

**GRC Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Strategic Evaluation  
of the implementation of BMZ/Social Structure Funding by GRC  
in the period 2011-2022**

**Content**

**1. Introduction & Context**

- 1.1 Development and policy context
- 1.2 Socio-political and socio-economical context (incl. gender situation)
- 1.3 Project/Program set up and institutional context - stakeholders

**2. Evaluation purpose and users**

- 2.1 Purpose
- 2.2 Users of the evaluation

**3. Task descriptions**

- 3.1 Evaluation scope
- 3.2 Evaluation criteria (IFRC - OECD-DAC)
  - including specific evaluation questions related to the project/program
  - a) Relevance
  - b) Effectiveness
  - c) Impact
  - d) Sustainability / Connectedness
  - e) Coherence

**4. Evaluation design and methodology**

- 4.1 Evaluation team
- 4.2 Participation of stakeholders
- 4.3 Sources of information
- 4.4 Methodology

**5. Evaluation process with timetable and reporting**

- 5.1 Timetable
- 5.2 Reporting
  - 5.2.1 Inception report
  - 5.2.2 Preliminary report
  - 5.2.3 Evaluation workshop
  - 5.2.4 Final report
- 5.3 Responsibilities and duties

**6. Evaluation quality and ethical standards**

**7. Selection criteria**

**8. Application procedure**

**9. Dissemination of evaluation results**

**10. Abbreviations**

**11. Annex**

## 1. Introduction & Context

The German Red Cross (GRC), together with several national Red Cross/ Red Crescent (RCRC) societies, plan a strategic evaluation in several countries in the second half of 2023.

1.1 Development and policy context

1.2 Socio-political and socio-economical context (incl. gender situation)

1.3 Project/ programme set up and institutional context - stakeholders

The Social Structure Funding (SSF) is a funding instrument of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) aiming at the establishment and/ or strengthening of functioning civil-society structures in specific priority areas of development policy in which the German Federal Government has a substantial developmental interest. Together with its long-standing SSF partners (i.e. former and current SSF grant recipients<sup>1</sup>), the BMZ has identified seven relevant funding areas<sup>2</sup> of which the “promotion of national aid societies” is relevant for GRC. Taking into account that establishing/ strengthening civil society structures requires long-term engagement and approaches, SSF programmes can be implemented for a duration of 9-12 years, divided into three year projects (phase I, II, III). Methodologically, the SSF programmes follow a unique multi-level approach whereby the projects should impact simultaneously at the level of the direct target group (i.e. affected populations, vulnerable groups of the society; *micro level*), at the level of the organizations, institutions and networks in charge of the relevant priority area (i.e. civil-society and governmental structures; *meso level*), and at the systemic level on which decisions about legal, budgetary and political frameworks in the funding area are being taken (*macro level*).

GRC has been implementing SSF programmes for many years to strengthen the role and capacities of Red Cross/ Red Crescent societies in partner countries and to improve the political, legal, or budgetary framework conditions that are essential to their mandate and main tasks as National Aid Societies and auxiliaries to the public authorities in the humanitarian field. Since 2011, country and regional programmes were implemented or are currently ongoing in 19 countries in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) and Latin America, summing up to 11 programmes in the last 11 years.<sup>3</sup> In this ToR, programme refers to the whole cycle of three subsequent SSF projects while project refers to a single three year project (phase I, II or III).

The different country and regional SSF programmes implemented by GRC and its sister National Societies cover a broad range of thematic areas, hence differ from each other in many aspects, including the specificities of the different geographic contexts. Nevertheless, all SSF programmes have in common the application of the same 3 level approach as described above. Main stakeholders of GRC’s SSF programmes are the respective sister National Society (SNS), including headquarter (HQ)/ branch level and volunteers, other relevant actors according to the thematic topic, e.g. local and national authorities/ ministries and civil society organisations, and communities. Programmatic focus areas are identified together in line with the SNS’ strategic plans and priorities. Several programmes have a focus on improving the framework conditions for disaster risk management (DRM), strengthening DRM capacities of SNS and other relevant actors, and supporting communities in

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the GRC, these are: Caritas, Arbeiterwohlfahrt International, Kolpingwerk, DGB-Bildungswerk, BORDA, Deutscher Genossenschafts- und Raiffeisenverband, Deutscher Volkshochschulverband (after 2018), Deutsche Welthungerhilfe, Malteser International, Don Bosco Mondo, Karl Kübel Stiftung.

<sup>2</sup> Funding areas of the SSF (1.2, I SSF FR): Non-formal youth and adult education, Cooperative systems, Promotion of national aid societies, Trade union education, Decentralized community services for the public (water, sewage and waste management), Professional social work in the welfare sector, Association-supported education for labor and society.

<sup>3</sup> Laos, Mozambique, Regional Project MENA (Lebanon, Morocco, Egypt, Palestine), Regional Project Central Asia (Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan), Philippines, Uganda, Regional Project Latin America (Columbia, Ecuador, Peru), Regional Project Bangladesh/ Myanmar, Pakistan, Somalia, Togo.

preparing for crises and disasters. This is achieved through trainings, consultancy and advocacy activities and support for piloting activities on community level.

Since 2017/ 2018, a more systematic approach in the planning of new programmes has been applied by GRC. This contributed to an increased exchange between colleagues managing SSF programmes in different countries as well as to a more streamlined structure of the respective logics of intervention, with the consequence that the recent SSF programmes are increasingly comparable with each other. It is assumed that progress has been made with regards to a systematic application of the 3 level approach and that this contributed to the overall quality of implementation. However, an overall evidence-based assessment of this assumption has not yet been carried out. Though individual evaluations of single projects have taken place, this was not done in a systematic or coordinated manner and only provided learnings and recommendations with regards to the evaluated project in country (or region, if regional programme).

For this reason, GRC conducts this strategic evaluation to systematically analyse achievements and shortcomings of SSF programmes implemented since 2011. The selection of 3-4 programmes, both ongoing and completed, for the evaluation will be conducted with the evaluator/ evaluation team based on programmatic criteria (e.g. thematic area, years of implementation, single country/ regional approach) and geographical coverage.

## 2. Evaluation purpose and users

### 2.1 Purpose

The primary purpose of this strategic evaluation is specific organisational learning for GRC and involved National Societies with regards to strategic planning and implementation of SSF programmes, in particular determining factors and conditions in-country, in the National Societies, in the National Societies' networks and relations to relevant public authorities and in the partnership between the National Societies and GRC that contribute to or hamper effective and efficient planning, implementation and management on all levels (micro, meso, macro).

Since SSF programmes will continue to be relevant to GRC and sister National Societies in the coming years, the evaluation also aims at contributing to improving the planning and implementation of ongoing and upcoming SSF programmes and projects. To this end, the evaluation shall specifically identify successes and challenges in the projects and give indications on potential changes in programme and project setup and target setting.

Since the SSF funding instrument builds on long-term duration, this cross-cutting evaluation also aims at identifying factors contributing to (a) sustainability of outcomes and impacts of SSF-projects on micro, meso, and macro levels, and (b) connectedness to other programmes of the National Society and other relevant actors in the area addressed by the respective SSF-programme.

Relevant to this evaluation:

- a) Specific organisational learning
- b) Contribute to improving SSF-projects
- c) Identify factors for sustainability of outcomes/ impacts of SSF projects

### 2.2 Users of the evaluation

- GRC International Cooperation staff, HQ and field, foremost members of Team 61 (T61) but also other teams involved in planning and implementation of SSF programmes;
- Host National Society management and staff involved in planning and implementation of SSF programmes;
- BMZ, division in charge of SSF grant recipients (511);

- Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), other SSF grant recipients.

### 3. Task description

#### 3.1 Evaluation scope

*Focus:*

Focus on relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability/ connectedness and coherence to determine whether GRC SSF programmes and projects reached determined targets by use of appropriate means, pursued relevant objectives, have had an impact on the target groups on the different levels of intervention, were sustainable and coherent with other activities of the SNS and other relevant actors. Factors and conditions contributing to achieving objectives and sustainability as well as main barriers on different levels are of major interest to identify lessons learnt and derive recommendations for current and future SSF programmes and projects. A specific focus shall be put on the (pre-)conditions at institutional level, especially the National Societies', that are essential to achieve impact and sustainability on meso and macro levels.

*Timespan:*

BMZ SSF programmes and projects implemented from 2011 to 2022.

*Geographical coverage:*

Based on the timeframe above, a total of eleven (11) projects were implemented under the BMZ SSF funding mechanism. The evaluation should cover at least eight (8) of the projects, with primary data collection taking place in at least four (4). Finalization of the four or more contexts will be done together with the evaluation management team of the GRC for this evaluation following the criteria below:

- Relevance of country to GRC strategic direction
- Regional nature of project (to gauge cross-country cooperation)
- Thematic field of interest or unique thematic field
- Completed at least one phase by 2022
- Possibility of implementing learnings in running SSF programme
- Cooperation with HNSs
- Region
- Access/ presence\*

The following are the list of projects for consideration:

- **Uganda** *Increasing the importance and capacity of the Uganda Red Cross Society (URCS) as a national aid organisation supporting the refugee response in Northern Uganda*
- **Somalia** *Assisting Somali Red Crescent Society (SRCS) - Somaliland to strengthen its community resilience strategy and to link it with a wider Disaster Management capacity building at local, regional and 'national' (Somaliland) level*
- **Mozambique** *Support rural communities in disaster risk reduction for extreme natural events in Mozambique*
- **Togo** *Institutional capacity building in disaster risk reduction and adaptation to climate change in Togo*
- **MENA** *Assistance for community-based institutional structures for conflict-sensitive disaster-preparedness and enhanced resilience in selected countries of the MENA region*
- **Central Asia** *Contribution to building capacities and increasing the resilience of Red Crescent structures and target communities at local, national and regional level in selected countries of Central Asia*
- **Pakistan** *Strengthening the capacities of the Pakistan Red Crescent Society (PRCS) in the area of climate-smart disaster risk management*
- **Bangladesh/ Myanmar** *Strengthening the structures and capacities of the Bangladesh Red Crescent (BDRCS) and the Myanmar Red Cross (MRCS) as National Aid Societies in the fields of DRR and relief*
- **Laos** *Consolidation of the blood system in selected rural areas of Laos*

- **Philippines** *Empowering the Philippine Red Cross (PRC) and their chapters, communities and government institutions to consolidate and replicate inclusive community-based disaster risk reduction in five provinces in the Philippines.*
- **Latin America** *Institutional strengthening of Red Cross Societies in Peru, Ecuador and Colombia*

### 3.2 Evaluation criteria and questions

#### a) **Relevance**

- Are the activities and outcomes of the country-specific programme consistent with the implementing SNS' objectives as well as the overall standardized logic of the SSF instrument and the goal to strengthen national societies' capacities?
- Are the activities, outcomes, and objectives of the country-specific programme consistent with the strategic priorities of the SNS and their auxiliary role?
- Are the outputs and outcomes consistent with the actual needs and capacities of those involved in the programmes (relevant authorities, organisations, and targeted communities)?

#### b) **Effectiveness**

- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? Both internal and external factors shall be considered, e.g. related to organisation and management in the National Societies, National Societies' relation and cooperation with GRC and relevant actors such as public authorities and other stakeholders, and project-relevant pre-conditions in the countries and communities.
- What were the major barriers to achieving the objectives on the different levels?

#### c) **Efficiency**

- To what extent were the inputs (financial, human and material resources) of the measures used economically in relation to the results achieved by the programmes?
- Were project results achieved on time and how were delays addressed?
- Was the programme/ project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

#### d) **Impact**

- To what extent have GRC's SSF programmes been able to achieve impact on micro, meso and macro level?
  - Micro-level: Impact of the activities on knowledge, awareness, access to services and/ or methods in targeted communities?
  - Meso-level: Impact of the programmes on capacities and/or structures of the National Societies, including branches, and other relevant actors?
  - Macro-level: Impact of the programmes on the auxiliary role of the NS in the respective countries and on relevant frameworks (e.g. legal, budgetary, institutional)?
- What other - also negative/ unintended - effects are/ were observed? In how far have the programmes had an impact beyond the originally planned effects, e.g. strengthened coordination and collaboration of involved stakeholders in areas not specifically addressed by the programmes?

#### e) **Sustainability & Connectedness**

- In how far were activities or methods replicated in other projects or programmes of the SNS and/ or approaches included in strategies/ methods of operation?
- In how far were activities linked/ connected to other future action and actors?
- Has the contribution of the programme been sustainable with regards to
  - the resilience of social structures in targeted communities, including resilience of volunteer structures? (micro level)
  - the capacity/ structure of the SNS? (meso level)
  - the systems, networks, plans etc. that have been strengthened/ introduced by the project? (macro level)

- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme?

**f) Coherence**

- To what extent have other interventions by the SNSs impacted the SSF programmes and vice versa? Which synergies and interlinkages with other interventions can be observed?
- To what extent have SSF programmes been complementary to other actors' interventions in the respective areas (national/ local authorities, other RCRC actors, (I)NGOs) and aligned with national policies, strategies and/ or priorities?
- To what extent are SSF programmes of the SNSs relevant to emerging trends? (e.g. climate change, people on the move, pandemics etc.)

#### **4. Evaluation design and methodology**

In general, GRC requests as much transparency and participation as possible in an evaluation process. Therefore, depending on the purpose of an evaluation, GRC is usually opting for an evaluation team, composed of an external and a national (local) consultant. The team structure will be discussed with the project partner beforehand. The team composition as well as the design and methodology of the evaluation are subject matters of the negotiations with the evaluator/s.

Qualification of evaluation team:

Essential:

- All key members of the evaluation team have at least 5 years' experience in conducting evaluations in international development cooperation and/ or humanitarian assistance, with samples of relevant evaluations provided as part of the application. A proven record of delivering professional results is required for every team member.
- Proven record in leading strategic/ multi-country evaluations, coordination, management.
- Proven experience in working in the field of international development cooperation/ humanitarian assistance with RCRC Movement, NGOs/ INGOs or other aid organizations.
- Strong analytical skills and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions, make recommendations, and prepare well-written reports in a timely manner.
- Fluency in English.

Preferable:

- At least one team member with proven knowledge and experience of BMZ funding instruments, preferably SSF (either through experience in implementation of BMZ/ SSF projects or evaluations of BMZ/ SSF projects/ programmes).
- Knowledge and experience in Disaster Risk Management (DRM), capacity building.
- Experience working in the regions relevant for the evaluation.
- Evaluation team members with knowledge of Spanish, French or Arabic are an advantage.

##### **4.1 Evaluation team**

- Evaluation core team in GRC International Cooperation (managing the implementation of the evaluation and reviewing deliverables)
  - T61 focal points (depending on selected projects)
  - T63 MEAL Cluster focal point
  - T63 M&IP focal point and coordinator
  - T64 focal point
- Evaluator/s – conducting the evaluation in the field and providing the deliverables



## 4.2 Participation of stakeholders

The following will serve as resource persons, as applicable:

- GRC HQ staff members (T61, T63, T64) who were involved in project implementation.
- GRC field office staff members who were involved in project implementation.
- SNS management, staff members, volunteers.
- Relevant BMZ staff.
- Community leaders/ members.
- Relevant government authorities.

## 4.3 Sources of information

The evaluator team will have access to all relevant project documents like project proposal, project management documents (logframe, activity plan, budget), monitoring tools, project reports (narrative and financial), evaluation reports, audits etc. These 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.

## 4.4 Methodology

The evaluation team should use the available secondary data for analysis. Furthermore, the evaluation team will be present in country for the data collection phase. For the collection of primary data, participatory methods should be applied. The choice of methods will have to be presented and described by the evaluation team and will be approved by GRC in the kick-off meeting. The IFRC standards for evaluation<sup>4</sup> should be respected and are the framework and basis for any evaluation activity executed by a consultant under GRC contract.

## 5. Evaluation process with timetable and reporting

The evaluation process has different phases and is described in the following paragraphs. The process will be guided by the contracting parties. The timetable will be agreed by both parties. The consultant should deliver a concept for the evaluation process in form of the inception report. Further reporting will consist of a preliminary report, which will serve as basis for an evaluation workshop and the final report, which will be the product to be delivered, including the validated workshop results.

---

<sup>4</sup> 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 technical 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.

## 5.1 Timetable

Date	Task	Responsible person	Days/ person
	Introductory meeting with evaluation team	GRC and consultants	1
	Analysis of relevant documents	Consultants	3
	Kick-off meeting	GRC and consultants	1
	Delivery of inception report	Consultants	2
	Implementation of evaluation in-country	Consultants	24
	Preliminary report delivery	Consultants	5
	Workshop report validation	Consultants	1
	Final report preparation	Consultants	5
	Report reception and final discussion	Consultants and GRC	2
	Total		44

The evaluation is expected to start in August/ September 2023 and to be completed latest by 30<sup>th</sup> November 2023, depending on availability of the consultants.

## 5.2 Reporting

### 5.2.1 Inception report

An 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. The inception report of the evaluator/s should not be longer than 8 pages (excluding annexes). The evaluator/s will give feedback to GRC about the ToR and their feasibility. This is the point where the evaluator/s, based on the information from the secondary data, can clarify open questions and possibly change the content or direction of the evaluation as well. The inception report should be delivered before the evaluation starts. It should contain:

- The key data of the evaluation (information on programmes/ projects, commissioner of the evaluation, contractors etc.)
- Feedback/ amendment of the ToR – suggestions for ToR amendments, if necessary
- Status of the evaluation preparation (team, timetable, distribution of tasks, reporting)
- Evaluation design: Chosen methods, approach, steps for their implementation
- Tools for their implementation (questionnaires, data processing and analysis etc.)
- A draft implementation plan for the evaluation.

The inception report will be discussed with GRC and the evaluator/s. Any changes of the ToR need an agreement of both parties, because they might change the conditions and thereby the contract between GRC and the evaluator/s.

### 5.2.2 Preliminary report

All findings, conclusions and recommendations, including the evaluation methodology, should be described and presented by the evaluator/s in a short preliminary evaluation report. 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 evaluation workshop. The report will be presented by the evaluator/s in the evaluation workshop.

### 5.2.3 Evaluation and validation workshop



Representatives of stakeholders and the evaluator/s will come together in the evaluation workshop. The workshop will be organized to discuss and validate findings, lessons learned, and recommendations proposed by the evaluator/s. Stakeholders might formulate additional recommendations if necessary. Possible content of an evaluation workshop:

- Presentation and discussion of the preliminary evaluation report
- Validation of lessons learnt and recommendations by all stakeholders
- Collection of additional observations or recommendations

It is expected that the evaluator/s present a structure for the workshop as part of their preliminary report. GRC and partners are responsible for the workshop preparation and all related logistics.

#### 5.2.4 Final report

The final evaluation report should consider the validation of the stakeholders during the final workshop and has to be delivered within 1 week after the workshop. All consultant works, inception, preliminary final and final report, should be delivered in English language.

The consultant will give his/ her recommendations but should incorporate the validation process during the workshop in the final report, including additional recommendations from the workshop participants. The report will have to be approved by German Red Cross.

**The final report should, as a minimum, include the following elements:**

- Key data of the evaluation (from the inception report)
- 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  
(structured along the OECD-DAC criteria: Relevance/ Effectiveness/ Efficiency/ Sustainability/ Impact)
  4. Lessons learned
  5. Major recommendations (mainly general 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
- Key findings with regards to the questions pointed out in the ToR
- Conclusions based on evidence and analysis
- Recommendations as expected in the ToR, which are relevant and feasible and targeted to the respective audience
- Lessons learned, as generalizations of conclusions for a wider use
- Annexes (ToR, list of consulted persons/ organisations, documentation, literature etc.)

Key findings, conclusions and actionable recommendations should be presented in a clear and transparent way, possibly put next to each other in a table to demonstrate the logic.

The report can be extended by the evaluator/s by additional points if necessary.

GRC evaluation team and the SNSs will analyse the final report, especially the feasibility of the recommendations proposed by the evaluator/s. The list of recommendations will be categorized into general and context specific. They should also be actionable to guide the planning and implementation of future projects.

#### 5.3 Responsibilities and duties

### 5.3.1 GRC

- will support the evaluator/s with the necessary information and working material.
- will facilitate all logistics in the countries in cooperation with the SNS.
- will give a security briefing to the evaluator before the mission.
- will sign the contract with the evaluator and cover the consultancy fees as per the contract.
- will maintain overall coordination between GRC HQ, GRC country offices, and SNS.
- will approve all deliverables from the evaluation.

### 5.3.2 Evaluator

- will define the methodology, the timeframe and the intended outputs/ outcomes of the various stages of the work.
- will specify arrangements required to organize the workshop or any other activity in close collaboration with the GRC and SNS.
- will follow the timeframe agreed and shall communicate any unforeseeable change as soon as possible.
- will conduct the necessary meetings, interviews, workshops, focus groups etc.
- will submit all deliverables (inception report, preliminary and final evaluation report) to GRC in English as per the agreed timeline.
- will revise the draft final report, based on the comments from GRC and SNS.

## 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 evaluation standards of the IFRC and the GRC International Cooperation MEAL Framework.

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. Selection criteria

The decision for the award of contract will be determined via credit points assigned to the dossier submitted according to the following criteria:

- Relevant experience (40%), broken down as follows:
  - Knowledge and expertise in conducting strategic/ multi-country evaluations of development assistance projects/programmes (40%)
  - Experience in working in developing countries in either capacity building programming or working with national partner organisations (35%)
  - Proven ability to carry out participatory workshops (15%)
  - Proven experience with BMZ in either programming or conducting evaluations (10%)
- Technical quality of the proposal (30%), broken down as follows:
  - Proven understanding of overall task at hand (30%)
  - Pertinent and credible methodology proposed to cover the scope of the task at hand with a sufficient level of sophistication and detail to generate reliable results (40%)
  - Feasibility of workplan given the envisaged timeframe (30%)
- Price (30%)

Applied scoring system:

## GRC – Team International Cooperation

- 5 points: Fulfilled criteria very well (5 points are being awarded if the bidder's experience (on the basis of the submitted bid) shows excellent indications of the area relevant to the contract and/or the concept is very well elaborated and there is outstanding reference to the subject matter of the performance.)
- 4 points: Fulfilled criteria well (4 points are being awarded if the bidder's experience (on the basis of the submitted bid) shows good indications of the area relevant to the contract and/or the concept is well elaborated and there is good reference to the subject matter of the performance.)
- 3 points: Fulfilled all criteria (3 points are being awarded if the bidder's experience (on the basis of the submitted bid) shows sufficient indications of the area relevant to the contract and/or the concept is sufficiently elaborated and there is relevant reference to the subject matter of the performance.)
- 2 points: Fulfilled basic criteria (2 points are being awarded if the bidder's experience (on the basis of the submitted bid) shows a few indications of the area relevant to the contract and/or the concept is only partly sufficiently elaborated and there is little reference to the subject matter of the performance.)
- 1 point: Fulfilled criteria inadequately (1 point is being awarded if the bidder's experience (on the basis of the submitted bid) shows no or only few indications of the area relevant to the contract and/or the concept is insufficiently elaborated and there is no to little reference to the subject matter of the performance.)
- 0 points: Criteria not fulfilled

The total number of points achieved by the respective offer is calculated by determining the price point value (PPW) and the quality point value (QPW). Based on the point values calculated in each case, the total number of points is determined according to the weighting of price and quality.

For the price, the quotient of the cheapest offer and the offer to be evaluated is formed and multiplied by 100 and the percentage weighting.

$$((\text{Cheapest offer price} / \text{Offer price to be valued}) \times 100) \times \text{Weighting factor} = \text{Price points}$$

Please note that the school grading system is of course not applicable to the evaluation of the price.

Based on the given possible evaluation levels, the quality is evaluated for each award criterion as follows:

$$(\text{Points achieved} \times \text{Factor 20}) \times \text{Percentage weighting} = \text{Quality points}$$

Calculation of the total points:

$$\text{Sum price points} + \text{Quality points} = \text{Total points achieved}$$

## 8. Application procedure

Interested consultants should submit their dossier by **6<sup>th</sup> August 2023, 23:59 midnight CEST** to Mr. Byron Nonato via email ([t63meal@drk.de](mailto:t63meal@drk.de)) and copying [b.nonato@drk.de](mailto:b.nonato@drk.de), stating “**Application for SSF Strategic Evaluation**”. The dossier is to be submitted **in English**. The tender is handled via an **open procedure**.

## GRC – Team International Cooperation

- Curriculum vitae of all team members
- Letter of motivation summarising relevant experiences and qualifications for the consultancy
- Technical proposal covering the following elements:
  - A chronogram for how the evaluator/s propose/s to complete all tasks (please use the proposed timetable as outlined under "timetable" – changes should be kept to an absolute minimum).
  - A methodology for the evaluation.
- Financial proposal:
  - Financial proposal should consist of daily fees and applicable taxes
  - Daily fees + % of taxes = overall fees
  - Please do not include a breakdown of prices, the financial overview should only state the daily fees and applicable taxes. VAT needs to be clearly stated separately.
  - The offer should be in EUR.
  - Daily fees need to be inclusive of insurance and visa costs, as well as any other costs that may be incurred for travelling prior to departure from home country as well as during in-country travel for this evaluation.
  - Fees should also include translator and enumerator costs.
  - International and local travels will be arranged by GRC, as per internal guidelines.
  - Hotel accommodations in countries to be visited will also be arranged by GRC, as per internal guidelines for cost and security.
  - **Interested consultants who are registered within the EU (but not in Germany) must not include VAT in their offer. The evaluation of the offer will consider the net price plus the statutory VAT in Germany. Based on the "reverse-charge procedure", GRC will pay respective statutory Value Added Taxes in Germany. Nevertheless, please indicate your VAT number/ taxpayer ID with your offer.**
- Filled out declaration of conformity (see Annex A)
- Examples of previous comparable work (at least an Executive Summary of a recent work – at most 5 years old)
- At least two reference persons
- Filled out data protection form (see Annex D)
- Validity of your offer needs to be a minimum of 60 days.

GRC will not consider incomplete dossiers. Tenderers must raise questions in writing by **31<sup>st</sup> July 2023, 12:00 noon CEST**, to the above-mentioned email address. GRC reserves the right to continue the further communication after submission of quotes via a combination of media (e.g. post, email, phone). GRC may – but is not obliged to – ask each tenderer individually for clarification of its quote including breakdowns of prices etc. within a reasonable timelimit to be determined by the evaluation committee.

Payment schedule (upon receiving invoice from consultant):

- 30% upon signature of contract
- 20% upon GRC approval of inception report
- 50% upon GRC approval of finalised report

## 9. Dissemination of evaluation results and their application

The following organisations will receive the final report: BMZ, GRC, relevant SNSs.

The accepted recommendations should be used by GRC, relevant SNSs, BMZ.

Evaluation results and recommendations will be used for future and ongoing programmes to improve the implementation process, and for GRC, the partner organisations and stakeholders for their organisational learning.

The follow up should be organised and a respective plan should be developed and implemented in an agreed timespan, to ensure the application of the recommendations by the user group of the evaluation.

## **10. Abbreviations**

BMZ	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
GRC	German Red Cross
RCRC	Red Cross Red Cresecent
SNS	Sister National Societies
SSF	Social Structure Funding (Sozialstrukturförderung)

## **11. Annexes**

- A – Declaration of conformity
- B – Code of Conduct
- C – Contract
- D – Data protection form ("Vereinbarung zur Auftragsverarbeitung")