a "Syrian Entrepreneurship Center" in İstanbul in 2018, which offered one-to-one business consultancy services, a business consultancy hotline, technical and financial assistance to register informal businesses, capacity building training for businesses, and networking activities among MSMEs. INGEV established a Business Development Centre in Şanlıurfa through the BRIDGES 2 programme in 2020, through which INGEV provide entrepreneurship training, business skills training, business grants, support to formalise businesses, and business network events.

United Work was established in 2016 to increase the socio-economic conditions for Syrian refugees in Türkiye. United Work was initially established by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs to bridge the gap between the demand for labour on the part of international companies operating in Türkiye and the supply of labour from Syrian refugees. United Work builds a network of employers, offers job placement services, provides training in relevant skills to increase the

employability of refugees, and ensures social cohesion through sustainable, formal, and decent jobs.

2. Programme Summary

BRIDGES 3 supported the economic recovery of displacement-affected populations in Türkiye through two key outcome areas. Firstly, refugees and vulnerable members of the host community were supported to reintegrate into the local market system, through improved access to safe and decent wage employment. This was achieved through the provision of career counselling, vocational training, and access to long-term Turkish language courses. Additionally, displacement-affected populations were provided with direct employment opportunities through cash-for-work schemes, and through wage subsidy schemes. Secondly, home-based businesses and Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) were established and/or strengthened, to create employment opportunities to meet the local labour market demands. By the end of the programme period, the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) expects that at least 1,528-unique individuals access wage employment and 1,022 individuals establish or strengthen private businesses, with 2,550 people accessing income-generating activities in total.

BRIDGES 3 was built on the previous BRIDGES 1 and BRIDGES 2 programmes, both funded by KfW. Lessons learned from both BRIDGES programmes have been incorporated to inform the development of BRIDGES 3. Moreover, BRIDGES 3 has been designed to respond to the context in which displacement-affected populations in Türkiye seek income-generating opportunities, including the global COVID-19 pandemic and economic downturn. In recognition of the additional barriers people face to accessing wage- and self-employment, BRIDGES 3 places greater emphasis on the activities that directly lead to employment opportunities. Activities that proved most successful in BRIDGES 1 and 2 and that were piloted in BRIDGES 2 have been prioritised and strengthened through the utilisation of lessons learned from both programmes. This includes the provision of Productive Asset Support (PAS), cash-for-work initiatives, short-term job placements and wage subsidy schemes.

BRIDGES 3 reflects commitments made to strengthen localisation as part of DRC Türkiye's partnership strategy, with increased responsibilities passed to partners through the programme. BRIDGES 3 thereby invested in the long-term capacity of national CSOs, helping to ensure the sustainability of work initiated by the programme.

After the devastating earthquake beginning of February 2023, the following emergency response measures were added to the initial proposal:

- Support to the emergency response of implementing partners Orange and INGEV (procurement and distribution of non-food items)
- Support to the emergency response of municipalities and short-term income generation for earthquake-affected populations via CfW, and;
- Business Recovery Grants for Home-Based Businesses and MSMEs

The overall objective of the programme is **'To improve the resilience of refugees and vulnerable host communities by enhancing their access to dignified and sustainable livelihood**

opportunities and decent employment in Türkiye’ which is measured through the below indicators:

- G.1: Number of unique individuals reached through all the programme interventions
- G.2: Number of short-/medium-term employment opportunities financed by P4P
- G.3: Number of jobs with longer-term perspective facilitated by P4P activities
- G.4 # and % of start-up grantees who self-report increased income by the end of the programme period as compared to the pre-programme baseline

The programme logic includes three outcome areas which are achieved through relevant outputs and measured through outcome and output indicators outlined in the table below:

Programme Logic		Indicators
Outcome 1	Refugees and host beneficiaries are reintegrated into the local market system through improved access to safe and decent-wage employment.	1.1 Number of successful placements in jobs (short- and long-term employment) facilitated by the training activities
		1.2 Number of people employed through wage/work permit subsidies retained placement at least for a period of 9 months
Outcome 2	HBB and MSMEs are established and strengthened to support the local economy	2.1 % of surveyed people reported increased income by the end of the programme
		2.2 Number of businesses provided with start-up capital/start-up kits
		2.3 % of businesses/livelihood activities operating after 6 months
		2.4 % of MSME grantees (HBB, start-up) reported that training was useful and according to their needs
		2.5 % of HBB and MSME grantees reported that mentoring and coaching support activities were useful
Outcome 3	Partnership with the private sector is strengthened to enhance access to employment opportunities for refugees and vulnerable host communities.	3.1 Number of people reporting successful placements in jobs facilitated by job referral and networking activities
		3.2 % of surveyed beneficiaries reported that job referral and market linkage activities were useful for employment/livelihood
Output 1.1	Refugees' and host beneficiaries' capacity is	1.1.1 Number of people reached through counselling sessions
		1.1.2 Number of people who complete Turkish Language Training (A1, A2 or B1 level)

	strengthened through skills enhancement.	1.1.3 Number of people who complete vocational technical skills training
Output 1.2	Refugees and host beneficiaries have improved access to short-term employment.	1.2.1 Number of people placed in short-term employment opportunities (cash for work / on-the-job training)
		1.2.2 Number of people who complete short-term employment opportunities (cash for work / on-the-job training)
Output 1.3	Refugees and host beneficiaries have improved access to decent employment opportunities in the formal sector.	1.3.1 Number of people hired by businesses provided with a wage subsidy, work permit or job placement support
Output 2.1	Refugees and host beneficiaries are equipped with technical inputs to successfully run a business.	2.1.1 Number of MSME start-up participants who complete basic and advanced entrepreneurship training
		2.1.2 Number of HBB participants who complete Home-Based Business Training
		2.1.3 Number of HBB grantees who receive follow-up coaching sessions.
		2.1.4 Number of MSME start-up grantees who receive mentoring sessions.
Output 2.2	Refugees and host beneficiaries are supported to establish HBBs and MSMEs.	2.2.1 Number of people establishing HBB through the provision of PAS
		2.2.2 Number of people establishing MSMEs through the provision of start-up
Output 3.1	Market linkages events are conducted with the private sector to facilitate job opportunities for refugees and vulnerable host beneficiaries.	3.1.1 Number of people registered through ISKUR and linked with employment opportunities
		3.1.2 Number of HBB and MSMEs grantees who participate in product fairs
		3.1.3 Number of business networking events conducted

3. Target Group

DRC primarily have targeted vulnerable displaced refugees and host communities in south- and south-eastern Türkiye reaching directly to 8,100 individuals from refugee and host communities. The proposed ratio of SuTP and host community members under the programme is 50:50 in some programme components, such as job placements, to promote social cohesion and respond to the contextual changes that contribute to the further vulnerability of Turkish households. DRC is

committed to maintaining the 40:60 ratio of women and men, to ensure gender parity across all aspects of the programme. All participants are expected to be 18 years and above.

4. Scope of Evaluation

DRC Türkiye aims to conduct an external evaluation for the BRIDGES-III programme, with the primary goal of gathering evidence to inform the economic recovery programme. The evaluation's overall objective is to ensure that the interventions implemented in the programme align with the context and have led to satisfactory programme performance while contributing to its main objective.

In addition to assessing the programme's performance, the evaluation will also focus on capturing valuable lessons learned and best practices, promoting a continuous learning process. The evaluation's scope will be determined based on the OECD-DAC criteria, which include Relevance, Effectiveness, Coherence, Impact, Efficiency, and Sustainability. Detailed explanations of each criterion can be found in Section H.

5. Specific objectives

The following are the specific objectives of the evaluation:

- a) To assess the performance of the programme against key evaluation criteria for all activities implemented by DRC and partners;
- b) Assess the programme in terms of coordination, complementarity and coverage with the local capacities, network of relevant actors and authorities;
- c) Assess the programme implementation concerning the participation, information sharing and accountability to the affected populations.
- d) Identify lessons learned and best practices in the programme implemented by DRC and partners;
- e) Provide recommendations based on findings for DRC, its implementing partners, KfW and other relevant stakeholders, etc.
- f) 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.

6. 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 things?

- To what extent the affected communities were involved in the design and decision-making processes of the programme? How actively?
- To what extent were the programme objectives and interventions valid or in line with the needs of people and context?

- How needs-based, context-adapted¹, and capacity-conscious was the design of the programme?
- How appropriate was DRC's programme design and implementation structure?
- How relevant were the response modalities to the identified needs and the context?
- How relevant were the capacity-building initiatives to the identified gaps?
- To what extent were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
 - How responsive were programme activities to the needs of different targeted groups, concerning gender, people with disability, refugees and host community members, 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 have the key contextual changes, threats and opportunities that arose during implementation influenced and informed programme implementation?
- **How well the programme was adapted to respond to the needs arose with the earthquake and the needs emerged post-earthquake?**
- How appropriate were programme participants' participation and complaints and feedback mechanisms to the context?
- To what extent were monitoring and Information Management findings and data 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 did the programme complement existing interventions in the country programme as well as the 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 relevant 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 design and implementation of the programme?
 - How was the programme coordinated with government stakeholders 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?

¹ E.g. 6th February's earthquake

- What were 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 objectives achieved/are likely to be achieved?
 - What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- How effective was DRC's response within the economic recovery programme concerning intervention modalities such as career counselling, multiple training i.e. soft skills, transferable skills, vocational skills, Turkish language skills training, cash for work, wage subsidies, business formalization grants, grants/assets support to establish home-based businesses and MSMEs, linkages to access the employment opportunities, events to link the small scale producers with the market to promote businesses etc.?
 - 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 economic recovery interventions addressed through organisational and capacity development?
- To what extent was the economic recovery programme staffing structure, including the overall management structure, appropriate to deliver an effective economic recovery response?
 - What are the recommendations in terms of structure for similar programmes?
- To what extent the programme participants were informed of the selection criteria or participation in the programme?
 - How effective were the selection criteria in reaching the most vulnerable populations?
- To what extent was the programme able to respond to unforeseen challenges and opportunities? E.g., the February earthquake.
 - How well the programme was adapted to respond to the needs arose with the
 - Were there any potential/actual risks encountered during the programme implementation or as it approached its end and how they were (if any) addressed?

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.
 - Keeping the programme impact in consideration, programme interventions were possible to scale up?
- 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?
 - How do they relate to the principal objective of the programme?
- 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 e.g., target refugee and host community members, municipalities, private sector businesses and local partners more resilient (in line with the programme results) than before?

7. Methodology

DRC is dedicated to conducting the final evaluation in accordance with ethical principles in evaluation, namely Integrity, Accountability, Respect, and Beneficence. DRC intends to involve programme participants and stakeholders in line with the OECD DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation. The selected evaluation firm or consultant should employ a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, utilizing both primary and secondary data collection techniques. A comprehensive and robust methodology is expected to be developed by the chosen party, subject to approval by DRC Türkiye, to ensure representative sampling and credible findings. The evaluation methodology should also leverage existing monitoring and data from the DRC Türkiye programme.

Participatory methods will be employed during the evaluation to engage programme participants and stakeholders, allowing them to independently and fairly express their views on programme successes, failures, impacts, gaps, good practices, and lessons learned. While the evaluation will predominantly take place in the field in person, the selected consultancy or firm may conduct 20-30% of the data collection remotely, especially with staff, partner staff, local stakeholders, and participants who are unable to attend in-person discussions due to limitations.

DRC encourages creative and participatory data collection methods to gather and document the best possible evidence from the programme. The sampling should be inclusive and representative, reflecting diversity and inclusion.

Hence, the consultant(s) or firms should possess experience in participatory approaches to learning and inquiry, especially in seeking the perspectives of key stakeholders, including:

a. Targeted refugee and host community members

b. Partners and actors directly involved in the programme at various levels:

- Implementing partners (INGEV, Orange, United Work)
- Companies and local authorities participating in wage subsidy and cash-for-work schemes
- Local authorities
- KFW representatives and relevant program staff

c. DRC staff engaged in programme implementation, such as program managers, coordinators, and field teams.

Furthermore, the following aspects should be considered:

- The chosen method(s) and approach should align with the evaluation's objective.
- The individuals consulted during the evaluation should be relevant to the evaluation's focus.
- The selected method(s) and approach should enable triangulation of findings from different sources and methods.
- Programme participants should be consulted only if relevant to the evaluation questions.
- Data collection that is not used or not pertinent to the evaluation should be avoided.
- The chosen method and approach should adhere to ethical standards and be culturally sensitive.

- The consultancy/firm bears sole responsibility for data privacy and security.

Note: Individual consultants or firms with operational knowledge of the local context in Türkiye will receive priority consideration.

8. Timeframe of evaluation

The evaluation is scheduled tentatively from September to November 2023. The final report will be submitted to DRC in accordance with the agreed timeline as stipulated in the contract. The specific dates will be discussed and determined with the chosen firm or consultants. It is essential to note that the deadlines established with the selected consultants/firms will be firm and non-negotiable.

9. Reporting

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

10. Evaluator's qualifications and expression of interest

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

- Extensive expertise (minimum five years) in evaluations of complex Economic Recovery/Livelihood programmes consisting of self and wage employment schemes in a humanitarian context
- Proven experience in conducting evaluation studies with international humanitarian organisations and knowledge of the livelihoods/economic recovery sector in Türkiye
- Proven experience in the use of quantitative and participatory qualitative methods for data collection and analysis including in-person and remote data collection and 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 for the team leader and at least a first degree for the other team member(s);
- Understanding of data collection ethics including GDPR (Global Data Protection Regulations) and KVKK (Kişisel verileri koruma Kanunu)

The following are desirable:

- Familiarity with the humanitarian response to the Syrian conflict and with the Türkiye context
- Proficiency in Arabic and Turkish languages
- Familiarity with DRC programmes and operations.

11. Expected outputs /Evaluation deliverables

The following are the expected deliverables of the evaluation.

1. **Inception Report:** The inception report will be submitted to DRC 10 working days after signing the contract with a clear evaluation methodology, timeline and data collection tools. The inception report will need to be endorsed by DRC before data collection starts.
2. **First Draft of Evaluation Report:** Consultant/Firm will prepare the first draft evaluation report in English and will share it with DRC (between 30 to 35 pages excluding annexes, including executive summary not exceeding 2 to 3 pages). Feedback from DRC will be provided within one week after the submission of the draft report. Minimum guidelines on the evaluation report:
 - I. The report should systematically answer the key questions posed;
 - II. It should fairly and clearly represent the views of the different actors/stakeholders;
 - III. It should give the conclusions of the evaluator in a way that is clear and substantiated by the collected evidence.
3. **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.
4. **Evaluation Debrief Meeting:** A remote or in-person debrief meeting/workshop will be conducted by the selected firm or consultant to present the draft findings of the evaluation, and to give feedback to extended SMT.
5. **Final Draft Evaluation Report:** A final draft of the evaluation report will be shared within 7 working days after the debriefing meeting with DRC and partner staff. It will include changes/modifications, agreed between DRC and the consultant/firm.
6. **Lesson Learned Note and Quality of Evidence Checklist:** Two separate annexes will be prepared along with the final evaluation report, i.e. DRC lesson learned note and BOND principles and checklist for assessing the quality of evidence. DRC will share the templates for both annexes.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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.

15. 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:** samet.bayrak@drc.ngo & hueseyin.kaplan@drc.ngo
- **Deadline for Request for Clarifications:** **07 September 2023, 1500 TK Time**

BID SUBMISSION

- **Email Address:** rfq.tur.cot@drc.ngo
- **Deadline for Request for Clarifications:** **11 September 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 3 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’ availability for the proposed period. Note: As stated above the evaluation should start as early as possible in September 2023 and the final evaluation report should be submitted to DRC by the end of November 2023.

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 an economic recovery/livelihood programme (non-economic recovery/livelihood 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 in economic recovery/livelihood programmes

16. 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
1	Quality of an outlined methodology presented by the evaluation firm or consultant	40 points

1.1	Proposed methodology with due consideration given to all key elements in the ToR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed data collection methods - Sampling methodology - Diversity and inclusion considerations - Data management approach 	20 points
1.2	Action plan with realistic deadlines. Should go in line with ToR requirements	10 points
1.3	Presentation of the methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarity - Reflecting the ToR requirements - Understanding of the context 	10 points
2	Previous experience in the fulfilment of similar programmes	15 points
2.1	Quality of sample reports from previous evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Example 1 (3.25 Points) - Example 2 (3.25 Points) 	7.5 points
2.2	Relevant feedback/reference from at least two previous clients <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reference letter 1 - Reference letter 2 	7.5 points
3.	CV quality for staff performing the evaluation	15 points
#	CV of a minimum of four evaluation management team members with matching qualifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation Team Leader (5 points) - Evaluation Quality Control Coordinator (5 points) - Evaluation Coordinator in the field (5 points) - Evaluation Reporting Manager (5 points) 	
Total technical evaluation score part 1		70

The minimum passing technical score shall be 55 out of 70

Note: Bidders who passed the technical evaluation part 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	15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarity - Flexibility - Reflecting the ToR - Understanding of the context 	
Ability to address the panel members' questions and concerns	5
Ability/expertise to evaluate the programme target areas	5
Total technical evaluation score part 2	30

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)