

German Red Cross
Terms of Reference (ToR) for an
Overarching Evaluation of the Global Projects (I and II)

regarding

**Contributions to Preparedness for, Anticipation of and Response to
Humanitarian Needs in Fragile, Conflict-affected and Violent Settings**

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Background | 2 |
| 2. Evaluation purpose and users | 3 |
| <i>2.1 Purpose</i> | 3 |
| <i>2.2 Users of the evaluation</i> | 4 |
| 3. Task description | 4 |
| <i>3.1 Evaluation scope</i> | 4 |
| <i>3.2 Evaluation questions of strategic importance to the Global Projects</i> | 5 |
| 4. Evaluation design and methodology | 5 |
| 5. Evaluation process with timetable, deliverables, responsibilities and duties | 7 |
| <i>5.1 Timetable</i> | 7 |
| <i>5.2 Deliverables</i> | 8 |
| <i>5.3 Responsibilities and duties</i> | 9 |
| 6. Evaluation quality and ethical standards | 10 |
| 7. Dissemination of evaluation results and their application | 10 |
| 8. Application process and award of contract | 10 |
| <i>8.1 Key tender information</i> | 10 |
| <i>8.2 Application dossiers</i> | 11 |
| <i>8.3 Qualifications, admission and scoring</i> | 12 |
| <i>8.4 Application and selection process</i> | 15 |
| 9. Further information on contractual requirements and payment | 15 |
| 10. Abbreviations | 17 |

1. Background

The German Red Cross (GRC) is a member of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (RCRC Movement). The RCRC Movement is composed of the individual National Societies (NS) in each country/territory (currently 191 are recognized), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) – the network of National Societies which has a secretariat based in Geneva, Switzerland. Each member of the Movement plays a different role in crises, but all are recognized internationally as key actors in humanitarian affairs.

The German Red Cross and the German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO) have been cooperating in the framework of two **Global Projects (GP)** since 2019, which are now currently in their second phase (2023-2025). A key aim of this cooperation is to allow for a more flexible approach towards meeting priority humanitarian needs in case of crises and disasters implemented through GRC's sister Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies (SNS). Also central to this aim is strengthening SNS' technical and material preparedness and operational capacities to allow for the fulfilment of their respective mandates.

The Global Projects consist of operational and thematic components. Under the operational **Global Project I (GPI)**, GRC aims to “**contribute to the reduction of negative impacts of sudden onset disasters and crises and protracted crises for the affected population**” through the delivery of humanitarian assistance in cooperation with Host National Societies (HNS). There are three different types of responses, namely Immediate Emergency Aid (IEA) in case of sudden-onset disasters or unpredictable sudden aggravation of a crisis, Medium-Term Emergency Assistance (MTEA) in protracted and forgotten crises, and Humanitarian Disaster Preparedness (HDP) including Anticipatory Action (e.g. Forecast-based Financing, FbF) with a focus on community preparedness and HNS capacities. Under the first phase of GPI (2019-2022), GRC and HNS implemented a total of 103 projects in 46 countries. As of publication of this ToR, 56 projects in 37 countries have been initiated during the current phase. In addition to individual projects, GPI allowed GRC to invest in surge capacity for rapidly deployable direct support bilaterally to HNS or through the global surge mechanisms of the RCRC Movement (IFRC and ICRC).

The thematically focused **Global Project II (GPII)** aims at “**strengthening and further developing international humanitarian aid and the international humanitarian system**”. It aims at strengthening and further developing the RCRC Movement and the wider humanitarian system to deliver high quality, effective and needs-based humanitarian aid. Building on, developing and promoting new learnings and innovations, GPII provides support to National Red Cross Red Crescent Societies as well as to humanitarian operations in three key thematic areas: Anticipatory Action (AA), humanitarian Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), and Health (including water, sanitation and hygiene, WASH). Humanitarian Assistance in the Urban Context, Climate Change (CC) and Digitalization/Information Management (IM) are also cross-cutting topics of GPII.

In the first phase, two overarching aspects of the GPI were evaluated, namely (i) the process for implementing Immediate Emergency Aid, and (ii) coordination and complementarity of Medium-Term Emergency Assistance.¹ For GPII, a mid-term evaluation was conducted which focused on

¹ Executive Summaries/ Factsheets of both evaluations can be found on the GRC website <https://www.drk.de/wirkungsmessung/>.

analysing the impact of the new funding model in terms of strengthening and developing humanitarian aid and the humanitarian system, and to analyse synergies, such as the transfer of knowledge, between the two Global Projects. In the second phase, one evaluation was conducted in 2024 to analyse both Global Projects' contributions to enabling locally led actions by sister National Societies.

This proposed 2025 evaluation shall focus on the Global Projects' contributions to the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement's and the wider humanitarian community's preparedness for, anticipation of and response to humanitarian needs in fragile, conflict and violence-affected settings.

The German Red Cross, together with the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement, acknowledges that communities in fragile, conflict and violence-affected settings are disproportionately impacted by disasters. Disasters are five per cent more likely to occur in armed conflict settings and lead to 34 per cent more disaster-related deaths due to heightened vulnerability (Caso et al., 2023). Fragility, conflict, and violence (FCV) undermine the resilience of communities, the institutional frameworks designed to support disaster risk management (DRM) and the individual and collective coping capacity of affected populations. Effective and sustainable DRM integrated along the overall programming is pivotal to save lives and ensure we leave no one behind amidst political and social turmoil and insecurity.

FCV also disrupts the foundations of societies, increases vulnerability, and severely reduces people's ability to deal with multiple, interacting and compounding risks and cope with growing climate-induced natural hazards in humanitarian contexts. Despite their acute vulnerability to complex risks, communities enduring FCV are often neglected by investment in DRM because of the challenges attached to working in fragile, conflict-affected and violent contexts. In the end, these communities are disproportionately affected by disasters, highlighting the critical need for urgent, joined up and bold action in line with the Declaration on Climate, Relief, Recovery and Peace at COP 28.

The humanitarian imperative to strengthen community resilience and enable proactive risk reduction is clear. However, the challenges, complexities and uncertainties associated with FCV settings mean that we are still lagging in expanding effective and sustainable DRM to face increasingly extreme weather events and other impacts of climate change.

2. Evaluation purpose and users

2.1 Purpose

The proposed evaluation aims (i) to analyse the **contribution of GRC through the Global Projects towards enabling sister National Societies and the wider humanitarian system in preparing for, anticipating and responding to humanitarian needs in fragile, conflict-affected and violent settings** implemented in the frame of the Global Projects of GRC and GFFO, and (ii) to **generate learnings** to inform GRC's international cooperation in disaster risk management and emergency response specifically on readiness, anticipation and response programming in these contexts.

The evaluation takes place in the last year of the second phase (2023-2025) of the Global Projects. It shall help to ascertain notably the relevance, impact and sustainability of the different partnerships and approaches implemented under the Global Projects in strengthening disaster risk

management in fragile, conflict-affected and violent settings. The findings shall be used to inform strategic decisions for the upcoming next phase (under discussions with GFFO) as well as in the overall FCV programming for GRC and the wider humanitarian sector. The evaluation should thus generate concrete and actionable recommendations for GRC and other humanitarian actors. The findings shall furthermore inform GRC's cooperation with sister National Societies, the RCRC Movement and the wider humanitarian community more generally.

Finally, the evaluation will also contribute to GRC's and GFFO's strategic priorities regarding humanitarian interventions in FCV settings.

2.2 Users of the evaluation

- GRC International Cooperation Division's Senior Management, Grant Managers of the Global Projects, Heads of Regional Units and Country Managers, Heads of Thematic Units and Technical Managers, Surge Unit, Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) and Security Units;
- Sister National Societies' staff involved in the Global Projects at a strategic level;
- Direct partners of GPII (e.g. Climate Centre, IFRC and ICRC) and others;
- GFFO Humanitarian Divisions S-07, S-08 and S-09 involved in the Global Projects;
- Other humanitarian organizations working in these contexts.

3. Task description

3.1 Evaluation scope

The evaluation will systematically analyse the contributions towards strengthening preparedness for, anticipation of and response to humanitarian needs in FCV contexts based on the different programmes and approaches that GRC and sister National Societies have engaged in in the context of Global Project I and II up until the beginning of the evaluation exercise.

The evaluation will focus on analysing contributions to and learnings from the following:

- i. GRC partnership with sister National Societies and other Movement partners working in FCV contexts
- ii. Enhancing capacities, tools, policies and approaches for programming in FCV contexts
- iii. Facilitating learning and exchange within and outside of the RCRC Movement on programming in FCV contexts
- iv. Gaps and opportunities in programming in FCV contexts

The analysis will cover partnerships and approaches implemented with sister National Societies, and Movement and other humanitarian partners in the following areas, as applicable in the selected contexts (with a focus on FCV contexts):

- i. Overall humanitarian response;
- ii. Institutional preparedness programming, including for Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA) and Information Management (IM);
- iii. GRC's role and contributions to humanitarian DRR, Health and Anticipatory Action;
- iv. Surge mechanisms and risk management;
- v. Accountability to Affected Population (AAP); and
- vi. Coordination and complementarity.

The evaluation shall provide overarching recommendations for the Global Projects and specific recommendations for GPI and GPII.

3.2 Evaluation questions of strategic importance to the Global Projects

Main question:

How did **GRC (via the Global Projects)** contribute to enable the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement and the international humanitarian system to **prepare for, anticipate and respond to** humanitarian needs in **fragile, conflict-affected and violent contexts (FCV)**?

Sub-questions:

- (i) How is increasing fragility, conflict and violence affecting **GRC cooperation with sister NS and other partners**? What adjustments need to be made to mitigate these effects on GRC's international humanitarian programming?
- (ii) What were the GP's **achievements** towards enhancing disaster risk management **tools, policies, capacities and approaches** regarding humanitarian interventions in FCV contexts? How relevant were GRC's approaches to sister National Societies strategies and priorities and other humanitarian partners?
- (iii) How did the Global Projects **facilitate the exchange of experience and knowledge** within and outside the Movement on the topic of disaster risk management in FCV settings?
- (iv) What **opportunities or gaps exist for the German Red Cross to further enhance** the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement's and the humanitarian system's capacities to address humanitarian needs in fragile, conflict and violent settings?

4. Evaluation design and methodology

The consultant(s) will propose an evaluation design and methodology as part of their offer. It is expected that they include both qualitative and quantitative methods to triangulate and substantiate findings and that they comply with the IFRC Standards for Evaluation². The offer should provide a clear description of and rationale for the choice of design and methods given the evaluation subject and questions, as well as outline the feasibility and resources involved. A more detailed version taking into consideration a deeper understanding of the subject after initial discussions and sighting of documents and including operational aspects is to be agreed with GRC during the inception phase and to be presented as part of the inception report.

² **The IFRC Evaluation Standards are:**

1. Utility: Evaluations must be useful and used.
2. Feasibility: Evaluations must be realistic, diplomatic, and managed in a sensible, cost effective manner.
3. Ethics & Legality: Evaluations must be conducted in an ethical and legal manner, with particular regard for the welfare of those involved in and affected by the evaluation.
4. Impartiality & Independence: Evaluations should be impartial, providing a comprehensive and unbiased assessment that takes into account the views of all stakeholders.
5. Transparency: Evaluation activities should reflect an attitude of openness and transparency.
6. Accuracy: Evaluations should be technically accurate, providing sufficient information about the data collection, analysis, and interpretation methods so that its worth or merit can be determined.
7. Participation: Stakeholders should be consulted and meaningfully involved in the evaluation process when feasible and appropriate.
8. Collaboration: Collaboration between key operating partners in the evaluation process improves the legitimacy and utility of the evaluation.

The proposed design and methodology should take into consideration that the evaluation covers a complex program and is of an overarching nature, with a focus on analysing contribution and distilling learnings. This should be reflected in the design and methodology, for example, by highlighting analytical approaches to tracing contributions and attributing results as well as to triangulating causal linkages.

The consultant(s) are furthermore expected to familiarize themselves with the specific understanding of programming and approaches in FCV contexts within GRC, the RCRC Movement, and logic of the Global Projects. This includes notably the **concept of auxiliary role of National Societies** to the public authorities in their respective countries **and the nature of the RCRC Movement itself.**³

Some available references:

- Learning from Red Cross and Red Crescent assistance in protracted crises and complex emergencies: <https://www.ifrc.org/media/53833>

- A study of National Society Development in fragile, complex, protracted conflict and violence-affected contexts: <https://www.ifrc.org/document/call-change-study-national-society-development-fragile-complex-protracted-conflict-and>

- Handbook DRR in FCV: <https://preparecenter.org/resource/navigating-fcv-drr-handbook/>

- Toolkit AA in FCV: <https://www.anticipation-hub.org/download/file-4850>

The following methods should be considered:

- Desk review of relevant RCRC Movement and GRC documents, e.g. policy, strategy or guidance documents;
- Desk review of key project documents of the Global Projects (including concepts, proposals, reports, evaluations etc.);
- Collection of qualitative data e.g. through key informant interviews (KIIs) or focus group discussions (FGDs) with key persons relevant to the evaluation subject, both remotely and in-country;
- A quantitative survey of Host National Society and other Movement partners;
- A quantitative analysis of secondary data such as field reports and financial transfers to HNS; Additional methods that consultants deem appropriate for analysis or drawing out specific aspects, such as case studies.

The evaluator(s) will have access to all organizational (RCRC Movement/GRC) and project documents relevant to the evaluation. GRC will prepare a preliminary document repository that will be made available to the evaluator(s) at the start of the evaluation through a cloud-based platform. The evaluator(s) are expected to review the repository, engage with GRC on aspects not covered or where the information should be made available in a different form, and commit to using the information made available for analysis. The documents are confidential but can be cited and used in the evaluation process. Information which could do harm to any stakeholder if published should be treated in a confidential way. The decision about the publication is the right of GRC. Following

³ For further resources, see <https://www.ifrc.org/who-we-are/international-red-cross-and-red-crescent-movement/about-national-societies/auxiliary> (16.03.2024); IFRC, "Guide to Strengthening the Auxiliary Role through Law and Policy", 2021.

the conclusion of the evaluation, **the evaluator(s) commit to deleting the documents shared with them.**

The collection of primary data should aim for a high level of participation. Though primary data may partly be collected remotely through e.g. online interviews, evaluators are expected to visit one to two GP project country to gather direct impressions. Contacts with relevant interview partners will be facilitated by GRC. The following persons could serve as resource persons, as applicable:

- Heads of relevant departments;
- The thematic leads of National Society Development (NSD), (humanitarian) DRR, Anticipatory Action, Health, CVA, Surge and Risk Management as well as other thematic leads or Technical Managers as needed;
- Heads of Regional Units and Country Managers;
- GRC Field Staff;
- Key staff and senior managers of Host National Societies;
- Key staff and managers of ICRC, as the lead Movement partner for conflict;
- Other select groups as required (e.g. specific RCRC volunteers, Movement working groups on specific topics or consortia between Movement partners); and
- Relevant staff of the German Federal Foreign Office.

Target areas for primary data collection, including in-country visits, will be identified together by GRC and the consultant(s). A set of selection criteria will be preliminarily developed by the GRC and discussed with the consultant(s) in the inception phase of the evaluation.

It is also expected that the evaluator(s)/consultant(s) are the same as the ones for whom CVs are submitted in the tender process and that communication will be done through the communicated team lead/main consultant. In case in-country (outside of Germany) data collection is foreseen with national (local) consultant(s) partners, this must be clearly outlined in the application, with CVs of the local consultants provided. Changes in the team composition require discussion and agreement with GRC and may not be done unilaterally.

5. Evaluation process with timetable, deliverables, responsibilities and duties

The evaluation process will be guided by the contracting parties, namely the Evaluation Commissioners, the Evaluation Manager/Evaluation Steering Committee and the evaluator(s). The specific timetable will be agreed by both parties. The consultant(s) should deliver an inception report detailing the methodology and timeframe. Further reporting will consist of a preliminary report, which will serve as basis for a validation workshop, the final report and a factsheet summarizing key aspects, which will be the products to be delivered. The final report shall reflect the validated workshop results.

5.1 Timetable

A total of **50 consultancy days** are allotted for this evaluation. The final evaluation report and the factsheet should be submitted no later than **15 November 2025**. A recommendation of timeframe of activities is expected in the submitted tender. Finalization of details of the timeframe are to be done jointly by GRC and the selected consultant(s) – taking into consideration further developments in the different country contexts.

5.2 Deliverables

The deliverables for this evaluation include **(i) inception report, (ii) preliminary evaluation report, (iii) validation workshop, (iv) final report and (v) factsheet**. All consultant(s) works (presentations during kick-off and validation workshop, inception, preliminary and final report, factsheet) must be delivered in **English**. GRC will have ownership of all the deliverables.

A **kick-off meeting** will be organized by GRC to introduce the process and the consultant(s) to relevant staff.

The **inception report** offers the opportunity for the evaluator(s) and GRC to clarify the contract and the ToR after a first study of the existing project documentation, prior to starting the evaluation exercise. The evaluator(s) will give feedback to GRC about the ToR and their feasibility, can clarify open questions, and suggest changes with regards to the content or direction of the evaluation. GRC places a high value on this report for guiding the remainder of the evaluation process. The inception report will be discussed with GRC and the evaluator(s). Any changes to the ToR need an agreement of both parties as they might change the conditions and thereby the contract between GRC and the evaluator(s). The inception report of the evaluator(s) should not be longer than 15 pages (excluding annexes) and should contain:

- Key data of the evaluation (project title, project data, commissioner of the evaluation, contractor(s) etc.);
- Feedback on/suggested amendments to the ToR;
- Status of the evaluation preparation (team, timetable, distribution of tasks, reporting);
- **Evaluation design and methodology, including evaluation analysis matrix;**
- Draft version of primary data collection and analysis tools (e.g. surveys, KII guides etc.);
- **Preliminary insights from the secondary data analysis;**
- Draft implementation plan for the evaluation.

Following primary data collection and analysis, the consultant(s) will deliver a **preliminary report** that represents a first version of the final report and follows the same structure. It is based on the **desk review of available documents and analysis of primary information collected** through qualitative and quantitative methods. All findings, conclusions and recommendations as well as the evaluation design, methodology and limitations should be clearly described. The results of the preliminary report will first be discussed with GRC and the partner(s) and will serve as basis for the preparation of the validation workshop, where the consultant(s) will present the preliminary findings and recommendations.

Representatives of stakeholders and the evaluator(s) will come together in a **validation workshop** to discuss and validate the findings, lessons learned, and recommendations proposed by the evaluator(s). Stakeholders might formulate additional recommendations if necessary. It is expected that the evaluator(s) present a **structure for the validation workshop as part of their preliminary report**. A validation workshop may possibly cover the following aspects:

- Presentation and discussion of findings and conclusions;
- Validation of lessons learnt and recommendations by all stakeholders;
- Collection of additional observations or recommendations.

GRC is responsible for the workshop preparation on all administrative and logistics requirements. In case visa are required for entry to Germany to conduct the workshop at GRC headquarters in

Berlin, this shall be communicated by the consultant(s) in a timely manner based on the agreed timetable in the inception report.

The **final evaluation report and factsheet** must be delivered a maximum of **7 business days** after the validation workshop and no later than **15 November 2025**. The consultant(s) will give his/her/their recommendations in the final report but should consider and include the validation and recommendations provided by the participants during the workshop. The final report should have a length of approximately 35-40 pages (excluding annexes) and, at a minimum, include the following elements:

- **Factsheet** with key data of the evaluation, incl. overarching findings and recommendations (3-5 pages);
- Executive Summary – a tightly drafted, to-the-point, free standing document (about 5 pages max.) with the following, fixed structure:
 1. Short project description
 2. Key questions of the evaluation
 3. Key findings
 4. Lessons learned
 5. Major recommendations
- Introduction – with purpose of the evaluation, scope, key questions, short description of the project to be evaluated and relevant framework conditions;
- Evaluation design and methodology, including limitations;
- Key findings regarding the questions pointed out in the ToR, clearly supported by evidence and analysis;
- Conclusions based on evidence and analysis;
- Recommendations as expected in the ToR, which are relevant and feasible and targeted to the respective audience and of strategic nature. **Separate/individual recommendations for GPI and GPII are expected.**
- Lessons learned as generalizations of conclusions for wider use;
- Annexes (ToR, primary data collection tools, itineraries of field visits, list of consulted persons/organisations, documentation reviewed, literature consulted, full survey findings if applicable etc.)

The structure can be extended by the evaluator(s) by additional points if necessary.

GRC will analyse the final report, especially the feasibility of the recommendations proposed by the evaluator(s). The final report will have to be approved by GRC.

The consultants grant GRC exclusive rights of all deliverables.

5.3 Responsibilities and duties

GRC:

- Will provide all relevant documentation to the evaluator(s);
- Will facilitate the arrangement of interviews (online and in-person) with evaluation participants;
- Will facilitate logistics for field travels in cooperation with the respective sister National Societies, including flights, -in-country transportation, accommodation and translators, and security briefings as per GRC regulations
- Will prepare the logistics for the validation workshop;
- Will provide timely feedback on and approve the deliverables from the evaluation;

- Will cover all fees as specified in the contract signed by both parties;
- Will maintain overall coordination between GRC headquarters, GRC Field Offices, sister National Societies and other Movement partners involved.

Consultant(s):

- Will define and specify the design, methodology, and tools, timeframe and intended outputs/outcomes of the various stages of work;
- Will conduct the necessary meetings, interviews, workshops, focus groups etc.;
- Will specify any arrangements required for potential field visits;
- Will specify arrangements required to organize the validation workshop;
- Will submit all deliverables (inception report, preliminary and final report, validation workshop workplan/presentation, factsheet) in English based on the agreed structure and as per the agreed timeline;
- Will revise the preliminary report based on the feedback received from GRC;
- Will follow the timeframe agreed and shall communicate any unforeseeable change as soon as possible.

6. Evaluation quality and ethical standards

The evaluator(s) should take all reasonable steps to ensure that the evaluation is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of people and the communities of which they are members, and to ensure that the evaluation is technically accurate, reliable, and legitimate, conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organisational learning and accountability. Therefore, the evaluator(s) should adhere to the IFRC Standards of Evaluation (see above).

The final report will be evaluated by GRC based on a checklist of criteria. The evaluator(s) will receive feedback from GRC before the final payment of the consultant contract is approved.

7. Dissemination of evaluation results and their application

The following organisations will receive the full final report, including the factsheet: GFFO, GRC, relevant SNS. The factsheet/executive summary will be made publicly available on the GRC website. The factsheet and executive summary may be shared in additional fora.

Evaluation results and accepted recommendations will be used for ongoing and future programming, both in the context of the Global Projects and GRC international cooperation, by GRC, as well as by SNS and other relevant partners and stakeholders for organisational learning. A management response and implementation plan shall be developed and implemented in an agreed upon timespan to ensure the application of the recommendations by the user group of the evaluation.

8. Application process and award of contract

8.1 Key tender information

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Type of tender | Open invitation to tender/ public tender Alternate offers are permitted |
|----------------|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|
| Tender documents | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Terms of Reference 2. Draft contract 3. Data Processing Agreement (GDPR & TOMs) 4. Declaration of Conformity 5. Code of Conduct of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement & Rules of Conduct for staff and volunteers on GRC missions 6. Project briefs for the Global Project I and II <p><i>All documents are an integral part of the contract.</i></p> <p>In addition, questions answered by the contracting party as well as corrections made to the tender documents published on the GRC website are part of the contract.</p> | |
| Publication | <p>https://www.drk.de/das-drk/aktuelle-ausschreibungen/</p> <p><i>This link contains the only binding version of all documents, regardless of information shared in other portals/ through other ways. Revisions, additions, answers to questions etc. are also published here and constitute an integral and binding part of the documents. Interested applicants are encouraged to check regularly for updates.</i></p> | |
| Schedule | Publication of tender | 24 April 2025 |
| | Deadline for questions from applicants | 09 May 2025, 12:00 CEST |
| | Deadline for submission of offers | 13 May 2025, 12:00 CEST |
| | Envisioned timeframe for online presentations | 19 to 23 May 2025 |
| | Envisioned timeframe for award of contract | 2 to 6 June 2025 |
| | Envisioned timeframe for signature of contract | 9 to 13 June 2025 |
| | Estimated start of evaluation exercise | 16 June 2025 |
| | Offer binding period | 31 July 2025 |
| Submission of questions and applications | <p>Via email</p> <p>to Mr. Byron Nonato, MEAL Unit Lead</p> <p>via email to t63meal@drk.de with b.nonato@drk.de in copy</p> <p>stating as subject T63-MEAL-2025-01 “Application for Overarching Evaluation of the Global Projects in FCV Contexts - 2025”</p> <p>in English language.</p> | |

8.2 Application dossiers

Incomplete dossiers may not be considered, which applies to both formal requirements and content requested.

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 1. Letter of motivation | <p>Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief overview of relevant experiences and qualifications |
| 2. Curriculum vitae | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of all members of the team undertaking the exercise |

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must provide evidence for the essential qualifications sought <p><i>It is expected that the evaluator(s)/consultant(s) executing the evaluation are the same as the ones for whom CVs are submitted in the application dossier. In case data collection is foreseen to be undertaken with national (local) consultant(s) partners, the application should include their profiles as well. Any changes in the team composition between application and evaluation start as well as during the evaluation must be discussed and agreed with the evaluation steering committee.</i></p> |
| 3. Technical proposal | <p>Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief summary/ outline of the consultant(s)' understanding of the task at hand • Proposed evaluation design and methodology • Timetable |
| 4. Financial proposal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The financial proposal should show an overall sum excluding VAT. Prices of offers are compared on this basis. • The following cost are covered by GRC outside of the contract for this evaluation in line with the German Federal Travel Cost Act and should not be included in the financial offer: <u>Airfare, local transport, accommodation</u>. In case airfare, local transport, accommodation are not arranged directly by GRC, the consultant's costs are reimbursed up to the threshold stated in the Federal Travel Cost Act upon submission of original receipts. • Please indicate country of taxation and taxpayer ID. GRC will cover VAT of consultants registered outside of Germany as per reverse-charge procedure (for consultants registered in the common European area) or applying this procedure accordingly (for consultants registered in third countries). |
| 5. Work samples | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 reports of evaluations or relevant similar research, or, if full reports cannot be shared for confidentiality reasons, executive summaries/ factsheets • Max. 5 years old, with contributions of the evaluation team members either established clearly in the report or clarified by the applicant in the application dossier |
| 6. Declaration of Conformity | |

8.3 Qualifications, admission and scoring

Evidence of fulfillment of the criteria noted below is assessed based on the documents submitted with the application.

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Criteria for admission to tender | Application dossiers are complete and cover all content requested, and are submitted on time in the way specified |
| | <p>Essential qualifications of evaluation team:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All key members of the evaluation team have at least 3 years' experience in conducting evaluations in international development co-operation and/or humanitarian assistance |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Key members of the evaluation team need to have at least 5 years of experience in working in the field of international development cooperation/humanitarian assistance with RCRC Movement, international/local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or civil society organizations (CSOs) or other aid organizations such as international organizations or development banks 3. Strong research, methodological and analytical skills, and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions, make recommendations, and prepare well-written reports 4. Fluency in English |
| Criteria for evaluating admitted offers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The offered technical approach demonstrates a high level of (50%): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of the overall task at hand (15%) • Suitability of methodology to cover the scope and complexity of the task at hand with a sufficient level of detail to generate reliable results (25%) • Feasibility of timetable/ workplan given the envisaged timeframe (10%) • The quality of the submitted work samples with regards to the suitability of the design and methodology applied to the task at hand (10%) • The presentation demonstrates a high level of understanding, professionalism in presentation and engagement (10%) • Price (30%) |

Preferable qualifications sought among applicants (not required for admission):

- Experience and expertise in conducting complex/ overarching/ strategic evaluations;
- Knowledge of the Red Cross and Red Crescent;
- Experience and expertise in policy formulation, organizational procedures, and/ or management in larger organizations;
- Experience with conducting as well as managing evaluations;
- Expertise and experience in research methods as well as process facilitation, with a diverse range preferred.

Method for evaluating offers:

Offers are awarded points based on the criteria and the weight assigned to them outlined above. The total number of points achieved by an individual offer is determined by calculating a point value for the financial proposal (Price Point Value – PPV) and a point value for the qualitative criteria (Quality Point Value – QPV), which are then summed up. PPV and QPV are calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{PPV} &= ((\text{price of cheapest offer} / \text{price of offer to be evaluated}) \times 100) \times 30\% \\
 \text{QPV} &= \Sigma((\text{points for 1}^{\text{st}} \text{ criterion} \times 20) \times \% \text{ weight of 1}^{\text{st}} \text{ criterion}) + (2^{\text{nd}} \text{ criterion}) + (\dots) \\
 \text{Total points} &= \text{PPV} + \text{QPV}
 \end{aligned}$$

Points for quality criteria are assigned based on the following considerations:

| <u>Points</u> | <u>Technical proposal</u> | <u>Work samples</u> | <u>Presentation</u> |
|---------------|---|--|--|
| 5 | Demonstrates exceptional understanding of the evaluation requirements, specifically the strategic and contextual aspects, with detailed and comprehensive evaluation methodology that address all aspects of the ToR within a minimal timeframe | Offers outstanding and highly relevant work samples that are of very high quality, showing a concise understanding of their subject matter, highly suitable methodology as well as relevant and realistic outcomes tailored to the target audience | Provides a highly professional and engaging presentation, capturing the strategic focus of the evaluation, and outlining approach, methodology, and expected outcomes in a concise way, as well as reflecting a thorough insight into the subject matter |
| 4 | Shows a strong understanding of the evaluation requirements, including strategic and contextual aspects, with detailed evaluation methodology that address most aspects of the ToR within a feasible timeframe | Provides high-quality and relevant work samples that demonstrate a strong relevance with the ToR, showing a strong understanding of their subject matter, suitable methodology and relevant outcomes | Delivers a clear and professional presentation, capturing the focus and context of the evaluation, that effectively communicates the approach, methodology, and expected outcomes, showing good insight into the subject matter |
| 3 | Demonstrates a sufficient understanding of the evaluation requirements, with an adequate methodology that address the requirements of the ToR, within an acceptable timeframe | Presents acceptable work samples that are relevant and to the ToR content of sufficient quality, showing sufficient understanding of their subject matter, acceptable methodology and answering to the main purpose. | Offers a satisfactory presentation that communicates the approach, methodology, and expected outcomes of the evaluation adequately |
| 2 | Shows a limited understanding of the evaluation requirements, with methodologies that address some aspects of the ToR, in a timeframe that is not suitable | The work samples submitted are only partly relevant, with a lower quality and minimal alignment with the assignment 's objectives | Provides an incomplete or partially clear presentation that only partially communicates the approach, methodology, and expected outcomes, with limited references to the evaluation requirements |
| 1 | Demonstrates an inadequate understanding of the project requirements, with insufficient solutions | Provides work samples of low quality and relevance to the contract's objectives | Delivers a poor presentation that lacks clarity and does not effectively communicate the approach, |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| | that fail to address the key aspects of the ToR | | methodology, or expected outcomes, with minimal or irrelevant references to the evaluation requirements |
| 0 | Shows no understanding of the evaluation requirements, with no methodology provided | Work samples provided are of poor quality and/or entirely irrelevant | Does not present any approach, methodology, or expected outcomes |

8.4 Application and selection process

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Questions on tender | Applicants are strongly encouraged to raise their questions on the tender in the way and within the deadline specified above. Questions and answers will be published in an anonymized form under the link provided. They form an integral part of the contract. | |
| Bid opening/ admission to tender | Offers received will be screened for compliance with formal requirements and admission criteria. GRC reserves the right to communicate with the applicants after submission of offers to seek clarifications within a reasonable time limit and within the boundaries set by procurement regulations. This is documented. | |
| Scoring of admitted dossiers | Offers fulfilling admission requirements will be evaluated based on the criteria and method outlined above. At minimum, the three (3) offers with the highest score will be invited for an online presentation; in case of a tie for the last rank, both applicants shall be invited. <i>The initial evaluation and score is based on the award criteria 1, 2 and 4.</i> | |
| Online presentation | Estimated timeframe for presentations: | 22 to 28 May 2025 |
| | Total length: | 45 minutes |
| | Presentation: | Max. 20 minutes Covering (i) experiences and qualifications, (ii) understanding of the task at hand, (iii) proposed methodology, (iv) timetable Candidates may not present new content compared to their application dossier |
| | Discussion: | 25 minutes |
| | Language, means, documentation: | English – MS Teams – note taking/ protocol |
| Information on award of contract | GRC will inform the candidate(s) about the decision reached. Candidates may enquire for feedback on their individual application. | |

9. Further information on contractual requirements and payment

By signing the contract, the selected consultant(s) commit to abide by the Code of Conduct of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement as well as the Rules of Conduct for staff and volunteers on GRC missions. The consultant(s) are furthermore required to submit information on their data protection arrangements and conclude the “Order Processing Agreement” with GRC.

Payment schedule:

- 30% upon contract signature
- 30% upon GRC approval of the inception report
- 40% upon GRC approval of the final report

Payments require receipt of an invoice showing the consultant(s) contact details, referencing the services provided, and the consultant(s)´ bank details and VAT number/ taxpayer ID. Consultant(s) should anticipate a minimum of two (2) weeks for GRC to process the payment. Additional payment obligations on GRC´ s part as per ToR/ contract, such as travel cost, require the submission of original receipts.

10. Abbreviations

| | |
|------|--|
| AA | Anticipatory Action |
| CSO | Civil Society Organization |
| CVA | Cash and Voucher Assistance |
| DRM | Disaster Risk Management |
| DRR | Disaster Risk Reduction |
| EUR | Euro |
| FCV | Fragile, Conflict-affected and Violent |
| GFFO | German Federal Foreign Office |
| GP | Global Project(s), consisting of Global Project I (GPI) and Global Project II (GPII) |
| GRC | German Red Cross |
| HDP | Humanitarian Disaster Preparedness |
| HNS | Host National Society |
| ICRC | International Committee of the Red Cross |
| IEA | Immediate Emergency Aid |
| IFRC | International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies |
| IM | Information Management |
| MEAL | Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning |
| MTEA | Medium-Term Emergency Assistance |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organization |
| PNS | Partner National Society |
| RCRC | Red Cross Red Crescent |
| SNS | Sister National Society |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| VAT | Value-added tax |
| WASH | Water, Sanitation and Hygiene |