|  |
| --- |
| **Request for Quotation** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FROM** | **NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL** |
| Address | 24 Othman Ibn Afan St., Sheikh Jarrah |
| City | Jerusalem |
| Country | Palestine |
| Email | [ps.procurement@nrc.no](mailto:ps.procurement@nrc.no) |

The office of the Norwegian Refugee Council invites your company to submit a price quotation for Consultancy for Impact Evaluation in accordance with the requirements detailed below. You may use your company format or fill up the table below. Please carefully read the instructions on page 2.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Request for Quotation Requirements** | | | |
| RFQ # : | PS 6-2025 | Currency | USD |
| RFQ Issuing Date: | 10/03/2025 | Bid Validity Period (days): | 90 Days |
| RFQ Closing Date: | 17/03/2025 | Required Delivery Date: | As per deliverables timetable |
| RFQ Closing Time: | 23:00 Jerusalem Time | Required Delivery Destination: | n/a |
| Questions to the RFQ | [Ps.procurement@nrc.no](mailto:Ps.procurement@nrc.no) | Required Delivery Terms: | N/A |

The requested services under this RFQ will be detailed in the tables below.

This RFQ has the following Annexes to it:

* Annex 1: Terms of Reference (in this Document)

**RFQ Terms & Conditions**

**Manner of Submission:**

Deadline for bid submission is 17.03.2025 - 16:00 Jerusalem time. Sent to [Ps.Procurement@nrc.no](mailto:Ps.Procurement@nrc.no) with the subject - **PS -06-2025 Impact Evaluation Consultancy.**

**Requirements:**

* All Bids must include all customs and taxes payable in the country of delivery unless the RFQ specifically requests differently.
* Bids must be submitted in the currency indicated in the RFQ. Bids in other currency might not be accepted.
* It is NRC requirement that all consultants, ltd or sole trade, must be registered in accordance with the legal requirements at their base. The consultant must be able to submit documentation that proves that they are meeting all legal and tax obligation for the consultancy. If this is not possible, the consultant (sole trader) confirms by signing the Consultant declaration (Mandatory) that he/she complied with self-employment regulation in his/her country of origin.
* Your quotation should clearly indicate/ Include the following:
  + **Financial proposa**l quoted in USD, in the form of a lump sum and unit costs
  + **Currency of offer:** USD
  + **Copy of company registration** or signed consultant declaration.
  + **Copy of Tax Registration**
  + **Copies of Consultant’s** passport or ID (for Vetting purposes)
  + **Ethical Declaration** attached to this document- Signed and stamped.
  + **Validity of the offer**: 90 days.

NRC reserves the right to accept or reject the whole or part of your quotation based on the information provided. Incomplete quotations that do not comply with our conditions will not be considered.

**Assessment Criteria:**

All bids received and accepted will be evaluated based on the following criteria, **therefore please make sure you submit relevant documents needed for below evaluations:**

* **Step 1: Administrative compliance check:** Each bid will be checked to ensure compliance with all the RFQ requirements:
  + Cover letter
  + CV
  + Outline of evaluation framework and methods, detailed workplan and budget
  + Two References of former employers within the last three years
* **Step 2: Technical Evaluation**: shortlisted bidders from step 1 will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation criteria** | **Score** | **Scoring system** |
| Experience & qualifications of the consultant (education, Years of Experience (average), areas of expertise, ...) | 15 | Education (Sociology, Anthropology, Political Sciences) or any other relevant study (Geography, Statistics, etc.) |
| 15 | Experience in research / evaluation |
| 5 | Previous experience with humanitarian organizations |
| 5 | Provision of 3 relevant references of former employers |
| Evaluation methodology and framework | 10 | Workplan meeting the timeline provided |
| 10 | Provision of details on evaluation framework and methodology, and suggestions on evaluation planning |
| 10 | Provision of a detailed budget on the different expenses (salaries, movements, enumerators, etc.) |
| **TOTAL** | **70** |  |

Only bidders passing the technical evaluation will go through to the financial evaluation.

**Step 3: Financial Evaluation**: Financial bids from the shortlisted bidders who passed the Technical Evaluation will be evaluated in comparison to NRC established expectation and in comparison, to other bidders of comparable technical quality.

* Hourly Rate : 30%

Consultant Qualification.

***Evaluation Team Leader***

* Educational background in Sociology, Anthropology, Political Sciences.
* Experience in conducting evaluation and research work.
* Proven experience in designing qualitative and quantitative data collection methods, and data analysis.
* Capacity to conduct focus group discussions and in-depth interviews.
* Knowledge in humanitarian work, humanitarian settings and interventions, development.
* Knowledge of the West Bank and East Jerusalem context, including historical trends.
* Fluency in English and Arabic.
* Communication and good organizational skills.
* Capacity to lead a team and work collaboratively.

***Data collectors***

* Experience in conducting data collection, including semi-structured and structured interviews.
* Knowledge in humanitarian work, humanitarian settings and interventions, development.
* Knowledge of the West Bank and East Jerusalem context.
* Good sense of communication.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| NRC is obliged to ensure that its procurement decisions are clearly justified and documented and keeping within the Donors mandatory principles. In that regard, full and on-the-spot access must be granted to representatives of NRC, the Donor or any organisation or person mandated by it, to premises belonging to NRC or its contractors. The right to access shall include all documents and information necessary to assess, or audit the implementation of the contract.  NRC also expects suppliers who process personal data to comply with the General Data Protection Regulation (EU GDPR) and any relevant national legislation.  Suppliers processing personal data on an NRC contract will be required to sign a data processing / sharing agreement as part of the contract.  Refusal to sign such an agreement constitutes refusal of the contract terms and forfeiture of the contract on the part of the supplier.  If the activities of the contract take place in areas with Explosive Hazards, NRC accepts no liability for injury and/or death to contractor’s staff or damage to contractor’s property. | Anti-money laundering, anti-bribery, anti-corruption and anti-terrorism legislation and donor regulations require NRC to screen contractors against various international lists to ensure due diligence.  Submission of the quotation constitutes acceptance of these screening practices.  NRC aims to purchase products and services with minimum environmental impact. Environmental considerations form part of the NRC selection criteria, and NRC reserves the right to reject quotations provided by suppliers not meeting these standards.  All suppliers doing business with NRC should maintain high standards on ethical and environmental issues, respect and apply basic human and social rights, ensure non-exploitation of child labour, and give fair working conditions to their staff. **Suppliers will be required to sign and submit an Ethical Standards Declaration, together with their bid**.  NRC reserves the right to reject quotations provided by suppliers not meeting these standards. |

**Please provide information on each requirement.**

Additional rows can be inserted for all questions as necessary. If there is insufficient space to complete your answer in the space provided, please include it on a separate attachment with a reference to the question.

**Bidder’s General Business Details**

**General information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name (If applicable):** |  |
| **Primary contact name:** |  |
| **Job title:** |  |
| **Phone:** |  |
| **Email:** |  |
| **Registered Address:** |  |
| **Business licence number:** |  |
| **Country of registration** |  |
| **Registration date:** |  |
| **Expiry date:** |  |

**Owners/Managers (if applicable)**

Please fill in the below table with the full names, title/position, year of birth, and country of birth of the company’s owner(s) and manager(s)\*:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Full Name** | **Title / Position** | **Birth Year** | **Birth Country** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

*\* Please note this information is necessary in order to conduct the vetting procedure referred.  Owners and managers include but are not limited to Chief Executive Officer, Chief Operating Officer, Chair of the Board, Executive Director, Director, Manager.*

**Employees (if applicable)**

Please list the employees who would be involved with NRC in the event of contract award:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Employee name** | **Job title** | **Role on NRC project** | **Phone** | **Email** |
| 1. |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |

**Confirmation of Bidder’s Compliance**

We, the Bidder, hereby certify that our RFQ is a genuine offer and intended to be competitive and we confirm we are eligible to participate in public procurement and meet the eligibility criteria specified in the Invitation to Bid. We confirm that the prices quoted are fixed and firm for the duration of the validity period and will not be subject to revision or variation.

We, the Bidder confirm the documents attached to this offer are those validated by us.

We understand that NRC is not bound to accept the lowest, or indeed any bid, received.

We agree that NRC may verify the information provided in this form itself or through a third party as it may deem necessary.

**We confirm that NRC may in its consideration of our offer, and subsequently, rely on the statements made herein.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of Signatory: | Tel N°: |
| Title of Signatory: | Name of Company: |
| Signature & stamp: | Date of Signing: |
| Address: |

## Annex 1 Terms of Reference

**TERMS OF REFERENCE WBPC – Impact Evaluation**

**Background:**

The Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) is an independent, humanitarian, non-profit, non-governmental organization that provides assistance, protection and durable solutions to refugees and internally displaced persons worldwide.

1. **Project**

The West Bank Protection Consortium (WBPC) was established in 2015 and is funded by ECHO and other institutional donors. It brings together five International Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs):

* Action Against Hunger (ACF)
* Acted
* Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)
* Premiere Urgence Internationale (PUI)
* We World (WW)

The project aims to protect Palestinians in the West Bank and East Jerusalem from forcible transfers. The Consortium operates mostly in Area C of the West Bank and East Jerusalem. Its coordination offices are located in East Jerusalem (NRC, ACF, Acted) and in Ramallah (WW, PUI). All the five NGOs have at least one base in the West Bank, ensuring geographical coverage from north to south.

The Consortium is funded by DG-ECHO, along with various other donors. Starting with six donors in 2015, the Consortium has expanded over the years, reaching 14 donors in 2024. Fundings has increased from 7.4 million euros in 2015 to 27.4 million euros in 2024.

The project has three main pillars of intervention: 1. Emergency preparedness and responses to the violations of International Humanitarian Law (IHL)/ International Human Rights Law (IHRL), including demolitions, settler violence and forcible transfers, 2. Resilience building through community protection approach (CPA), material assistance and legal aid, 3. Humanitarian advocacy.

1. **Evaluation purpose and target audience**

The purpose of this evaluation is not only to enhance project implementation by identifying strengths and areas for improvement but also to assess how the project can best adapt to recent contextual changes.

It will enable Consortium members to critically examine the activities carried out and support future strategic and operational decision-making to ensure the project remains as relevant and effective as possible.

1. **Evaluation objective and scope**

The objectives of the evaluation will be to:

1. Assess the degree to which outcomes have been achieved through WBPC activities implementation.
2. Assess the contribution of the project toward the intended impact – prevent the forcible transfer of Palestinian households and communities.
3. Identify lessons learnt and provide guidance on ways to adapt the activities to the actual context.

The evaluation will focus on the following aspects of the project:

* Relevance[[1]](#footnote-2): Is the intervention doing the right things? The extent to which the intervention’s objectives and design respond to beneficiaries’, global, country and partner/institutions’ needs, policies and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.
* Effectiveness[[2]](#footnote-3): Is the intervention achieving its objectives? The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.
* Sustainability[[3]](#footnote-4): Will the benefits last? The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue?
* Coordination[[4]](#footnote-5): The extent to which the interventions of different actors are harmonized with each other, promote synergy, avoid gaps, duplication, and resource conflicts.

The study will focus on the last two projects funded by ECHO:

* Project 2023/00405 [Agreement number ECHO/PSE/BUD/2023/91008] implemented from the 1st of January 2023 to 30th of June 2024.
* Project 2024/00499 [Agreement number ECHO/PSE/BUD/2024/91008] implemented from the 1st of July 2024 to the 30th of June 2025.

Geographically, the assignment will focus on the areas of intervention of the project: the West Bank and East Jerusalem. It will focus on:

* The direct beneficiaries from the project.
* The stakeholders of the projects, including donors, institutions, International NGOs, National NGOs and associations, and international organizations.

1. **Evaluation questions**

The evaluation is expected to answer the following questions – these questions are non-exhaustive:

1. **Relevance: To what extent has the WBPC project outcomes, outputs, and activities been based on the needs identified at country / community level?**

1.1. What is the quality of the needs-based assessment information?

1.2. To what extent are needs assessments results reflected in the planning tools to meet vulnerable people’s needs, including specific vulnerable groups?

1.3. To what extent were lessons learned incorporated in later response plans?

1.4. To what extent does WBPC use data and context analysis to timely adjust programs and adapt its strategy?

1.5. To what extend are beneficiaries and/or vulnerable groups consulted in needs assessments and intervention planning?

1. **Effectiveness: To what extent does the WBPC program contribute to protecting vulnerable communities from forcible transfers?**

2.1. To what extent does the WBPC program contribute to the recovery of vulnerable Palestinian individuals and communities affected by rights violation from these violations and to the mitigation of the destabilization impact of demolition and settler violence objective?

2.2. To what extent does the WBPC program contribute to the strengthening of accountability and rule of law objective?

2.3. To what extent does the WBPC program contribute to the mitigation of the possible protection risks identified?

2.4. To what extent were cross-cutting issues (AGD) given adequate consideration in the response?

2.5. Did the response have any unintended, positive or negative effects on vulnerable communities targeted or on local conflict dynamics?

1. **Sustainability: Does the WBPC program contribute to increasing affected people’s skills and capacities to face protection risks in the future?**

3.1. Is there any evidence that the response helped the affected population to better cope with protection risks in the future?

1. **Coordination: Is the WBPC program well-coordinated, both between internal partners, donors and diplomats, and external actors, in order to reduce duplication of efforts?**

4.1. How effective are the coordination mechanisms at internal and external level to respond to the needs of the affected population and avoid duplication?

4.2. How effective is coordination at internal and external level to raise awareness on the violations of IHL and IHRL?

These questions will be reviewed by the consultant and suggestions will be provided in order to complement / improve the evaluation matrix.

1. **Approach and methodology**

Both quantitative and qualitative methods for data collection could be considered:

* ***Interviews***[[5]](#footnote-6): semi-structured interviews will be conducted with key informants, such as diplomats, representatives of humanitarian actors and partners, community leaders or partners’ colleagues to collect facts and opinions. Additional interviews will be conducted at the end of the impact evaluation process to collect reactions from stakeholders on the findings.
* ***Focus Group Discussions***: focus group discussions will be conducted to collect general opinions from different beneficiaries groups as collective expression. Groups will be constitute considering age (adults / elderly), gender (males / females) and diversity (people with disability) to ensure a better representation of all groups.
* ***Surveys & structured questionnaires***: questionnaires will be deployed to collect a large quantity of data, both qualitative and quantitative, among beneficiaries’ households. This will allow to have a better representation of communities targeted and draw general trends. Representative sampling will be done on beneficiaries’ households.
* ***Case study***[[6]](#footnote-7): some communities supported through CPA, Material Assistance and Settler Violence related activities had to leave their place and were forcibly transferred. In-depth interviews, FGD and surveys will be conducted in these communities to try to understand why these communities were displaced even after having received support from the WBPC. This will allow the identification of gaps and potential solutions to mitigate it in the future. On the other hand, it could be interesting to compare the findings in such communities with other communities which were not displaced and still manage to improve their conditions even while being victim of rights violation and violence.

The Consultant will provide some suggestions regarding the methodology to be followed in the Inception report.

1. **Activities**

The evaluation will be conducted according to a mixed-methodology method due to the complexity of the context and the project. The consultant will work closely with the Consortium MEAL Coordinator and the MEAL Working Group during all steps of the evaluation conduction. The following activities will be conducted by the consultant:

***Revision of the evaluation matrix and data collection tools***: These documents will be drafted by the Consortium MEAL Coordinator and the MEAL Working Group. These documents will be reviewed by the consultant and suggestions will be proposed to adjust the research questions and the tools.

***Submission of inception report***: An inception report will be proposed by the consultant based on the present ToRs, the evaluation matrix and the questionnaire tools reviewed. The report will be written in close coordination with the Consortium MEAL Coordinator and the MEAL Working Group.

***Data collection phase***: Regarding quantitative data collection and focus group discussions, the consultant will train the enumerator on the context, conduction of the surveys / groups, and good practices to be followed. Regarding the key informant interviews and case studies, they will be conducted by the consultant.

***Data cleaning and analysis***: Data collected will be cleaned, translated in English if needed, and transcribed for key informant interviews and focus group discussions. This data will be analyzed by the consultant, in coordination with the Consortium MEAL Coordinator and the MEAL Working Group.

***Submission of the evaluation report***: A first draft will be drafted by the consultant and submitted to the Consortium MEAL Coordinator. It will be reviewed by the Steering Committee and the MEAL Working Group. The draft version will be reviewed and finalized by the consultant, providing recommendations for the West Bank Protection Consortium. The final report will be reviewed by the MEAL Working Group and the Steering Committee.

1. **Evaluation principles & ethics**

The evaluation will be guided by the following ethical principles:

* Openness – of information given, to the highest possible degree to all involved parties.
* Broad participation – the interested parties should be involved where relevant and possible
* Reliability and independence – the evaluation should be conducted so that findings and conclusions are correct and trustworthy

In addition, the evaluation must be conducted in accordance with WBPC’s partners ethical guidelines for evaluation:

* Do-no-harm
* Confidentiality and protection of confidentiality
* Informed consent
* Gender-sensitive
* Context-sensitive

The Inception Report should outline how this will be achieved in the design and implementation of the evaluation.

1. **Timing and deliverables**

The proposal should present a budget for the number of expected working days over the period, and all related costs (transportation, data collectors, etc.).

The evaluation is scheduled to start in the beginning of April with desk work, revision of the evaluation matrix and data collection tools developed by the MEAL Working Group of the Consortium. The inception report should be submitted by the 20th of April. Field work is projected to be between mid-April and mid-May, depending on the availability of the consultant. The draft evaluation report should be submitted by the 10th of June, with the final version to be submitted on the 30th of June.

The evaluation report should at least include an executive summary, table of contents, methodology, main findings, conclusion, recommendations, and appendices including the Evaluation terms of reference, maps, record of interviews and focus group discussions, and bibliography.

In case of major problems or delays, the consultant should inform immediately the Consortium MEAL Coordinator and the Steering Committee. Significant changes in the timeframe should be approved in advance.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Revision of the evaluation matrix and data collection tools | April 10th |
| **Submission of inception report** | **April 20th** |
| Data collection phase | April 25th – May 15th |
| Data cleaning and analysis | May 20th |
| **Submission of first draft of the evaluation report** | **June 10th** |
| Revision by the MEAL WG / Steering Committee | June 20nd |
| **Submission of the final version of the evaluation** | **June 30th** |

1. DAC definition [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Idem [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Idem [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. ANALP definition [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. McDONALD B., ROGERS P., “Interviewing”, UNICEF Methodological Briefs Impact Evaluation, no.12, 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. GOODRICK D., “Comparative Case Studies”, UNICEF Methodological Briefs Impact Evaluation, no.9, 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)