

INTRODUCTION

This document provides the Terms of Reference for the external evaluation of the *South Sudan Joint Response (SSJR) 2022-2023* project funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs through the Dutch Relief Alliance, which is implemented from January 2022 to December 2023. Save the Children, as lead of the SSJR, is seeking consultancy services of an individual consultant, consultancy firm, organization or institution to conduct the final evaluation.

The Dutch Relief Alliance

The South Sudan Joint Response is part of the Dutch Relief Alliance (DRA) which was established to respond to the challenges of the humanitarian system and the growing gap between humanitarian needs and humanitarian funding in partnership with the Dutch Ministry for International Trade and Development Cooperation to increase effectiveness of Dutch humanitarian aid. The Dutch Relief Alliance (DRA) is a coalition of 14 Dutch NGOs which respond to protracted crises as well as acute crises. The main objectives of the Dutch Relief Alliance are to deliver effective, efficient, relevant and timely humanitarian aid through collaboration.

The South Sudan Joint Response

The South Sudan Joint Response (SSJR) started in 2015 and continued annually up to the current multi-annual phase of 2022-2023. In total 8 phases of protracted crisis mechanisms and 3 acute crisis mechanism phases were implemented. The SSJR 2022-2023 is the first multi-annual funding of 2 years that the SSJR has implemented. The DRA in its 2022-2026 Strategy, plans a shift to Multi-annual funding from the annual funding in line with the Grand Bargain commitments. The SSJR 2022-2023 program is a 24 months project, with a total budget of €14.083.708, which started on 1st January 2022 and will end by 31st December 2023. The project is implemented by a total of 14 organizations namely Save the Children, War Child Holland, Tearfund, Help a Child, Dorcas Aid International, Care International, Plan International, ACROSS, Mary Help Association, Women Development Group, Charity Empowerment Foundation, Centre for Emergency Development and Support, UNIDOR, Women and Orphans Charitable Organization and Smile Again Africa Development organization. In 2022 and 2023, the project was implemented in 7 states of Northern Bahr El Ghazal Aweil, Western Bahr El Ghazal Wau, Warrap, Jonglei, Upper Nile, Unity State Bentiu and Central Equatoria. The SSJR focusses on 5 sectors, namely FSL, WASH, Nutrition, Multipurpose Cash and Protection.

S/No	INGO	NNGO	NNGO	State (& county)
01.	Save the Children	CEF		Warrap (Tonj East)
02.	Plan International	SAADO		Upper Nile State (Malakal, Fashoda, Melut)
03.	Dorcas Aid International	WDG	MHA	Western Bar el Ghazal (Tonj North & Wau)
04.	Care	UNIDOR		Jonglei & Unity State (Pibor & Koch)
05.	War Child Holland	WOCO		Upper Nile State (Malakal, Fashoda, Melut)
06.	Help a Child	ACROSS		Jonglei & Western Bahr El Ghazal (Pibor, Tonj North, Wau)
07.	Tearfund	ACROSS		Central Equatoria State (Lainya)

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The SSJR partners have a contractual obligation towards the donor, the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to ensure the realization of an evaluation. The purpose for this evaluation is twofold. On the one hand, the evaluation report will assess the performance of the SSJR and ensures accountability towards the Dutch Government, the Dutch public and the communities targeted with this program. On the other hand, it offers

a learning aspect for all stakeholders. The evaluation should identify key lessons learned from SSJR 2022-2023, substantial anecdotal evidence of the value of collaboration for the delivery of humanitarian aid through SSJR 2022-2023 and identify specific recommendations for SSJR 2024-2026 (phase 10). The SSJR 2024-2026 partners expect to be able to use the findings of this evaluation to contribute to, and strengthen the implementation in 2024-2026. The period that this evaluation will cover is Jan 2022 until July 2023. Below are the key objectives of the evaluation to which the consultant will focus on.

The evaluation is to assess the overall performance of the SSJR against selected OECD DAC criteria and the Core Humanitarian Standards, ensuring accountability towards the Dutch Government, the Dutch public and the beneficiaries of the program. It should be noted that the consolidated log frame with project results of 2022 and baseline data collected in the start of 2023 is available, and that the consultant is expected to include an analysis of the data gathered in the consolidated log frame.

KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The consultant in consultation with the SSJR partners is expected to address the following questions, and outline any additions/revisions which may be deemed necessary as part of the inception report for review, if realistic within the given scope, time, and budget. The final questions should cover all six objectives and include enabling and hampering factors to achieve project's objectives.

The evaluation will be based on OECD/DAC criteria outlined below.

Relevance/Appropriateness: assesses whether the intervention is doing the right things according to needs of target populations and the context. It seeks to answer the degree to which the programme objectives and activities have been aligned with the humanitarian needs of target populations, including most vulnerable groups (women, children disabled people), local context, national policies and strategies, if it continued to adapt as circumstances changed and therefore is still valid. Under this section, the evaluation shall aim to answer the below questions:

Objective 1

- Was the humanitarian assistance provided by the SSJR 2022-2023 project in line with the humanitarian policy, strategy and procedures of DRA, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Netherlands?
- Was the humanitarian assistance provided by the SSJR 2022-2023 in line with needs, priorities and rights of the affected populations as per the South Sudan Humanitarian Response Plan?
- (CHS) To what extent were SSJR 2022-2023 partners involved beneficiaries in project design (e.g. development of indicators), implementation (e.g. community committees) and MEAL (e.g. monitoring progress)?
- How relevant was the design objectives and activities of the SSJR programme been in addressing humanitarian needs in South Sudan, particularly considering the people in humanitarian need keeps rising? Outline any additional considerations that could have been included in line with evaluation findings.
- To what extent was SSJR able to adapt and provide appropriate response to context changes and evolving needs, capacities, and the priorities of the people, taking into account the specific needs of the most vulnerable groups (with particular attention given to women, children, and disabled persons)?
- Were there any unexpected negative effects on the communities, as a consequence of the activities implemented?
- To what extent does the SSJR contribute to the resilience of the targeted communities? Does the SSJR need to focus more on nexus/resilience or keep its humanitarian basis as core?
- (CHS) What (joint) mechanisms were in place to identify the most vulnerable, and were these mechanisms adequate and appropriate enough to detect vulnerability? Who were involved in this process and why (not)?

Objective 2

- (CHS) To what extent were activities based on what communities needed, did Joint Response partners ask communities what they wanted, and, are there any concrete example of adjustments in the program accordingly to beneficiaries' feedback and preferences?
- (CHS) How and to what extent have communities (both IDPs, host communities and returnees) been involved in the development of selection criteria to identify the most vulnerable?

Objective 3

- To what extent the collaboration between organizations working in SSJR 2022-2023 contributed to reaching beneficiaries and targets in a more effective, efficient, relevant and timely manner, as set in the log frame and in the narrative proposal.

Effectiveness: judges whether the intervention is achieving its planned results. It assesses the extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its results at output and outcome levels, including any difference in results across target groups and geographical areas. It also identifies barriers and contributing factors towards results achieved. Under this section, the evaluation shall aim to answer the below questions:

Objective 1

- To what extent have the planned results (outputs, outcomes) been achieved in all the phases of SSJR?
- Which factors and/or actors were crucial for the achievement of, or failure to achieve, the project objectives?
- How did the project coordinate with and/or complement other similar (Projects not funded by DRA) actions in the field - geographical and thematic?
- How did partnership with local NGO support inform DRA partners implementation process?
- To what extent mainstreaming protection, including conflict sensitivity, gender sensitive and transformative programming, and disability inclusion successful?

Objective 2

- Asses to what extent the activities have been implemented well and how well they have contributed to the strategic objectives as laid out in the program documents, considering the OECD DAC criteria and the Core Humanitarian Standards.
- (CHS) To what extent the joint accountability system put in place by the SSJR partners ("The Joint AAP system") effective in in gathering and addressing input from the communities (including variety of channels, e.g. PMCs and CACs)? How inclusive are these feedback channels? Are there any concrete example of adjustments in the program accordingly to beneficiaries' feedback and preferences? The below characteristics f-of the AAP should be looked into:
 - (CHS) How and to what extent did SSJR partners provide opportunities for community members to provide feedback?
 - To what extent were the feedback loops closed?
 - To what extent did the collected feedback and complaints resulted in adaptations of the response?
 - To what extent relevant information on the program and partner organisation has been shared with the communities?
 - To what extent communities were able to actively participate in all phases of the project cycle (from design up to evaluation processes)?
- To what extent did SSJR 2022-2023 adhere to the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS)? Include examples of how these standards were considered/adhered to and link them to the focus of SSJR 2022-2023.

Objective 3

- What opportunities for collaboration have been utilized and how have these contributed to increased effectiveness and efficiency? Which opportunities for collaboration have not been

- utilized and should be utilized in the next joint response?
- To what extent, and how, did SSJR coordinate activities with external parties, i.e. national Government, UN OCHA, non-NJR INGO partners?
- How have the comparative advantages of different DRA partners contributed to the effectiveness of the joint response (either in individual programming or in collaboration), both at location-level and at a broader level?
- To what extent the collaboration between SSJR partners has led to increased positive impact on the lives of the beneficiaries.

Objective 4

- To what extent the adaptive management system and learning strategy of the project was effective. In this, a particular focus should be put on iterative decision-making (adjusting actions based on the evaluation of results) and the feedback loop between decisions and monitoring.

Efficiency: assesses how well resources were used to achieve the results. It seeks to answer the extent to which the intervention activities and results were delivered on time and within budget as compared to alternatives. Under this section, the evaluation shall aim to answer the below questions:

Objective 1

- Assess to what extent has the SSJR programme been implemented in a timely and cost-effective manner? Was there good value for money for the activities undertaken?
- To what extent has the joint response model of collaboration led to cost-effectiveness?

Objective 2

- Are there any concrete examples of successful models of collaboration of SSJR partners (within the JR) on geographic level, not just in terms of avoiding duplication but increasing complementarity and integrated programs affecting the reach and impact on beneficiaries? What are barriers and/or enablers to this?
- To what extent has the SSJR 2022-2023 used harmonized approaches (e.g. harmonizing PDM's and cash transfer approaches) and how? Please provide clear examples of harmonization in approaches. Has this contributed to efficient and effective programming?

Objective 3

- Which/how learnings and recommendations from previous phases have been incorporated (phase 1 – 7), and improve the implementation between 2022 and 2023 (including recommendations of the SSJR 2019-2021 final evaluation and the learning exchange visits)?
- What have been the reasons for (not) implementing the recommendations?
- What kind of learning activities have been most effective according to SSJR partners?
- Did partners make any changes to their programming as a result of these learnings, leading to better quality program?
- Is there any substantial anecdotal evidence on how activities to increase learning have affected the delivery of humanitarian aid by SSJR partners?

Objective 4

- To what extent has working with a local partner had an advantage given the context the SSJR members are working in?
- To what extent have SSJR localization efforts contributed to the capacity of local partners to fund, design, and deliver humanitarian actions in South Sudan? What factors played a role in this?

Impact: ascertains if the intervention made any difference, how and to what extent the positive or negative, intended or unintended, effects that would not have happened if there was no intervention and on which sub-populations/partners. As there is no counterfactual or comparison group for this evaluation, this

criterion is based on reported or perceived contributions to impact. Under this section, the evaluation shall aim to answer the below questions:

Objective 1

- How has SSJR impacted the lives of crisis affected population (IDPs, returnees and host communities) in sustaining their lives through integrated life-saving humanitarian assistance?
- What has changed as a direct result of the SSJR intervention? Are there unintended positive or negative consequences of the SSJR programming on target population and/or on national and international SSJR partners?
- Which groups have been affected (or unaffected) by the changes?
- The SSJR has 2 general objectives and 3 inter-sectoral strategic objectives. To what extent has the SSJR contributed to / reached these objectives?

Objective 2

- Is there any substantial (anecdotal) evidence of how collaboration between SSJR partners, specifically related to complementarity, has led to positive impact on the lives of beneficiaries? If it did, to what extent did the collaboration among partners make the SSJR 2022-2023 relevant?
- What has been the impact on collaboration of the joint activities organized by the lead organization?

Objective 3

- What has been the impact of the SSJR localization efforts on the localization agenda of the humanitarian community in South Sudan?

Sustainability: evaluates whether the net benefits of the intervention are likely to contribute after the cessation of programme activities.

Objective 1

- To what extent does the intervention reflect and consider factors which have a major influence on sustainability, i.e. economic, ecological, social and cultural aspects?
- To what extent have the outcomes and results of the SSJR program been sustained after the previous years of the South Sudan Joint Response and to what extent will they be sustained after the completion of the project?
- What are the contributing factors and constraints that require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of the project outcomes?
- How have localization efforts contributed to sustainability of project activities?

Objective 2

- To what extent do the AAP system and FCMs reflect and consider factors which have a major influence on sustainability, i.e. economic, ecological, social and cultural aspects?

Objective 3

- Investigate what has contributed to this added value and what has not, and whether there have been any unintended effects deriving from the implementation of the project.
- Moreover, assess whether the joint activities conducted in the SSJR 2022-2023 led to increased collaboration and increased capacity to reach the targeted communities in a more effective, efficient, relevant and timely manner.

Objective 4

- Assess and identify the key lessons learned including any negative impact of the project activities for example impact of project activities contributing to climate change, negative community beliefs and customs and practices, frictions between communities, and establish recommendations for SSJR in 2024-2026.

Objective 5

- Evaluate to what extent the SSJR programme has contributed to increased capacity and ownership of local actors including CSOs, community structures, local authorities and communities etc. To what extent have local partners gained the capacity to continue the delivery of humanitarian aid beyond the SSJR programme

Objective 6

- To what extent have capacity strengthening activities fulfilled the needs and priorities of the participants (especially local partners); what influence has this had on local partners' way of implementing? Provide concrete examples of how it contributed to their work and whether or not it improved program quality benefitting the beneficiaries.
- To what extent did local partners feel empowered / felt ownership in the design and implementation of the SSJR programme? What factors played a role in this?
- What has been the impact of the SSJR localization efforts on the localization practices of the DRA INGO partners?
- How has the role of the co-leadership of the SSJR increased decision-making powers and ownership in the SSJR?
- How has the NNGO engagement with donors platform contributed to the SSJR NNGOs capacity to access information and funding access directly?

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be carried out in a transparent and participatory manner by involving relevant stakeholders (UN, Cluster representatives, government, SSJR partners and affected people).

Locations

The proposed locations to be evaluated are Malakal, Wau, Pibor and Koch in Upper Nile, Western Bahr El Ghazal, Jonglei state and Unity State Bentiu respectively. Firstly, this sample provides the largest coverage of SSJR response locations but also priority sectors (FSL, Protection, Nutrition and WASH) of the SSJR which are priority sectors in the SSJR program. Secondly, these locations are interesting as they were part of the SSJR RTR conducted in November 2022 except Koch. All of these locations have been implementing SSJR since 2016. For the selection of locations for 2024-2026, Wau and Koch are not priority locations and will not be included on the list for implementation. Having the SSJR evaluation in this location will enable the external review and lessons learnt from this long-term locations which we will not continue implementing in and assess if the SSJR contributed to the situation in the locations be hence drawing learnings to be taken into consideration. Malakal was planned to be an exit location in 2023 however due to conflict and massive displacements it was retained for 2023 and it will be important to evaluate the adaptive response of the SSJR on such context.

Methods

A mixed-method approach is anticipated including but not limited to the following methods. With the Outcome harvesting being the main methodology.

1. **Outcome Harvesting as we are also shifting to focusing more on outcomes besides outputs**
 2. The Most Significant Change (MSC) technique as a form of participatory monitoring and evaluation
 3. Stories of Change or/ and Case studies
 4. Theory based approach of creating a theory of action and use this for the analysis
- Desk study and review of all relevant program documentation and monitoring data.
 - Key Informant Interviews with key stakeholders (Project teams, senior officials of national and international partners, Cluster leads, Government and UN agencies)
 - Questionnaire for SSJR partner staff
 - Focus Group discussions with target population
 - Household surveys with target population.

The use of creative or participative qualitative methods (to e.g. draw out and document learnings) is welcomed. The evaluation should be inclusive taking into account gender, age, disability, and other vulnerability considerations, sensitive of social norms and practices, and be considered of ethical data collection. In addition, the evaluation methodology should consider consultations with child and youth beneficiaries and highlight key approaches for undertaking it:

- *Safety and ethics considerations for engaging children in evaluation*
- *Data collection methods which are age and gender appropriate*

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

SSJR coordination team

- Starts the evaluation process;
- Prepares and publishes the ToR for the selection of the consultant;
- Participates in the consultant selection process;
- Is the contact person for the consultant;
- Leads and/or coordinates the evaluation
- Makes key documentation available from coordination level

SSJR partners

- Make necessary logistical and security arrangements to receive data collection team. This includes organizing and providing a security briefing upon arrival. The JR lead organization however makes final decision on security-related matters;
- Informs key staff, crisis-affected people and other relevant stakeholders of the upcoming visit;
- Makes key documentation and background information available to the consultant;
- Makes sure that key staff, crisis-affected people and other relevant stakeholders are available for participating in interviews and focus group discussions

Consultant

- Prepares the inception report;
- Prepares the data collection tools;
- Conducts data collection; transcription and data cleaning
- Executes the data analysis;
- Organize validation meeting/workshop with JR partners
- Writes the evaluation report
- Shares the evaluation report, together with the raw data, to the SSJR coordination team.

TENTATIVE TIMELINE

What	When
Deadline for applications	9 th August 2023
Interviews with pre-selected candidates	11 th August 2023
Selection of evaluation team	14 th August 2023
Inception report	16 August 2023
Data collection	21 st August 2023 – 6 th September 2023
First draft evaluation report	11 September 2023
Validation workshop	15 th September 2023

Final evaluation report	19 September 2023
-------------------------	-------------------

The timeline detailed above is an indicative timeline.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES AND DELIVERABLES

Process

The assignment shall start in August 2023 with an inception meeting. A first meeting shall be held before the assignment starts in order to review the ToR and agree on tentative work plan.

An inception report shall be submitted to SSJR Consortium Coordinator detailing the work plan, sampling frame, evaluation matrix and data collection tools. The consultant will finalize the report, incorporating feedback and suggestions coming from the SSJR Coordinator and the SSJR partners.

The consultant will be responsible for data collection including hiring enumerators where required. Data collection and fieldwork by the consultant shall take place in August 2023 where needed and the methodology will be mutually agreed upon by SSJR coordination and consultants, keeping the constraints generated by the security situation.

A briefing will be conducted for partners in the beginning of August 2023 by the consultant before the start of the data collection.

A draft evaluation report will be ready by end of August 2023. One feedback and verification workshop will be conducted where the main findings are presented to the SSJR partners who will be provided with the opportunity to provide verbal and written feedback.

The final report should be delivered no later than 18th September 2023. The content of the report will be finalized through mutual discussion between SSJR coordination and consultants.

Deliverables:

Inception report: The Inception Report will highlight the methodology and the guiding principles of the evaluation. The inception report will include: Objectives and key questions, methodology, evaluation framework/matrix (overview of method and source of information per evaluation sub-question), data collection methods, sampling approach, timeline and logistics, tools to be used for data collection. The report should be no longer than 20 pages.

Data collection and data analysis tools: The evaluator(s) will develop and / or build on existing tools for data collection and data analysis in line with the structure of the tools in the inception report.

Evaluation Final Report (between 20-35 pages, annexes excluded, in Microsoft Word format) including tabs and graphs representing the data:

- *Table of Contents*
- *List of Acronyms*
- *List of Tables*
- *Executive Summary*
- *Background*
- *Scope of Evaluation*
- *Methodology (including sampling)*
- *Main Findings*
- *Main Learnings*
- *Conclusions and specific recommendations with details how they might be implemented*
- *Annexes*
 - o *Project logframe*
 - o *Evaluation ToR*
 - o *Objectives and key questions*
 - o *Methodology*
 - o *Study schedule*
 - o *List of people involved*
 - o *Bibliography of consulted secondary sources*
 - o *Finalised data collection tools*

PROFESSIONAL SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS

Interested experts/consultancies/consultancy firms/organizations/institutions are required to provide CVs detailing the experience with similar type of assignments completed in the past.

Technical expertise

The following areas of technical expertise should be demonstrated in the Expression of Interest:

- A minimum of five (5) years' experience in conducting evaluations for humanitarian consortiums?
- Experience in design, planning and implementation of mixed-method evaluation exercises.
- Experience in quantitative data collection and analysis, use of sound statistical methods to identify causal relationships and address threats to internal validity.
- Experience in qualitative data collection and analysis of complex qualitative information, drawing findings from multiple sources and handling potential contradictions between data sets.
- Relevant subject knowledge and prior experience of working on multi-year programming in the emergency and humanitarian sector to ensure that design and research methods are as relevant and meaningful as possible as given in the work scope of this assignment.
- Proven knowledge and experience with using humanitarian sector frameworks for Quality and Accountability (e.g. CHS; SPHERE) in evaluation assignments;
- Statistical analysis: a range of statistical modelling and analysis of impact data; highly proficient user of: SPSS, STATA or equivalent; and qualitative data analysis techniques.
- Language Proficiency: Proficiency in English and the ability to produce good quality written documents in English is a mandatory requirement of this assignment.

Desired expertise and experience

Members of the evaluation team should hold at least a bachelor's degree in relevant field of study.

A consultancy firm, organization and individual with previous work experience with DRA is with added advantage.

The evaluation team should have prior experience of developing research designs that involve remote data collection and management.

Regional experience and cultural sensitivity: it is particularly desirable that the evaluation team has experience working in the South Sudan context or at the least work with a qualified national consultant during the execution of the tasks.

APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

Save the Children is inviting both individuals as well as teams of consultants, consultancy firms, organizations and institutions, to apply for this assignment. Interested candidates who meet the key qualifications and have relevant experience in designing and delivering similar type of assignments must submit their technical and financial proposals to the following email address provided below no later than **9th August 2023**

In case of questions about the assignment or the application process please contact Juba.Procurement@savethechildren.org.

The Expression of Interest (EoI) should include:

- 1) *A technical proposal (not exceeding 10 pages) that responds to the asks of this ToR. The technical proposal should contain a clear outline of the research methodology (quantitative and qualitative methods), data collection and analysis techniques (and alternatives in case of lack of access), a tentative work plan with clearly defined milestones to achieve within the given timeline of the assignment and a financial proposal.*
- 2) *CV for all proposed team members;*
- 3) *At least one sample of similar previous work;*
- 4) *two references, to be attached as annex to the technical proposal.*

Please note that incomplete EoI will not be assessed.

Financial Proposal The financial bid must be prepared and submitted with clearly defined breakdown of consultants' daily fee and other associated costs including taxes (20%), administrative costs, flights, costs and all other costs that will be incurred in executing this assignment.. Please read carefully **section Payment Schedule** of the ToRwhile developing and finalizing financial proposal.

Payment Schedule:

There will be two-payment schedule; first instalment of 30% of contract value after submission and approval of inception report while the remaining 70% will be paid after submission and approval of the final report to Save the Children.

Please be aware that, along with the quality of the technical proposal and of the sample of previous work submitted, the amount of the financial proposal will also be a criterion for assessing the EoI received.

Disqualification

Save the Children reserves the right to revoke the call or stop the process of hiring services without giving any prior reasons to the applicants. Incomplete application, applications submitted after deadline or application without financial proposal or vice versa will not be considered in the selection process.

Code of conduct

Save the Children's work is based on deeply held values and principles of child safeguarding, and it is essential that our commitment to children's rights and humanitarian principles is supported and demonstrated by all members of staff and other people working for and with Save the Children. Save the Children's Code of Conduct sets out the standards which all staff members must adhere to and the consultant is bound to sign and abide to the Save the Children's Code of Conduct.

Submission of application

Interested candidates/institutions/firms should submit a technical and financial proposal as mentioned above to Southsudantenders@savetheChildren.org . **Candidates/institutions/firms who did not fill the evaluation criteria in Annex I and did not attach requested supportive documents will not be considered for evaluation.**

Submission: All completed bids should be submitted to the below email address: Southsudantenders@savetheChildren.org and deadline is **Wednesday 09th August 2023 by 5:00pm CAT**

In case of any clarifications, please address it to Juba.Procurement@savethechildren.org.

Annex I-Evaluation Criteria

SECTION I - ESSENTIAL CRITERIA

INSTRUCTIONS – Bidders are required to complete all sections of the below table.

Item	Question	Bidder Response	
		Yes / No	Comments / Attachments
1	MANDATORY CRITERIA: bidder accepts Save the Children's 'Terms and Conditions of Purchase' included within Appendix 1 of the ITT, and that any work awarded from this tender process will be completed under the attached 'Terms and Conditions of Purchase'		
2	MANDATORY CRITERIA: The bidder and its staff (and any sub-contractors used) agree to comply with SCI and the IAPG's policies and code of conducts listed below. 1) Child Safeguarding Policy 2) Anti-Bribery & Corruption Policy 3) Human Trafficking & Modern Slavery Policy 4) Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse Policy 5) Anti-Harassment, Intimidation & Bullying Policy 6) IAPG Code of Conduct 7) Conditions of Tendering		
3	MANDATORY CRITERIA: The bidder confirms it is not linked directly or indirectly to any terrorism related activity, and does not sell any Dual-Purpose goods / services that may be used in a terror related activity.		
4	MANDATORY CRITERIA: The bidder confirms they are not a prohibited party under applicable sanctions laws or anti-terrorism laws or provide goods under sanction by the United States of America or the European Union and accepts that SCI will undertake independent checks to validate this.		
5	MANDATORY CRITERIA: The bidder confirms it is fully qualified, licensed and registered to trade with Save the Children (including compliance with all relevant local Country legislation).		

	This includes the bidder submitting the following requirements (where applicable):		Attach
	- Legitimate business address		Attach
	- Valid Tax registration number & certificate		Attach
	Valid Operating License		Attach
	Valid certificate of incorporation.		Attach
	Valid Tax Compliance Certificate.		

SECTION 2 – CAPABILITY QUESTIONS

Instructions – Bidders are required to complete all sections of the below table.

Item	Question	Bidder Response	Attachment(s)
1	Master’s degree in social sciences / International Development / Organization Development or other relevant fields and advanced skills in quantitative and qualitative research methodologies- If yes, Bidder should attach Proof of qualification.		
2	Proven track record in having conducted evaluations, Real Time Reviews in particular with use of the Outcome Harvesting Methodology approach with multiple organizations and in different locations covering different sectors etc. - If yes, Consultant should attach proof of previous experience in under taking similar assignment.	Bidder Response	Attachment(s)
3	Proven experience working in South Sudan- If yes, consultant should attach proof of experience conducting similar evaluation/s in South Sudan.		
4	Ability to work independently, take initiative and respond appropriately to constructive feedback and be proactive in conducting evaluation in consultations with the Program teams and able to submit quality report as per the agreed timelines. If Yes, consultant to clearly detail how he/she will achieve this deliverable.	Bidder Response	Attachment(s)
5	Experience in sharing and discussing review findings with clients, in-country partners and beneficiaries, and within an international research network- If yes, attach proof of experience.	Bidder Response	Attachment(s)
6		Bidder Response	Attachment(s)

	Have proven experience in layered and complex evaluations after appropriate ethical review processes and Consultant should confirm whether they have conducted a combined consortium evaluation with diverse multiple organizations . If yes, attach proof.		
7	Have a strong methodological background in multi-organizations evaluations. If Yes, Consultant should explain in detail the methodological approach he/she will employ to conduct this evaluation.	Bidder Response	Attachment(s)
8	The bidder (Evaluation team) has any experience in conducting any assignments like evaluations', RTR, Baseline etc. for the DRA or SSJR . If Yes, please share proof.		

SECTION 2 – SUSTAINABILITY QUESTIONS

Instructions – Bidders are required to complete all sections of the below table.

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Bidder Response</i>	<i>Attachment(s)</i>
1	The bidder demonstrates experience and understanding of local context and community		
2	The Bidder to confirm it is registered / has its primary operations in close proximity to the programming location. If yes, please indicate the physical address and attach proof.		