

**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TORS) FOR CONDUCTING AN EX-POST EVALUATION OF FOUR FAMILY STRENGTHENING PROJECTS ON BEHALF OF SOS CHILDREN’S VILLAGES RWANDA**



**March 22, 2021**

**Terms of Reference (ToR) for Conducting An Ex-Post Evaluation of Four Family Strengthening Projects on Behalf of SOS Children’s Villages Rwanda**

1. **Background**

These Terms of Reference (ToRs) serve as a request for proposals from firms or individual consultants who are interested in conducting an ex-post evaluation of SOS CV Rwanda four family strengthening projects implemented from 2013 up to now. Details regarding contents of proposals and submission procedures are explained herein.

SOS Children’s Villages Rwanda is a non-governmental social development organization affiliated to SOS Children’s Villages International, a global federation working to protect and care for children who have lost parental care, or who stand at risk of losing it. SOS Children’s Villages started working in Rwanda since 1979. Currently, it implements different programmes in four locations located in: Gasabo, Gicumbi, Kayonza, and Nyamagabe Districts. Current programmes include alternative childcare, family strengthening & community empowerment and youth empowerment.

SOS Children’s Villages Rwanda (SOS CVs Rwanda) has been implementing various family strengthening projects in four programme locations from 2013 up to date. Four of these projects have been co-financed by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) with SOS Kinderdörfer weltweit Hermann-Gmeiner Fonds Deutschland (HGFD) as lead applicant and SOS CVs Rwanda as local implementing partner. These parties have agreed to conduct an ex-post evaluation for the four projects, two in Gasabo District and 2 in Gicumbi District. The ex-post evaluation will be co-financed by BMZ and its objective is to assess the effectiveness and sustainability of the projects in empowering vulnerable families and community-based structures to provide adequate care to their children. This evaluation aims at deriving lessons learned and recommendations to improve the current programmes as well as to help re-strategise, plan and implement more effective and efficient programmes in the future.

The family strengthening projects concerned by this ex-post evaluation are the following:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project title** | **Project period** | **Project outcome** |
| 1. Improved household income and economic self-sufficiency of families in Byumba   Funded by BMZ through HGFD | Three years:  1 November 2013 to  30 October 2016 | 200 parents and 100 single-parent mothers and young adults are economically stable and improve the living conditions of their families |
| 1. Improvement of living conditions through ecological sustainability in Kigali   Funded by BMZ through HGFD | Three years:  1 November 2014 to  30 April 2018 | 250 parents are economically stable and improve the living conditions of their families |
| 1. Improved household income and economic self-sufficiency of families in Rukomo   Funded by BMZ through HGFD | Three years:  1 January 2017 to 30 April 2021 | 300 families have increased their household income and their agricultural production which enables them to independently cater for the needs of their children in nutrition, health and education  Due to sensitization and improved capacities 300 families and 1,500 members of the community are able to sustainably improve the living conditions in areas of family and hygiene |
| 1. Improvement of families‘ livelihood through socio-economic self-reliance in Gasabo district (Kigali)   Funded by BMZ through HGFD | Three years and a half:  1 July 2018 to  31 December 2021 | 300 families have increased their household income and their agricultural production which enables them to independently cater for the needs of their children in nutrition, health and education  300 families and 3,000 persons in the sectors Jabana and Rutunga have increased their awareness and their capacity to sustainably improve the living conditions in the areas of family and hygiene at the project locations |

1. **PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND USE**

**PURPOSE:**

The ex-post evaluation is intended to contribute to:

* **Ensuring programme quality**: The insights and findings gained through the evaluation will inform the planning and management of ongoing and future programmes and activities of SOS Rwanda
* **Expanded basis for exchange** with stakeholders and partners: The results of the evaluation expand the knowledge base on best practices
* **Continuous improvement** and adaptation of guidelines, processes and methods of SOS Rwanda and other organisations involved in the implementation of current and future programmes
* **Evidence-based justification of programme effectiveness** to stakeholders, partners, donors and donor agencies
* **Develop recommendations for** SOS Rwanda, SOS Children's Villages Worldwide, BMZ and local partners regarding future programming and collaboration.

**OBJECTIVES:**

The overall objective of this ex-post evaluation will be to determine the impact of the targeted projects implemented from 2013 up to date.

The ex-post evaluation will specifically seek to respond to these questions:

1. What change has the programme made in the lives of the participating children within our target group, their families as well as in the community for the last seven years?
2. How relevant, effective, efficient, coherent, sustainable, scalable, impactful and participatory are the programme interventions? This is to assess:

the effectiveness of the activities implemented in Gasabo and Gicumbi,

the efficiency of the projects in relation to beneficiaries, cost and timeframe,

the current figures of the Objectively Verifiable Indicators as found in the impact matrix

the sustainability of the projects (institutional, social, financial, etc.)

1. What lessons can be drawn from the programme that can be taken to further develop the programme?

Which approaches ('best practices') have proven successful in implementation? This is to document best practices (what worked well), challenges (what did not work well) and lessons learnt

How have the conceptual approaches in the individual project components developed over the course of the projects and across projects?

1. What impact/changes have happened due to program interventions on individual children and their families and wider community (impact)? Changes shall be examined in relation to all project components such as building of vocational skills, income generation, WASH, environmental awareness/ protection, child care and protection practices, and support for development of sustainable community-based structures. Special emphasis shall be given to the contribution of capacity building measures, both at the level of individuals as well as at the community level, in achieving a lasting and broad impact of the evaluated project interventions.
   * 1. The **impact at the individual level of** the individual children and their families is examined using several dimensions. These are
        1. Quality of care,
        2. Food security,
        3. Accommodation,
        4. Physical health,
        5. Education and skills,
        6. Livelihood
        7. social protection and inclusion,
        8. Social and emotional well-being
     2. The **impact at the level of the municipalities** in which the projects were implemented is examined using the following dimensions:
        1. Awareness of community members on the issues of children's rights and child protection
        2. Community-based support systems
        3. Progress towards sustainability
        4. Quality of alternative care
        5. Voluntary commitment and willingness to support community members
        6. Benefits for the next generation

In light of the evaluation findings, what are the strategic recommendations that SOS CV Rwanda could build on to improve on future interventions?

This is to make an analysis of results across the four projects and provide recommendations for improving future interventions, including an assessment of the potential for further conceptual development of the various programme components within family and community strengthening programmes (what should be kept, what should be stopped, what should be added). This shall inform the new strategic and conceptual development framework for Family Strengthening at SOS CV Rwanda.”

The desired results of the evaluation are:

To document the impact of the projects with special emphasis on the impact the projects have had on children, young people, families and communities in relation to the following projects components: building of vocational skills, income generation, WASH, environmental awareness/ protection, child care and protection practices, and support for development of sustainable community-based structures. Special emphasis shall be given to the contribution of capacity building measures, both at the level of individuals as well as at the community level, in achieving a lasting and broad impact of the evaluated project interventions

To provide commentary on the overall project design, the intervention logic and an analysis of the strategy and methodology used and on what approaches in the various family strengthening components may have been further developed throughout and across the projects (family development process, village saving and Loan Associations, animal revolving system, agricultural inputs,community empowerment initiatives etc),

To critically examine the impact matrix and verifiable indicators found in the original proposal and provide post-project figures along with a narrative explaining the reasons for under/over performance achievement.

To provide commentary on best practices and challenges.

To draw conclusions, make recommendations and state lessons learnt, suggest a new strategy and improvements in implementation of future projects.

To provide commentary on the current political, social and cultural factors influencing the implementation of the projects.

To document the communities’ attitude towards the projects

* To examine other cross-cutting topics of development cooperation (e.g. gender equality, human rights, inclusion, environmental sustainability)

Key stakeholders are:

Project participants/beneficiaries

Project team

Project partners, community members, local authorities, local partners and main stakeholders

Project management at national level

Key users of evaluations results are:

Project level: Project team and implementing partners

Management level: National Director (ND), National Programme Development Director (NPDD), National Family Strengthening Programme Advisor (NFSPA), etc.

Regional level: SOS International Office Region (IOR)

Global level: SOS CV International Office (IO), HGFD, other PSAs and potential donors

1. **SCOPE OF WORK AND METHODOLOGY**

The ex-post evaluation will be carried out in the two districts of Gasabo (City of Kigali), and Gicumbi (Northern Province).

Four FS services shall be evaluated, two that phased out to include their former participants and two with their current participants. The former participants from family strengthening have to have left between 2 and 6 years ago, and those from current projects have to have participated in the service for a minimum of 2 years:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Years when exited the programme or completed at least 2 years in the programme | | 2016 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | Total |
| Number participants | Families | 30 | 30 | 50 | 40 | 150 |
| Children | 30 | 40 | 60 | 50 | 180 |

The projects to be evaluated include a range of thematic components, as mentioned in section “3. Purpose, objective and use”. In order to ensure an effective approach in data analysis and finding presentation, the bidder’s proposal shall specify on which main thematic areas the evaluation intends to focus and which will be covered to a lesser extent. The evaluation questions should be developed around the following criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability, Coherence, Project Management and Coordination, Participation, as detailed below. On the basis of the above-mentioned evaluation criteria, instruments/questionnaires for the field mission should be prepared for stakeholders.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation issue** | **Key guiding questions** |
| **Relevance**  The extent to which the projects were suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor. | * To what extent was the project focused on the intended target group? * What were the specific criteria for the selection of beneficiaries? * To what extent did project participants meet the selection criteria? * To what extent did the project respond to the needs of the community? * To what extent did the project interventions respond to the needs and priorities of the project participants? * To what extent have the project adjustments made so far been relevant? |
| **Effectiveness**  A measure of the extent to which targeted projects attained its objectives. | * To what extent have the project objectives been achieved? * To what extent have the project strategies, methodologies, tools and processes contributed to the achievement of the planned results? * To what extent were the project objectives and activities in compliance with the target group needs? * To what extent were the beneficiaries aware of the project and the services it provided? Did all the targeted beneficiaries receive services by the project? * To what extent were beneficiaries satisfied with the project interventions? * Does the support system built in the target communities effectively respond to the situation of the target group? * To what extent did the SOS Children’s Villages contribute to the capacity building of the public / private partners and main duty bearers to respond to the situation of the target group? * To what extent were the local authorities involved and provided support to the project? |
| **Efficiency**  An economic term, which signifies that the projects used the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. | * Were activities cost-efficient? * Were objectives achieved on time? * Were the projects implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? |
| **Impact\***  The positive and negative changes produced by the projects’ interventions, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended both at the individual and community level | * To what extent has the quality of support improved the lives of the beneficiaries? * What was the impact against the planned results of the projects, in terms of changes brought about in the living circumstances of beneficiaries and communities? * What was the impact beyond the planned results of the projects, in terms of changes brought about in the living circumstances of beneficiaries and communities? (positive and/or negative) * To what extent can former-child participants meet the targets (scale level 1 or 2) set for the non-financial dimensions for individual impact? What observations can be made in comparing former-child participants with national or community level averages (depending on availability of data within country), or by comparing them to a ‘virtual control group’? * Broad developmental impact: To what extent does the programme contribute to a broader impact on the community beyond the individual impact (non-financial perspective)? What is the evidence of contribution of SOS Children’s Villages? |
| **Sustainability**  Concept concerned with measuring whether the benefits of a project are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. | * How many beneficiaries left the project since the beginning and became self-reliant? To what extent are the results which they have reached sustainable and are the results effective after the beneficiaries leave the project? * To what extent can activities, results and effects be expected to continue after the project financing (BMZ/HGFD) has ended? * Have the capacities of the implementation partner and other relevant actors been developed? If so, in what areas and how? * To what extent there is a network of partners to prevent children from losing the care of their families |
| **Coherence**  This includes internal coherence (the synergies and interlinkages between the services in the programme and other services carried out by the same organization) and external coherence (the consistency of the programme with other actors’ interventions/services in the same context). | * To what extent is the programme compatible with other interventions or services in the location? * What is the extent to which other interventions (particularly policies) support or undermine the programme, and vice versa? * To what extent is the programme adding value while avoiding duplication of effort? Is there complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others? |
| **Project management and coordination**  Evaluation of the role of the project management and coordination in ensuring quality implementation. | * To what extent did the projects have appropriate management and coordination structures and organisation of the process? Were these structures aimed at the quality of the project implementation? * To what extent the programme was supported by an appropriate management, monitoring and evaluation system? Was this system geared towards sustainability (with takeover of implementation partner in mind)? * Which other local implementing partners were involved in the process of management and coordination and how did this affect the quality of implementation? * **HUMAN RESOURCES**   + Adequate human resources in programme? If not, where/how?   + Relationship between staff members and team work   + Relationship between staff and implementation partner (including volunteers)   + Training of staff and volunteers   + Any training needs?   + Clear division of roles and responsibilities between the staff and between SOS and its partners |
| **Participation** | * + - To what extent are stakeholders (participant families, particular children, partners, local authority) involved in the design and implementation of the programme?     - To what extent is the programme designed to develop the necessary local institutional (governmental and/or non-governmental) capacity to respond to the problem? |
| **Scalability** | * + - To what extent is the potential of the projects to be effectively scaled up at local, sub-national and national level? |

* *Methodology to be applied in the evaluation*

The External Evaluation should be based on a participatory approach involving and engaging a wide and diverse range of stakeholders. It should also include various 'rights holders' who benefited from the projects, as well as the 'duty bearers' or those who were responsible and accountable for providing services. The successful bidder is requested to obtain written consent from all participants of the evaluation process and/or their official guardians/representatives (when applicable).

The bidders are required to propose a methodological approach for this ex-post evaluation, which is in line with the proposed thematic focus. The methodology shall generally concentrate on the objective observation, description and explanation of changes that have happened in beneficiaries lives due to their participation in the project. The evaluation approach should be results-oriented to provide evidence of both quantitative and qualitative achievements as well as the outputs and outcomes obtained by the programmes (or not). Hence, both primary and secondary data should be used in the evaluation and be collected from a wide and diverse range of primary and secondary sources.

Overall, the methodology of the evaluation shall include the following elements to the extent required by the proposed thematic focus:

* Document review including analysis on key reference documents (project documents, annual reports, mid-term and final evaluations, pre-feasibility and baseline reports, national social protections policies and strategic plans, family development plans, etc.)
* Evaluation methodologies should include quantitative (e.g. questionnaires as well as qualitative data collection methods, e.g. interviews, focus group discussions) and should approach all main stakeholders (participating families, programme co-workers, implementation partners and other CBOs, local authorities)
* The evaluation should use participatory methodologies to involve programme participants (families currently being on the programme as well as families that have already left the programme) and wherever possible children should be involved in the design and implementation of the evaluation.
* Case study of randomly selected beneficiaries’ files (present and those who exited the project). In case some beneficiaries of past projects may not be available anymore, then convenience sampling can be used.
* Interviews (structured and/or semi-structured; in person and/or by telephone) with key informants
* Focus groups with selected key informants
* Other methods relevant to evaluation objectives and scope

SOS Children’s Villages use a specific methodology for assessing the social impact of their programmes at individual and community level, called “Social Impact Assessment”. Regardless of the methodological approach chosen by the evaluator, findings of the ex-post evaluation shall be presented also in relation to the scales outlined in the social impact assessment methodologies. Documents on SOS social impact assessment will be shared with the successful bidder for inspiration. **ESS OF EVALUATION**

This section’s minimum requirements involve planning and designing data collection methodology and process, suggesting on-site visits within the project areas to meet project participants (children, families, state specialists, project team and project stakeholders), and collect information. This should be in accordance with the requirements stipulated in the evaluation design); pre-existing information sources that should be used for the ex-post evaluation: programme action plans, progress reports, annual self-evaluation reports, project final evaluations, databases, records by programme staff, any other collected data, e.g. through questionnaires, interviews, etc.

The bidder is required to propose details for the evaluation process, data collection and analysis procedures, particularly the amount and depth of data to be collected as well as the amount of resources to be devoted to the various process steps.

1. **OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES**

The external evaluators should prepare the following key deliverables:

* Inception report with the evaluation protocol – contains the evaluation framework; detailed evaluation methodology and design; work plan and budget; developed evaluation tools
* Draft evaluation report – Draft report will be prepared in line with the proposed structure bellow and should be submitted to the national project management, electronically via e-mail, in English. Organize an actual face to face presentation of the findings to the local team.
* Final evaluation report - The findings of the external evaluation shall be presented in a written report following the proposed outline. Attachments – Templates of applied evaluation tools (questionnaires; main areas for focus groups, research database, etc.). Final evaluation report should be submitted to National director in English, in electronic format.

1. **ELABORATION AND STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT**

External evaluators will analyse collected data and will prepare an evaluation report that describes the main findings, recommendations and lessons learned. The final report should follow the structure and content as outlined in the terms of references. That process step includes:

* Analysis of the data including a comparative analysis of the findings across the different Family Strengthening projects components and elaboration of conclusions, recommendations for future interventions
* Presentation of the findings to the respective project staff on local/national and regional/ level to ensure triangulation
* Finalisation of the report after having included the inputs from various stakeholders

Maximum length excluding appendices: 30 pages (see below for the standard reporting template)

The evaluation report should be structured in the following way:

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

* Table of contents
* Figures and tables
* Acronyms

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

* Background and project context
* Findings and conclusions
* Recommendations and lessons learned

1. **INTRODUCTION**

**1.1. SCOPE OF EVALUATION**

* Brief project description

**1.2. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE**

* Short description of the concerned FS projects
* Reason and justification for evaluation
* Aim and purpose of evaluation
* Key guiding questions

**1.3. EVALUATION MISSION**

* Time span and process of evaluation
* Profile, composition and independence (non bias) of evaluation team
* Participation of partners and target group in evaluation
* External factors influencing the evaluation process and respective consequences

**2. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

* Methodology and instruments
* Measures ensuring the protection of the stakeholders involved
* Suitability and limits of the methodical approach

**3. DEVELOPMENTAL EFFECTIVENESS**

**3.1. RELEVANCE**

* Consistency of project objectives with the needs of the target group and the objectives of the donor (BMZ), the German partner (HGFD) and the implementing partner (SOS CV Rwanda)
* Adequate developmental approach and conceptualisation
* Capacity development and support for development of sustainable structures

**3.2. EFFECTIVENESS**

* Quality of project planning
* Quality of system of indicators and objectives
* Quality of project implementation
* Motivation, ownership and legitimacy of implementing partner
* Quality of project management
* Achievement of project objectives
* Other effects on output and outcome level (incl. negative, if any)

**3.3. EFFICIENCY**

* Cost effectiveness of the project

**3.4. IMPACT**

* Individual impact
* Community-level impact
* Achievement of overall objective
* Model character, establishment of structures and broad impact
* Other effects of overall, broad developmental impact (incl. negative, if any)

**3.5. SUSTAINABILITY**

* Durability of positive impact (after project completion); also considering potential changes in the project context
* Risks for and potential of sustainable impact on the level of the organisation and the target group

**3.6 COHERENCE**

* Internal coherence
* External coherence

**4. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES**

* Cross-cutting topics of development cooperation (e.g. gender equality, human rights, inclusion, environmental sustainability)
* Contribution to organisational goals

**5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

* 1. **CONCLUSIONS**
  2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**
  3. **LESSONS LEARNED**
  4. **FIVE YEAR STRATEGY BRIEF**

**ANNEXES**

- Terms of Reference

- Composition and independence (non bias) of evaluation team

- Evaluation matrix

- Evaluation plan and time diagram

- List of stakeholders consulted

- Bibliography/reference

- Questionnaires/other data collection instruments

- Debriefing Protocol

- System of objectives and indicators

- Others if necessary

1. **TIME SCHEDULE AND OTHER RESOURCES**

The evaluation will be conducted within two months from the date of contract signature and the final report will be prepared over a period of 2 weeks after the field phase. The final report should be submitted not later than July 15, 2021. Bidders are requested to detail working days and daily rates proposed for various phases of the evaluation, e.g. preparation phase, research phase in country/ in project location, analysis and development of study report, travel days, etc. The following are indications for this section:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Week** | **Tasks/Milestones** |
|  | * Hold first meeting with the client and defining of the contracted volume of work * Prepare the action plan for the evaluation process indicating the exact dates of visit to the location * Finalise the list of the basic documents to be provided to the evaluation team. If translation is needed, define the documents for translation * Analyse all available basic project documents (BMZ-proposal, reports, BMZ-guidelines, concepts, etc.) * Inception report |
|  | * Develop set of tools (interviews, questionnaires, focus group scenarios etc.) * 2nd meeting with the client and discussion of the methodology and tools to be used during evaluation * Prepare and submit to NO schedule of site visits mentioning all required documents to be prepared in the location. * Develop and finalise in cooperation with the location the visit plan for defined local stakeholders, SOS location workers, stakeholders in the location, beneficiaries in the location. |
| 3,4,5 | * Field phase: make visit to the projects locations * Hold meetings with all relevant parties as per the visit plan * Provide and analyse project documents in the location * Analyse all data and prepare the draft report indicating the findings, recommendations, lessons learnt |
| 7,8. | * 3rd meeting with the client and discussion of the preliminary results of the evaluation * Prepare the draft report * Validation workshop * Receive feedback for the draft report from NO and insert in the final draft * Prepare and send final report to NO |

On the basis of the proposed time schedule as outlined above, the consultants will prepare a work plan for the evaluation and include this in their offer, and inception report. The work plan should show the different activities and amount of working days per evaluator.

1. **MANAGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION**

During the evaluation, the responsibilities will be distributed as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| # | Title/position | Responsibilities |
| National Office of SOS Children Villages Rwanda | | |
| 1 | National Director (ND) | Final approval of evaluation processes and the final evaluation report |
| 2 | HGFD | Final approval of evaluation processes and the final evaluation report |
| 3 | National Programme Development Director (NPDD) | Definition of the overall scope of work for the evaluation  Accompaniment of the evaluation process  Provision of feedback |
| 4 | National Family Strengthening Advisor (FSPA) | Monitoring of the whole working process  Direct exchange with the evaluator on methodology, action plan, draft report etc.  Preparation of meeting and visit plans |
| 5 | Project Coordinators | Organisation of meetings with all relevant people as per the visit plan  Provision of relevant documents and information (reports, statistics, etc.) |

1. **REQUIRED EXPERTISE**

The firm/person(s) carrying out this study should have a thorough understanding of the situation of the target group with proven competence and experience in conducting social research.

The consultants must have:

* proven competency in monitoring and evaluation, including impact assessment or project evaluation with at least 10 years of international experience in evaluation of development-related project as well as good knowledge of the local context. This would preferably be a consortium consisting of an international consultant and a local Rwandan consultant.
* a social science background, e.g. higher education in Social Work, Psychology, Social-pedagogy, Community Development, Demography, Statistics, etc. is of advantage
* a good understanding of development work, the social welfare and child protection system in the country
* a good understanding of child rights and issues affecting vulnerable children
* good facilitation and interpersonal skills
* proven experience in interviewing children and vulnerable groups
* proven experience in participatory processes and data collection methods
* strong skills in coordinating teamwork
* strong analytical and conceptual skills
* excellent written communication skills
* ability to transfer complex concepts and ideas into practical and simple language
* ideally experience in organising research processes with/for institutional donor-funded projects
* ideally experience and credibility in providing evaluating services to BMZ financed projects

The evaluation team should consist of the number of persons which can be affordable in accordance with the approved evaluation budget. Roles and responsibilities in the team are distributed in accordance with the competence, level of expertise and requirements of the team members. In order to be more time effective, the revision of documents, meetings with the project team, beneficiaries, partners and stakeholders can be carried out simultaneously and divided among evaluation team members.

The team leader of the evaluation team is responsible for:

* Quality and timely fulfilment of the ToR with expected results of the evaluation
* Overall evaluation design of the process
* Elaborated evaluation plan indicating each step of the process
* Effective distribution of the responsibilities among evaluation team members
* Quality and timely implementation of the evaluation plan
* Effective and quality data collection
* Data compilation and analysis aimed at reaching the goal of the evaluation
* Preparation and submission of high quality and consistent evaluation report in due course

External evaluators should not be biased and have any reason for conflict of interests. The evaluation team must respect the participating communities’ culture, social norms, values and behaviour; and maintain appropriate relationships with participants of this evaluation.

1. **BIDDING, SELECTION, CONTRACTING**

After the opening, each proposal will be assessed first on its technical quality and compliance and subsequently on its price. The proposal with the best overall value, composed of technical merit and price, will be considered for approval.

**Technical Evaluation**

The technical proposal will be evaluated on the basis of its responsiveness to the Terms of Reference (TOR) as per the evaluation criteria below. The obtainable number of points specified for each evaluation criterion indicates the relative significance or weight of the item in the overall evaluation process.

Bidders may additionally be requested to provide additional information (virtual presentation or phone interview) to SOS Children’s Rwanda on the proposed services.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **Quality and Relevance of Technical Proposal** | **Maximum obtainable points** |
| 1.1 | Overall quality and relevance of proposal to ToR | 100 |
| 1.2 | Existence of effective and realistic work plan in accordance with ToR | 60 |
| 1.3 | Sufficiency of resources (e.g. human resources) and their proper allocation for timely provision of project deliverables | 50 |
| 1.4 | Detailed quality assurance process for all deliverables (e.g. to test consistency of ratings, ensure validity of interviews and statistical data) | 40 |
|  | TOTAL | 250 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **Qualification and expertise of or organisation/team of consultants/consultant submitting proposal** | **Maximum obtainable points** |
| 2.1 | Reputation of firm/organisation and staff and individual consultant/s (competence and reliability) in carrying out evaluations | 35 |
| 2.2 | Relevance of:  - Specialized knowledge  - Proven expertise in carrying out evaluations | 80 |
| 2.3 | Team leader | 50 |
| Qualifications |
| Relevant professional experience as required by the ToR |
| 2.4 | Team members | 35 |
| Qualifications |
| Relevant professional experience as required by the ToR |
|  | TOTAL | 200 |

**Price Proposal**

The total amount of points allocated for the price component is [**50**]**.** The maximum number of points will be allotted to the lowest price proposal that is opened and compared among those invited firms/consultants who obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the technical proposal. All other price proposals will receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest price; e.g.:

**(Max. score for the price of bid) \* (Lowest price)**

**Points for price proposal:** **X = ---------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**Price of bid**

**Documents to submit**

Bids should be submitted to the National Office of SOS Children's Villages Rwanda located at Kacyiru **through the following e-mail: sos.procurement@sos-rwanda.org.** All documents must be in PDF. Applications for the ex-post evaluation should contain the following information:

1. Consultancy firm with registration certificate from Rwanda Development Board if registered in Rwanda
2. Tax Clearance certificate from Rwanda Revenue Authority if registered in Rwanda
3. At least 4 certificates of good completion related to previous similar studies/assignments
4. An example of a recent/relevant evaluation report (if available for public use)
5. Three references (at least two of them must be familiar with your work)
6. Detailed Methodology/ Technical Proposal demonstrating how you understand and meet requirements for this assignment
7. Detailed Work plan (including a time line) showing the detailed sequence and timeline for each deliverable
8. CVs of the research team member(s) including current geographical location(s)
9. Detailed financial proposal with all taxes inclusive
10. Price schedule form (to be sealed in a closed envelope or a separate PDF file)
11. Any other information to further support the eligibility of the candidate

**Deadline for submission**

The proposal has to be received by latest April 16th, 2021. Proposals received after the deadline will be not be considered.

**Modification and withdrawal of bids**

Proposals may be withdrawn on written request prior to the closing date of this invitation. Any corrections or changes must be received prior to the closing date. Changes must be clearly stated in comparison with the original proposal. Failure to do so will be at the bidder’s own risk and disadvantage.

**Signing of the contract**

SOS Children’s Villages Rwanda will inform the successful bidder electronically and will send the contract form within 2 weeks after closure of the bid submission deadline. The successful bidder shall sign and date the contract, and return it to SOS Children’s Villages Rwanda within seven calendar days of receipt of the contract. After the contract is signed by the two parties, the successful bidder shall deliver the services in accordance with the delivery schedule outlined in the bid.

**Rights of SOS Children’s Villages:**

* contact any or all references supplied by the bidder(s);
* request additional supporting or supplementary data (from the bidder(s));
* arrange interviews with the bidder(s);
* reject any or all proposals submitted;
* accept any proposals in whole or in part;
* negotiate with the service provider(s) who has/have attained the best rating/ranking, i.e. the one(s) providing the overall best value proposal(s);
* contract any number of candidates as required to achieve the overall evaluation objectives
* Copyright and other proprietary rights:

SOS Children’s Villages Rwanda shall be entitled to all intellectual property and other proprietary rights including, but not limited to, copyrights, and trademarks, with regard to products, processes, inventions, ideas, know-how, or documents and other materials which the Contractor has developed for SOS Children’s Villages Rwanda under the Contract and which bear a direct relation to or are produced or prepared or collected in consequence of, or during the course of, the performance of the Contract. The Contractor acknowledges and agrees that such products, documents and other materials constitute works made for hire for SOS Children’s Villages Rwanda.

All materials: plans, reports, estimates, recommendations, documents, and all other data compiled by or received by the Contractor under the Contract shall be the property of SOS Children’s Villages Rwanda and shall be treated as confidential, and shall be delivered only to SOS Children’s Villages Rwanda authorized officials on completion of work under the Contract. The external consultant is obliged to hand over all raw data collected during the assessment to SOS Children’s Villages Rwanda.

1. **MODE OF PAYMENT**

* 1st phase: The consultant shall receive 25% of the total agreed amount at the time of signing this contract.
* 2nd phase: The consultant shall receive 35% of the total agreed amount after the submission of the draft report, and after having received feedback from relevant stakeholders. This phase includes presentation of the draft report.
* 3rd phase: The consultant shall receive the remaining 40% of the total payment after incorporating all of the feedbacks received from various stakeholders and the submission of the final report.

Done at Kigali on 22nd March 2021

**Jean Bosco Kwizera**

**National Director**

**SOS Children’s Villages Rwanda**