Project Evaluation Study

Request for Quotations (RFQ)

USAID/SAFE MIGRATION IN CENTRAL ASIA (SMICA)

Safe Migration in Central Asia (SMICA) is a five-year (2019-2024) activity implemented by Winrock International in Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, and funded by United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

Winrock International seeks proposals from qualified firms with experience conducting evaluations in multidimensional development sector project (TIP, migration, labor recruitment, etc.). Qualified firms are those that have been involved in similar projects in the past, particularly within the last three (3) years.

Interested parties may send their proposals as outlined here within.
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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | RFQ No. | RFQ- 2023-001- USAID SMICA |
| Issue Date | **November 20, 2023** |
| Title | Project Evaluation Study |
| Issuing Office | USAID/Safe Migration in central Asia (SMICA), Winrock International |
| Deadline for Questions |  **November 27, 2023** |
| Deadline for ProposalSubmission | **December 15, 2023** |
| Point of Contact | SMICAProcurement@winrock.org |
| Anticipated Award Type | Firm Fixed Price Subcontract |
| Basis for Award | The award will be issued to the responsible and reasonable offeror who provides the best value to the project and its client using a combination of technical and cost/price factors. |

# Introduction

The Safe Migration in Central Asia (SMICA) project aims to strengthen the ability of Central Asia (CA) to promote safe migration and reduce trafficking in persons (TIP). SMICA builds on previous United States Agency for International Development (USAID) counter trafficking in persons (CTIP) activities in CA and establishes close coordination with other U.S. Government (USG) programming to leverage additional resources, magnify impact and avoid overlap. The project collaborates with national, regional, and international experts and organizations to strengthen bilateral and multi-country strategies and actions to promote rights-based migration and counter TIP; reduce vulnerability of at-risk populations to all forms of TIP; and expand and improve identification and assistance to trafficked persons.

Winrock International invites qualified offerors to submit a proposal to conduct the Project Evaluation Study. The USAID Mission to the Kyrgyz Republic has initiated an external evaluation of the implementation of SMICA activities as they relate to the Kyrgyz Republic. Therefore, SMICA expects that the USAID Mission project evaluation will focus on beneficiaries in the Kyrgyz Republic, while this scope of work is expected to cover all aspects in the other countries where SMICA is implemented.

A study of the knowledge, attitudes, and practice (KAP) on TIP among the populations of interest was carried out at the project start-up to establish reference points and inform project design. No formal project assessments have been carried out to date.

# Scope of Work

## Project Background

The overarching goal of the SMICA project is to strengthen the mutual accountability of all stakeholders, including governments, NGOs, and the private sector to become more self-reliant in efforts to prevent trafficking in persons, protect survivors of human trafficking, and promote safe migration. With support for governmental, nongovernmental, and business stakeholders, the project addresses both push and pull factors for TIP and protection for vulnerable migrants, recognizing that these factors and the political and economic climate of each country are unique.

In order to achieve this goal, SMICA project will carry out activities that generate the following intermediate results:

- Strengthened bilateral and multi-country strategies and actions to promote rights-based migration and counter trafficking in persons (IR1)

- Vulnerability of at-risk populations to all forms of TIP reduced (IR2)

- Identification and assistance to trafficked persons expanded and improved (IR3)

- Increased Prosecution of TIP cases (IR4).

The SMICA project uses five cross-cutting themes to inform implementation under every objective of the project:

Sustainability: The project will work in close coordination with national and sub-national governments, communities, NGOs, and the private sector to strengthen existing systems, build new mechanisms where needed, and support their ownership of the initiatives.

Gender Equality and Female Empowerment: Gender affects migration and trafficking in a myriad of ways, including decisions on who will migrate and how the social networks migrants use, integration and reintegration experiences, labor opportunities at the destination, and rights and resources available in countries of origin. Through gender assessments conducted as part of situational analyses in each country, the project identified key gender-related gaps and specific issues and constraints. The project uses these analyses, along with USAID Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) related gender assessment, to inform project implementation, staffing, programmatic entry points, and indicators to ensure equitable gender participation in and benefit from each activity.

Effective Youth Integration: SMICA is rooted in a Positive Youth Development approach, which is based on the belief that “given guidance and support from caring adults, all youth can grow up healthy and productive, making positive contributions to their families, schools, and communities”. The project includes concrete and practical approaches that address the challenges that youth face as a project target community and will also involve and support young people as staff, volunteers, and community leaders within project activities.

Selective and Focused Interventions: The project is broad in scope and flexible to adapt to changing environments, funding requirements, new data, and priority needs. Despite the broad scope, the project seeks to identify and implement focused interventions that have the greatest impact and reach, support long-term change, and are tailored to specific regional, national, and sub-national contexts and needs.

Complementarity with Other Programs: The project will ensure that planned activities leverage and complement those simultaneously undertaken by other stakeholders, including intergovernmental, nongovernmental, and other agencies. The project will also coordinate with other USG and donor-funded programs implemented regionally and within each country to maximize impact.

**Figure 1: The Safe Migration in Central Asia Project Results Framework**



## Purpose of the Project Evaluation Study

*The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the project's achievements as outlined in the results framework, to assess the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, outcome and listening to and engaging with stakeholders to track the results of project interventions in relation to KAP study findings and recommendations. Aligned with ADS201, it is considered a final evaluation given that it is happening in the project’s final year. It is also considered to be an internal evaluation as it is being commissioned by USAID’s implementing partner, Winrock International.*

**Target Audiences**

The evaluation will provide USAID, Winrock International, other project stakeholders, and stakeholders working to combat TIP and promote safe migration more broadly and an assessment of the project’s performance. The evaluation results, conclusions, and recommendations will serve to inform stakeholders in the design and implementation of subsequent phases or future CTIP and safe migration projects as appropriate.

The study report will be shared with stakeholders through existing regular meetings with different key stakeholder groups and will be published in line with requirements for all USAID programs.

The final evaluation is structured around two broad, interrelated **objectives**:

**Evaluation Objective 1: Assess changes in relation to initial KAP study findings and recommendations.**

This study should evaluate overall project performance, including whether the recommendations from the initial KAP study were used by the project to formulate and implement measures to strengthen their collaboration with other assistance efforts and improvements in program implementations and how helpful they were.

**Evaluation Objective 2: Assess project’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and outcome.**

In addition to assessing project achievements, the evaluation firm will also be responsible for answering a set of evaluation questions related to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and outcome using various methods.

***Table 1*** below summarizes each evaluation criteria, proposed evaluation questions to be addressed by the evaluation firm, and potential respondents and methods to be used to collect data. The questions below are guidelines; the final key evaluation questions and methods will be decided in collaboration between Winrock and the selected firm or consultant.

**Table 1: Evaluation Questions**

| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Suggested Evaluation Questions** | **Potential Data Collection Method and Respondents** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective 1** |  |  |
| *Assess project achievements in relation to KAP study findings* | How were the recommendations from the KAP study used by the project to develop and implement measures to strengthen collaboration with other assistance programs and improve program implementation? | Interview: SMICA staff |
| How has the original design evolved during SMICA’s implementation, particularly in response to the findings from the KAP study? | Interview: SMICA staff |
| **Objective 2** |  |  |
| *Relevance* | How relevant has SMICA’s objectives, priority interventions and the approach been to the situation of the beneficiaries?  | Interview: Government,Focus Group Discussion (FGD): Beneficiaries |
| How were existing relevant USAID and U.S. government activities leveraged? | Interview: SMICA staff, USAID/USG implementers |
| To what extent were cross-cutting themes considered in the design and implementation of this project? | Interview: SMICA staff |
| *Effectiveness* | What were the major factors—including project design, implementation, and the operating environment—which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the objective targets?  | Interview: SMICA staff |
| Which project activities made the most and least significant contribution to intended strategic objectives?  | Interview: SMICA staff, Government |
| Which activities scaled up quickly compared to others, and why?   | Interview: SMICA staff |
| How do SMICA beneficiaries perceive the overall quality of project delivery and technical assistance? | FGD: Beneficiaries |
| (a) How did SMICA adapt to the pandemic and to what extent were adaptations/shifts in the program’s delivery strategy required to reach SMICA’s beneficiaries? (b) How do SMICA beneficiaries perceive the quality of the program’s adaptation?  | Interview: SMICA Staff (a) FGD: Beneficiaries (b) |
| *Efficiency* | To what extent does the management structure support efficiency for implementation, learning and reflection for Winrock and Partners, and ensure proper risk management?   | Interview: SMICA staff |
| Did any activities with relatively high impact/effectiveness have higher reach of beneficiaries than others? | Interview: SMICA staff |
| *Sustainability* | What is the likelihood that the project benefits will sustain over time after SMICA ends? Why do they think that, and how it/they will be sustained? | Interview: Government, SMICA staffFGD: Beneficiaries |
| To what extent has SMICA developed local ownership and sustainable partnerships?  | Interview: Government, SMICA staffFGD: Beneficiaries |
| Which, if any, improved institutions, or processes are likely to continue after completion of SMICA? | Interview: Government, SMICA staff |
|  | Which outcomes or outputs can be deemed sustainable? | Interview: Government, SMICA staff |

| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Suggested Evaluation Questions (continuation)** | **Potential Data Collection Method and Respondents** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Sustainability*  | What recommendations do key project stakeholders have for similar, future activities? | Interview: Government, SMICA staffFGD: Beneficiaries |
|  *Outcomes*  | What are the immediate and/or medium-term effects (intended and unintended, positive, and negative) of SMICA after over 4 years of implementation?  | Interview: Government, SMICA staffFGD: Beneficiaries |
| How could successful interventions have been optimized and/or scaled up during the project’s implementation?  | Interview: Government, SMICA staffFGD: Beneficiaries |
| What are SMICA’s main legacy areas across its four focus intermediate results (IRs)?  | Interview: SMICA staff |
| To what extent has the project contributed to strengthening the regional/bilateral cooperations to promote safe migration and reduce trafficking in persons? | Interview: Government, SMICA staff |

The evaluation questions may be further discussed and refined with the selected evaluation firm to ensure that the process captures the evaluation objectives.

## Methodology

**Methodology:** Based on the evaluation questions mentioned above, the evaluation firm is encouraged to propose cost effective research methods to respond to evaluation questions and approaches that will allow triangulation of data that are of particular interest. This section should also include information on how data will be collected and analyzed, including the software to be used and the analytical approach taken (if applicable). While designing the assessment methodology, the firm must take into consideration the SMICA Results Framework (listed in Figure 1). The selected research firm will be responsible for developing the design, methods, tools, and data collection protocols, but all final decisions regarding methodology will be made in collaboration with SMICA.

## Roles and Responsibilities

The evaluation firm will implement some or all the following activities, depending on the final evaluation design:

* Collect data with inclusion and gender perspective including collection of socio- demographic data and disaggregation by gender, age, and disability. The evaluation firm is responsible for creating and enabling environment for female and male, youth, and adult participation.
* Review project documents (other project data, KAP study data, monitoring data, quarterly and annual reports, etc.).
* In collaboration with SMICA, develop a detailed evaluation plan including study design, sampling protocols, data collection tools, data analysis plans, etc.) and timeline for the execution of the evaluation tasks (preferably a Gantt chart with work breakdown structure), and a final report structure outline.
* Translate into Russian and pilot all survey questionnaires and tools.
* Hire a field team (supervisors and data collectors), preferably recruiting experienced staff with similar research exercises in country.
* Prepare a field manual for training, then train data collectors.
* Arrange all fieldwork logistics.
* Oversee data collection and any required data entry or transcription, using appropriate quality control measures and supervision.
* Ensure anonymity of data, human subject research concerns (Do No Harm - dignity, right, safety, and privacy concerns), and confidentiality.
* Ensure that all data collections staff receive Winrock’s Ethics Training.
* Present initial findings and recommendations (drawn from their own conclusion, free from organizational or political pressure) to SMICA and Winrock AGILE team, and subsequently to USAID for feedback.
* Prepare a draft report using SMICA provided outline.
* Prepare a revised report that incorporates the feedback provided by SMICA.
* Submit a final report in English to Winrock.
* Submit cleaned datasets to SMICA in line with Winrock requirements.
* Submit to SMICA all the documents related to the study (filled questionnaires, electronic versions of the collected data, transcripts, coded qualitative (interview/focus group) data, training manual, fieldwork logs, etc.).
* Hold weekly status calls with SMICA – MEL team and senior management team.
* Prepare a research brief on any identified ethical issues and how they were addressed.
* Document “stories of change”.
* Prepare a 2-3-page stand-alone brief in English describing the evaluation design, key findings and other relevant considerations that will serve to inform any interested stakeholders of the final evaluation and should be written in language easy to understand by non-evaluators and with appropriate graphics and tables.
* Prepare a PowerPoint that includes key objectives, methods, processes, and findings of the evaluation.
* Conduct presentation of key findings delivered via webinar to SMICA and Winrock Home Office team.
* Prepare and submit final report.

*SMICA will:*

* Provide access to the research materials cited above (Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, KAP study, reports and protocols, etc.) and will ensure that the contractor receives timely feedback to the research firm on research design, all data collection tools, translation, sampling strategy and other methodological components.
* Provide TIP orientation session.
* Provide a complete list of:
	+ Direct and indirect beneficiaries
	+ Implementing partners and government partners
	+ Informing government partners and other partners about the Project Evaluation.

# General instructions to offerors

Offerors wishing to respond to this RFQ must submit proposals in English in accordance with the following instructions. Offerors must review all instructions and specifications contained in the RFQ. Failure to do so will be at the offeror’s risk. Issuance of this RFQ in no way obligates Winrock to award a subcontract. Offerors will not be reimbursed for any costs associated with preparation of submission of their proposal. Winrock shall in no case be responsible or liable for these costs.

Submission to Winrock of a proposal in response to this RFQ constitutes an offer and indicates the offeror’s agreement to the terms and conditions of this RFQ and any attachments hereto. Winrock reserves the right not to evaluate a non-responsive or incomplete proposal.

# Submission Details

# Proposal Submission Deadlines

Proposals must be received no later than before the date and time indicated on page 3 of this RFQ. Late submissions will not be accepted. Winrock International may request additional documentation after the bid deadline. Winrock will review all submitted proposals after the closing date and may conduct in-person or remote interviews with candidates under consideration.

All submissions are to be made electronically to SMICAProcurement@winrock.org with the subject line “SMICA PROJECT EVALUATION STUDY”. Please include the name of the person in your organization who is submitting the application as well as the current telephone and email contacts.

# Questions Submission Deadline

Inquiries/questions must be received no later than November 27, 2023, 17:00 Eastern Time (USA) and must be submitted via e-mail to SMICAProcurement@winrock.org. Winrock will review and responses to questions will be posted by December 4, 2023, 17:00 Eastern Time.
Winrock will evaluate complete vendor proposals to determine which proposal represents the best value to Winrock. This is an unsealed solicitation request. Winrock reserves the right to negotiate with the vendors with or without discussion.

**Proposal Structured & Required Documentation**

Offerors must submit 2 sets of proposals, including a technical proposal and cost proposal in separate files, with all pieces of the proposal labeled clearly. Each proposal should be typed in 12-point font. Submissions must be in English and typed single-spaced. All pages must be numbered and include the RFQ reference number and name of organization on each and every page.

The proposal submission should include each of the following sections in the specific order listed below in order to be considered for this consultancy:

**Technical Proposal**

The technical proposal (not to exceed 13 pages) shall include:

* **Organization** **Information (1 page):** The applicant shall list legal business name, authorized contact including address, phone number and email; proof of business registration. Briefly describe the history, vision/objectives of the organization, legal/registration status, and organizational structure. A photocopy of the organization’s registration certificate and latest audited financial statement should be attached as an annex. This section should also state the organization’s legal status in Central Asia, if applicable.
* **Analysis and Proposed Approaches/Methodologies (maximum of 5 pages):** Describe the underlying assumptions, conditions, and constraints that will inform the applicant’s approach and guiding principles to evaluation. Describe the proposed approaches and methodologies for addressing the research questions laid out in Evaluation objectives 1 and 2. Describe the proposed methods for data collection. This section should include information on how data will be collected and analyzed, including the software to be used and the analytical approach taken (e.g., will inductive or deductive coding be used for qualitative analysis?) Explain the perceived risks related to the assignment and proposed actions to mitigate them. This should also outline any ethical considerations including issues of consent/assent and plans for protecting human subjects.
* **Work Plan (maximum of 2 pages)** The applicant shall propose an activity-based work plan that is consistent with the timeline, technical approach, and methodology described, structured around key milestones of the evaluation process. The work plan should follow the example illustrated in the **Table 2** below. A Gantt chart can also be used to illustrate the work plan.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 2: Illustrative schedule of activity-based work plan** |
| **Activity Milestones** | **Week 1** | **Week 2** | **Week 3** | **Week 4** | **Week 5** | ***(Etc.)*** |
| **Phase I - Engagement** |
| Inception Meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inception Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Work Plan Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *(Etc. as proposed by applicant)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Phase II – Research and Data Collection** |
| Work Plan approval |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preparations and training |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data collection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Field-based interviews |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drafting of report |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demobilization |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *(Etc. as proposed by applicant)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Phase III – Analysis and Reporting** |
| Collaborative editing of draft Evaluation Report  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collaborative editing of final Evaluation Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *(Etc. as proposed by applicant)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* **Proposed Level of Effort (1 page):** For the SOW response, the applicant shall propose the total number of person-days required at that skill level to fulfill each of the evaluation activities. (For example, if 10 enumerators will work for 10 days on data collection, then 10 people x 10 days = 100 person-days). 3 below presents an example of how to document activity-based effort across the team:

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3: Illustrative schedule of activity based LOE for evaluation team members** |
| **Activity Milestones** | **Team Leader** | **Senior Expert(s)** | **Senior Analyst(s)** | **Junior Field Staff**  |
| **Phase I – Engagement** |
| Inception Meeting | *## person-days* | *## person-days* | *## person-days* | *## person-days* |
| Inception Report |  |  |  |  |
| Work Plan Development |  |  |  |  |
| *(Etc. as proposed by applicant)* |  |  |  |  |
| **Phase II – Research and Data Collection** |
| Work Plan approval |  |  |  |  |
| Preparations and training |  |  |  |  |
| Data collection |  |  |  |  |
| Field-based interviews |  |  |  |  |
| Data analysis |  |  |  |  |
| Drafting of report |  |  |  |  |
| Demobilization |  |  |  |  |
| *(Etc. as proposed by applicant)* |  |  |  |  |
| **Phase III – Analysis and Reporting**  |
| Collaborative editing of draft Evaluation Report  |  |  |  |  |
| Collaborative editing of final Evaluation Report |  |  |  |  |
| *(Etc. as proposed by applicant)* |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL DAYS:** |  |  |  |  |

* **Technical Experience and Past Performance References** (**maximum of 2 pages):** The applicant shall provide a summary of the organization’s technical capacity to conduct monitoring and evaluation in general – with particular focus on final evaluations. The applicant should include details of contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements involving similar or related assignments within the last three-five years. Reference information must include the location, a brief description of the scale and scope of work performed, total compensation value, and the current contact phone number of a responsible and knowledgeable representative of the organization. Winrock reserves the right to contact these projects as an organizational reference as part of the selection process.
* **Sample Technical Output (Annexed/Attached):** The applicant shall include one or more examples of a report or deliverable submitted to a client that relates to mid-term, final evaluation, end line study, survey of multidimensional development sector projects.
* **Personnel and Team Composition (maximum of 2 pages):** The applicant shall list and briefly describe the names, qualifications, and functions of the proposed evaluation team. This must include at least three key personnel – a Team Leader and at least two other professionals. The Evaluation Team Leader must meet the qualifications and experience described in **Appendix A** – Evaluation Team Composition. The skills and qualifications for other key personnel are subject to the applicant’s discretion. CVs of all three key personnel (not to exceed 5 pages for each) must be included as an annex to the technical proposal; up to three other CVs may be included for reference.

**Financial Proposal:**

The offeror must present a detailed financial proposal that covers the following items and includes a narrative on the assumptions behind the estimates.

* Salaries. Including personnel for technical assistance, data collection, data, data entry, and analysis, (e.g., staff, enumerators, supervisors, drivers).
* Per diem and Travel. Includes daily costs for lodging and meals and incidental expenses during training and during field work, mode of transportation, vehicle rental, gas.
* Printing. Including survey questionnaires (if applicable), other study tools, reports.
* Communications. Including internet service, cell service, mobile data, etc.
* Supplies. Including paper, pens, bags, other materials for data collection and field work.
* Training costs
* Other relevant costs
* The cost quoted must include unit price and total price in USD.

Additionally, the offeror shall submit on a separate sheet with the fixed price for the anticipated deliverables under this RFQ.

# Evaluation criteria

Proposals must clearly demonstrate alignment with the SOW described above with an adequate level of detail.

A Proposal Evaluation Committee designated by Winrock will review the technical and financial proposals, assess, score, and rank them according to the technical (Table 4) and financial (Table 5) evaluation criteria shown in the tables. The proposals will be scored according to the points shown for each criterion. The technical proposal will carry a 90% weight (Technical Pass Mark is 50%), and the financial proposal will carry a 10% weight. As a part of the evaluation process, the bidder may be interviewed/asked for a presentation on the submitted proposal by the Proposal Evaluation Committee. Only firms/consultants that obtain more than 50 points in the technical proposal will have their financial proposal reviewed.

**Technical Proposal**

The technical evaluation criteria and allocated points are summarized in Table 4 below.

**Table 4: Technical evaluation criteria**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Technical Criteria** | **Points** |
| **1** | **Experience of the Team & Team Composition (composed of 1a, 1b, 1c)**  | **25** |
| 1a | Minimum of 3 years of demonstrated experience in designing and conducting final evaluations and similar studies on TIP, migration, labor recruitment activities etc. in development sector.  | 5 |
| 1b | Knowledge of USAID performance monitoring systems, conducting evaluations or assessments preferably for the development sectors noted above incriterion 1a. | 5 |
| 1c | Team Leader and Other Team Member previous experience in similar assignments, as described in this scope of work.   | 15 |
| **2** | **Experience with Survey Design/Approaches/Methodologies, Data Collection, Data Analysis and Findings (composed of 2a, 2b, 2c)**  | **50** |
| 2a | Appropriateness and quality of proposed approaches/methodologies  | 40 |
| 2b | Demonstrated experience with data analysis, and extracting key findings, conclusions, and recommendations. | 5 |
| 2c | Experience with the Most Significant Change (MSC) technique and documenting the change stories.  | 5 |
| **3** | **Evaluation Planning and Management**  | **15** |
| 3a | Proposed work plan activities and timeframe.  | 10 |
| 3b | Verified references. | 5 |
|   | **Total technical points (1 + 2 + 3)**  | **90** |

**Financial Proposal**

The financial proposal shall include a calculation of total compensation based on the level of effort described and the daily rates proposed for the various positions.

All other direct costs (e.g., travel, logistics, materials, etc.) will be negotiated with the applicant after selection based on the level of effort (LOE) and daily rate criteria.

The financial evaluation criteria and allocated points are detailed in **Table 5** below.

**Table 5:  Financial evaluation criteria**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Financial Evaluation Criteria for Selection** | **Points** |
| 1 | Sufficiency, reasonableness, and accuracy of detailed expenditures including per unit cost, with budget per unit cost budget clearly defined in USD.  | 5 |
| 2 | Budget explanation and justification of costs.  | 5 |
|   | **Total financial Points (1 + 2)**  | **10** |

# Award

Winrock will review all proposals, and make an award based on the evaluation criteria stated above and select the offeror whose proposal represents the best value to SMICA project. Winrock may also exclude an offer from consideration if it determines that an offeror is "not responsible", i.e., that it does not have the management and financial capabilities required to perform the work required.

Evaluation points will not be awarded for cost. Cost will primarily be evaluated for realism and reasonableness. Winrock may award a higher priced offeror if a determination is made that the higher technical evaluation of that offeror merits the additional cost/price.

Winrock may award an offeror without discussions. Therefore, the initial offer must contain the offeror’s best price and technical terms.

## Anticipated deliverables, payments, and completion dates

**Deliverables**

All deliverables under this assignment are internal to the evaluation team, Winrock and USAID, unless otherwise instructed by Winrock. Key evaluation deliverables are as follows. Table 6 below provides a list of key milestones and dates. A list of deliverables and their due dates is included in **Appendix B**.

* **Inception Report and Work Plan**

This report will summarize the agenda and conclusions of the inception meeting, which will involve the contractor, selected members of the SMICA team, representatives from the Winrock home office, and perhaps USAID staff. During the meeting, the evaluation team will review and discuss the SOW in its entirety, clarify team member roles and responsibilities, prepare the work plan, develop data collection methods, review, and clarify any logistical and administrative procedures for the assignment.

Based on the outcome of the inception meeting and report, the evaluation team will provide a revised work plan to SMICA Chief of Party (COP). Winrock will provide any necessary feedback or edits, after which the evaluation team will submit a final version of the document.

At a minimum, the work plan should include (a) a task timeline, (b) a description of the methodology to answer each evaluation question, (c) team responsibilities, (d) document review process, (e) key informant and stakeholder meetings, (f) site visits details, and (g) draft and final report outlines.

* **Evaluation Plan**

This deliverable will expand upon the analysis and approaches/methodologies proposed by the evaluator in the technical proposal. It will serve as a guiding framework for the rest of the evaluation and will be included as an annex in the Final Evaluation Report.  The evaluator will describe the data collection instruments to be applied and how they will be applied during the evaluation. After acceptance of the evaluation methodology and data collection instruments by SMICA, the evaluator will train survey enumerators, supervisors, interviewers, documenters, and data encoders, for the sample survey data collection, as proposed in the SOW submission, and appropriate to the scope of work. The training should include pre-testing of the instruments in select project sites. Training activities should be documented in a training report.

* **Weekly Updates**

To ensure ongoing communication, the Evaluation Team Leader will provide a bulleted weekly email update to SMICA and Winrock headquarters (or any other designated evaluation Point of Contact) reporting on progress. Any delays must be communicated immediately to Winrock to allow quick resolution and to minimize any disruptions to the evaluation. Emerging opportunities to strengthen the evaluation should also be discussed with Winrock headquarters and the COP and MEL Manager, as they arise.

* **Draft Evaluation Report**

A *Preliminary Draft Evaluation Report* must be submitted to Winrock headquarters and COP by **April 5, 2024**. Winrock and USAID will provide comments to the evaluation team by **April 15, 2024**.  A *Revised Evaluation Report* will then be submitted to Winrock headquarters and COP that incorporates responses to comments on the preliminary draft and offered in the event/workshop. The written report should clearly describe findings, conclusions, and recommendations in separate sections. **Appendix C**presents an outline of the reporting requirements. The report should answer all the evaluation questions, and the structure of the report should make it clear how the questions were answered. The draft report must have well-constructed sentences that are presented in a way that clearly presents findings, conclusions, and recommendations.  The draft report must be of a high quality with no grammatical errors or typos. A report is high quality when it represents a thoughtful, well-researched and well-organized effort to objectively evaluate what worked on SMICA, what did not work, and why.

* **Virtual Event/Workshop**

This will be attended by SMICA management, the home office project team and USAID, to be conducted virtually during the month of **April 2024**. The event/workshop will serve to present and discuss the key findings, conclusions and recommendations stemming from the evaluation. Input from the stakeholders can be used to refine the draft Evaluation Report.

* **Documented “stories of change”**

The evaluation team in coordination with SMICA and Winrock HO should select the “most significant stories” from data collected and evaluation team is expected to submit documented “stories of change”.

* **Stand-alone brief**

The evaluation team will submit a 2-3-page stand-alone brief in English describing the evaluation design, key findings and other relevant considerations that will serve to inform any interested stakeholders of the final evaluation and should be written in language easy to understand by non-evaluators and with appropriate graphics and tables.

* **Final Evaluation Report**

The evaluation team will submit the Revised Draft Evaluation Report to Winrock electronically in English. To the extent possible, all information that is compiled from field-based studies should be (i) provided in an electronic file in an easily readable format; and (ii) organized and fully documented for use by persons not fully familiar with the project or the evaluation. The report format should follow the template for drafting evaluation reports for USAID-funded Projects.This template will be provided to the firm upon award.

Winrock will review and edit the Revised Draft Evaluation Report as needed and engage the Evaluation Team Leader in this process.  When completed, Winrock will submit this draft to USAID for their review and comments. Following receipt of these, Winrock will produce a Final Evaluation Report that incorporates responses to USAID’s comments.

The Final Evaluation Report will be professionally formatted and submitted to USAID for publication in accordance with the USAID Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. Winrock shall provide a copy of the evaluation report that is free of personally identifiable information (PII) and proprietary information. Winrock will sign and return the USAID public evaluation disclosure statement with the final version of the evaluation report. Copies will be distributed via email to partners and key stakeholders for free distribution. Hard copies will also be published and delivered to USAID’s designees upon request. Upon completion of the project, SMICA reports will be archived in Winrock’s home servers and will remain available upon request.

**Payments and Completion dates**

Upon award of a subcontract, the deliverables and deadlines detailed in the below table will be submitted to Winrock. Payment will be made within 30 calendar days upon acceptance and approval of a deliverable and Invoice by Winrock. Note that throughout the life of the subcontract, the Evaluation Team Leader will provide weekly email updates to SMICA and Winrock headquarters on progress.

**Table 6. Key milestones and dates**

| **Activities** | **Estimated Date of Completion**  | **Deliverables** | **Amount****(% of Total)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1**. Award and Contract Signing** | **January 5, 2024** | * Fully executed Final Evaluation contract
 |  |
| **2. Inception meeting (kick-off)** with SMICA and Winrock team to discuss the study design and gain full alignment on the evaluation requirements. | **January 12, 2024** |  |  |
| **3. Desk Review** of SMICA project-related documents, including the MELP and other relevant project-level studies/assessments. | **Week of January 8, 2024** |  |  |
| **4. Draft Inception Report with Evaluation Design** for data collection and analysis, including agreed methodologies, data quality assurance plan, data collection tools, enumerators training, detailed work plan, logistics, etc. | **January 24, 2024** | * 1st draft of the Inception Report
 |  |
| **5. SMICA feedback on the Inception Report received** |  **February 2, 2024** |  |  |
| **6. Final Inception Report with Evaluation Plan** | **February 9, 2024** | * Approved Inception Report
 | 20% |
| **7. Training of Enumerators/Data Collectors** covering SMICA project background, confidentiality, and Do No Harm (dignity, rights, safety and privacy) considerations, data collection tools using a mobile app, and interviewing skills. | **Week of February 12, 2024** | * Approved Training Report
 |  |
| **8. Field work completed for the Survey, FGDs and/or KIIs** | **March 15, 2024** |  |  |
| **9. Report on field survey data collection and survey data consolidation**. Organize all data collected; consolidate survey data into a database, exportable into a MS Excel template. Ensure anonymity of data, Do No Harm (dignity, rights, safety, and privacy) concerns, and confidentiality. | **March 22, 2024** | * Qualitative datasets and report
 | 30% |
|  |  |  |  |
| **10. Draft Study Report** (including all datasets) | **April 5, 2024** | * 1st draft of Evaluation Report
 | 30% |
| **11. Virtual Event/Workshop to present draft Evaluation Report findings to Winrock / USAID****12. SMICA feedback on draft Evaluation Report received** (from Winrock & USAID) | **April 2024 (TBD)****April 15, 2024** | * Approved event/workshop agenda
 |  |
| **13. Final Study Report, a stand-alone brief and documented “stories of change”** submitted to SMICA  |  **April 22, 2024** | * Revised Final Evaluation Report for submission to USAID
 |  |
| **15.** **Available for follow-up guidance** per donor requests for clarification on final report. | **May 10, 2024** | * Approved Final Evaluation Report USAID
 | 20% |

***Please note that:***

* ***The fixed price for the deliverables should be inclusive of all taxes.***
* ***The anticipated deliverables and associated payments may be adjusted based on agreement between research firm/consultant and Winrock International (after successful firm/consultant is selected)***

# Confidentiality Statement

This document, and any attachments thereto, regardless of form or medium, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential, copyrighted, trademarked, patented, or otherwise restricted information viewable by the intended recipient only. If you are not the intended recipient of this document (or the person responsible for delivering this document to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, printing or copying of this document, and any attachment thereto, is strictly prohibited and violation of this condition may infringe upon copyright, trademark, patent, or other laws protecting proprietary and, or, intellectual property. In no event shall this document be delivered to anyone other than the intended recipient or original sender and violation may be considered a breach of law fully punishable by various domestic and international courts. If you have received this document in error, please respond to the originator of this message or email him/her at the address below and permanently delete and/or shred the original and any copies and any electronic form this document, and any attachments thereto and do not disseminate further.

Where no notice is given, all information contained herein is Copyright 2021 Winrock International.

# Certification of Independent Price Determination

(a) The offeror certifies that—

(1) The prices in this offer have been arrived at independently, without, for the purpose of restricting competition, any consultation, communication, or agreement with any other offeror, including but not limited to subsidiaries or other entities in which offeror has any ownership or other interests, or any competitor relating to (i) those prices, (ii) the intention to submit an offer, or (iii) the methods or factors used to calculate the prices offered;

(2) The prices in this offer have not been and will not be knowingly disclosed by the offeror, directly or indirectly, to any other offeror, including but not limited to subsidiaries or other entities in which offeror has any ownership or other interests, or any competitor before bid opening (in the case of a sealed bid solicitation) or contract award (in the case of a negotiated or competitive solicitation) unless otherwise required by law; and

(3) No attempt has been made or will be made by the offeror to induce any other concern or individual to submit or not to submit an offer for the purpose of restricting competition or influencing the competitive environment.

(b) Each signature on the offer is considered to be a certification by the signatory that the signatory—

(1) Is the person in the offerors organization responsible for determining the prices being offered in this bid or proposal, and that the signatory has not participated and will not participate in any action contrary to subparagraphs (a)(1) through (a)(3) above; or

(2) (i) Has been authorized, in writing, to act as agent for the principals of the offeror in certifying that those principals have not participated, and will not participate in any action contrary to subparagraphs (a)(1) through (a)(3) above; (ii) As an authorized agent, does certify that the principals of the offeror have not participated, and will not participate, in any action contrary to subparagraphs (a)(1) through (a)(3) above; and (iii) As an agent, has not personally participated, and will not participate, in any action contrary to subparagraphs (a)(1) through (a)(3) above.

(c) Offeror understands and agrees that –

(1) violation of this certification will result in immediate disqualification from this solicitation without recourse and may result in disqualification from future solicitations; and

(2) Discovery of any violation after award to the offeror will result in the termination of the award for default.

# Appendix A: Recommended Evaluation Team Composition

The evaluation team shall be composed of a technically qualified, gender-balanced, and culturally sensitive staff of professionals with proven experience working in the development sector with a focus on TIP and safe migration.

**Team Leader/Evaluation Specialist.** The Team Leader will provide overall leadership for the team, and s/he will draft the evaluation design, coordinate activities, arrange periodic meetings, consolidate individual input from team members, and coordinate the process of assembling the final findings and recommendations into a high-quality document.

S/he will lead the preparation and presentation of the key evaluation findings and recommendations to the SMICA staff at Winrock headquarters and other major stakeholders*.* The evaluation Team Leader will report to the chief of party and designated Winrock Evaluation Manager and coordinate in the field with SMICA staff as needed to acquire necessary information, contact local partners and key informants, and facilitate site visits and other surveys.It will be the responsibility of the Evaluation Team Leader to ensure the communication and coordination needed for the survey to produce the field-based information needed for the evaluation.

Minimum qualifications include:

* a master’s degree in social sciences field – or 3+ of similar experience at the senior level
* a minimum of 3+ years of professional work experience in donor-funded development programming and/or economic development
* demonstrated experience of conducting similar research and studies
* familiarity with donor regulations and systems, including performance monitoring guidance on gender policies and guidance, project management, and reporting
* experience with the Most Significant Change (MSC) technique
* fluency in English and excellent communication skills – particularly writing.

**Senior Experts/Analysts:** The Team Leader will be supported by a multi-disciplinary evaluation team consisting of one or more members possessing a diverse and complementary set of technical capacities – preferably experience with:

* qualitative and quantitative approaches and methodologies for research and analysis
* survey design – including experience creating data collection tools, and with data analysis, and extracting key findings and conclusions
* experience to work in a multicultural environment and to hire qualified field-survey personnel.

**Junior Field Staff:** The evaluation team will be supported by a staff of junior-level enumerators and data collection agents – to be recruited and managed by the evaluation firm.

# Appendix B: List of key deliverables and due dates

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Due date** |
| Draft Inception Report with Evaluation Design | **January 24, 2024** |
| Final Inception Report with Evaluation Plan  | **February 9, 2024** |
| Weekly Updates | **Ongoing** |
| Draft Study Report | **April 5, 2024** |
| Virtual Event / Workshop | **TBD (April 2024)** |
| Final Study Report | **April 22, 2024** |
| Available for follow-up guidance  | **May 10, 2024** |

# Appendix C: Reporting Requirements

|  |
| --- |
| **Cover Page** (with photo, if possible)**List of Acronyms****Table of Contents**, which identifies page numbers for the major content areas of the report.**Executive Summary** – Stand-alone document that concisely states the project background and purpose, evaluation questions, design, methods, limitations, findings, conclusions, and recommendations (not to exceed 4 pages)**Body of Report****1. Introduction and Purpose*** 1. **Project Context** - Describe the context in the country that the project is being implemented, including any social, political, demographic, institutional, or gender equality factors that are relevant to the project.
	2. **Project Description** – Describe the project including, project activities and implementation strategy, location(s) of project activities, target population, stakeholder roles and contribution to the project, project status, and budget.
	3. **Results Framework** – Include the project’s theory of change, results framework graphic, and critical assumptions.
	4. **Purpose of the Evaluation** – Describe the purpose of the evaluation including the evaluation type and purpose, any previous evaluations related to the project, the intended audience of the evaluation, how the evaluation findings will be used by the implementer, and how the evaluation informs the program’s broader Learning Agenda.
1. **Evaluation Design and Methodology**
	1. **Evaluation Questions** - List the evaluation questions in the context of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability (as outlined in the final evaluation TOR).
	2. **Evaluation Design –** Describe the overall design/approach used for the evaluation, including the type of evaluation, how culturally appropriate participatory methods were incorporated into the design, and how ethical standards regarding all participants, especially at-risk populations, were incorporated into the evaluation design.
	3. **Sampling Methods –** Describe the basic sampling strategy used during the evaluation including the sampling frame, rationale and mechanics of participant selection for the sample, number of participants selected out of potential subjects, selection criteria for any counterfactual/control groups (as applicable), limitations of the sample, minimum detectable effect and confidence level.
	4. **Data Collection Methods -** Describe data collection methods and instruments (both qualitative and quantitative) and analysis tools used in the evaluation. The actual instruments themselves (e.g., full surveys and interview guides) should be included in the annexes. Items of discussion include level of precision (quantitative), value scales or coding used (qualitative), level of participation, description of how tools were developed/adapted to be relevant to local stakeholders and culturally appropriate, empowerment of stakeholders through the evaluation process, reliability of the data, and how the data collection methods were design to collect gender related data, including disaggregated data and questions reflecting gender issues.
	5. **Data Analysis Methods –** Describe how those data are analyzed. Common methods of analysis include regressions, difference-in-difference calculations, interview coding, etc. It should be clear how these methods are linked to each of the evaluation questions and why they are appropriate to answer those questions.
	6. **Evaluation Limitations -** Outline key limitations of the evaluation (for example: lack of data; selection bias as to sites, interviewees, comparison groups; seasonal unavailability of key informants; contamination of control groups, etc.) and how these were mitigated.
2. **Findings -** Findings are empirical facts based on data collected during the evaluation and should not rely only on opinion, even of experts. It should report both qualitative and quantitative data, and also report on the project’s key performance indicators (a table with the results of all performance indicators should be included in an annex). The findings should also consider the possibility of unintended side effects of the intervention. This could include an analysis of how project interventions affected various segments of the population differently (e.g., different affects based on gender, socio-economic status, age, etc.).
3. **Conclusions -** Describe the conclusions of the evaluation. Clearly explain how the logic behind the conclusions correlate with actual findings. Conclusions should be substantiated by findings consistent with data collected and methodology used and ultimately answer the Evaluation Questions. If conclusions are tentative, clearly identify the details of what is known and what can be plausibly assumed. Ensure the conclusions add value to the findings. Do not highlight simple conclusions that are already well known and obvious.
4. **Recommendations -** Recommendations should be relevant to the project, Terms of Reference (TOR), and objectives of the evaluation and formulated clearly and concisely. Describe how the evidence and analysis provide the basis for the recommendations. Recommendations must be specific and actionable, prioritized to the extent possible, and include responsibilities and a timeframe for their implementation. They should also take into account gender and other intersectional issues, as relevant.

**Annexes –** All relevant annexes should be part of the report. Annexes that are required for evaluations are: bibliography, table of indicator data, results framework, data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocol, sampling tools, etc.), terms of reference or statement of work for the evaluation, conflict of interest forms, key elements of statistical results. Note that Winrock requires evaluators to submit a version of the report free from personally identifiable information (PII). Items that should NOT be included in the Annexes (or anywhere in the report) include: a list of participants and/or people interviewed for evaluation and names, email addresses, phone numbers, addresses, or similar information linked to individuals. |

# Attachment A: KAP STUDY REPORT

(Please see this report posted on the same page where this RFQ was posted)

