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1 Terms and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLP</td>
<td>Core Learning Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E+C</td>
<td>SDC Evaluation and Corporate Controlling division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA</td>
<td>Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO</td>
<td>Federal Ordinance of 11 December 1995 on Public Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD</td>
<td>Human Security Division of the FDFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECO</td>
<td>Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOGA</td>
<td>Whole-of-Government Approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Purpose of this document

This document contains the requirements relating to the mandate for the project “Independent Evaluation of the Linkage of Humanitarian Aid and Development Cooperation at the SDC”. It serves as a template for the bidder to submit his or her offer. Contracts are awarded according to the invitation to tender procedure according to Art. 35 of the PPO.

3 Goal and content of the mandate

3.1 Introduction

The directorate of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) has mandated the SDC Evaluation and Corporate Controlling division to commission an independent institutional evaluation on the linkage of Swiss humanitarian aid and development cooperation. The evaluation is expected to start in January 2018.

The chapter 3 of this document is based on the Approach Paper approved by the Directorate of the SDC on 30 October 2017. It describes the background, goal and purpose of the evaluation and presents the objectives and related questions of the evaluation. It further describes the expectations, road map and institutional set-up.

3.2 Background

3.2.1 Definitions and concepts

The concept of the nexus or linkage between humanitarian aid and development cooperation\(^1\) is relatively vague and has evolved over time with different names and understandings:

- During the 1980s, the linkage between humanitarian aid and development was mostly described as a **continuum** model, i.e. linking relief, rehabilitation and development within

---

\(^1\) The SDC acknowledges that aspects of security, peacebuilding and human rights are an important part of the linkage between humanitarian aid and development. These aspects are also under the responsibility of the Human Security Division (HSD) of the FDFA. However, the scope of this evaluation in the area of peacebuilding, security and human rights shall be limited to SDC-mandated interventions (see chapter 3.4.3 Scope).
an operational model of sequencing. This model however was based on the assumption that disasters are temporary, with clearly distinctive phases and at the end of which communities would get back to “normal”. The model thus ignored the complexity and multidimensional characteristics of most disasters.2

- In the 1990s, the continuum model was replaced by the “contiguum model”, which recognized the complex nature of disasters and highlighted the need to apply different instruments (relief, rehabilitation and development) simultaneously across space and time.3

- In 1996, the term “Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development” was first used by the European Commission to describe this contiguum model. The concept demands that relief actions take better account of development requirements and objectives, that actions are taken to facilitate the transition from relief to development and that development actions take better account of disaster risks.

Today, the term linkage (sometimes also called nexus) is commonly used to underline this **integrative connection between humanitarian aid and development cooperation.** In fact, the term LRRD is often misunderstood as a mere strengthening of continuity and coordination between assistance forms (more in the sense of the continuum model). Ensuring the transition between forms of assistance is however only one element of linking humanitarian aid and development. The term “linkage” might therefore be more adequate to describe the original, more holistic idea of LRRD, namely that (1) relief activities become more development-oriented and that (2) development programs do more to reduce the risk of disasters and conflicts.4

### 3.2.2 Justification

Today humanitarian assistance is increasingly provided in the same countries year after year and **protracted crises** have been taking an increasing share of total humanitarian assistance.5 Humanitarian and development actors have to deal with conflicts that are dynamic and not linear, often coupled with natural disasters that complicate the situation further. Most of the protracted humanitarian crises have not improved in the last 20 years, and many have even deteriorated. These are also the countries and regions where the extreme poor of the world are increasingly concentrated, and where significant funds of both development cooperation and humanitarian assistance are flowing.6 Today, 14 out of 21 priority countries of the SDC’s bilateral cooperation are facing protracted crises. Ensuring the **complementarity and the integrative connection of both types of instruments** is crucial to respond to humanitarian needs on the one hand, and contribute to poverty reduction and resilience on the other hand.

But the necessity to link humanitarian aid and development cooperation is also widely acknowledged in the case of crises or disaster responses that are more short-term. Also in these kinds of contexts, humanitarian aid is provided in a specific **economic, social, political and ecological systems and context** which has to be taken into account and in which other interventions (e.g. development cooperation) have been implemented or are being simultaneously implemented.7

---

2 Audet (2015); Manyena (2012).
3 Audet (2015); Fiege (2012).
4 Streets (2011).
7 Fiege (2012).
Missing links between humanitarian aid and development cooperation in such complex and fragile contexts can have negative effects on both types of instruments:

- Exacerbating the short-term orientation of humanitarian assistance without clear exit strategies and thus undermining more sustainable solutions.
- Limiting the development actors' awareness of the emergency-related aspects in connection with their work, such as the necessity to develop and implement flexible and agile strategies in countries affected by protracted crises or to invest in disaster risk reduction.

This, in turn, leads to operational problems on the ground since synergies between interventions are not used or under-used and project implementation can be discontinuous. This is exacerbated by the fact that, without appropriate links, aid organisations can often not predict whether they will receive follow-up funding.

Aware of the necessity to find solutions to protracted crises, donors (including the SDC), international organisations and NGOs have committed themselves at the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit to increase their efforts in “bridging the development-humanitarian divide”. The Sustainable Development Goals constitute the main reference framework, defining the common outcomes to be achieved by 2030. It is in the context of these ongoing debates that the SDC has decided to commission this evaluation.

3.2.3 Common challenges for donor agencies

The literature identified several recurrent challenges in implementing the linkage concept in practice:

1. **Conceptual:** As shown above, there are various different models of the linkage and the concept in general is rather vague. Moreover, it is not always clear what the different forms of assistance are and how they interact with each other.

2. **Institutional:** Many donors have institutional divisions between their humanitarian and development branches, even when both are integrated in the same ministry. Humanitarian staff often stay in the humanitarian branch throughout their career while development staff remain affiliated to the development branch.

3. **Funding lines:** Related to the above-mentioned institutional divisions, many donors have separate funding lines for humanitarian aid and development cooperation. These public funds are subject to the scrutiny of parliamentary budget committees and audit institutions which are intent on avoiding duplications and overlapping mandates. This reduces the flexibility of donors in adapting their approaches according to the evolving needs on the ground.

4. **Principles and mind-sets:** Effective linking requires changing existing mind-sets and combining instruments that are based on different principles and mandates. According to the humanitarian principles, humanitarian aid should be independent from political and economic objectives and provide life-saving solutions. Development, by contrast, is provided with the objective of contributing to systemic change, which often implies working more closely with political actors, public institutions, civil society and private sector than in the case of humanitarian aid. Seeking synergies to overcome the gap between these mind-sets and

---

8 Streets (2011).
9 Streets (2011).
10 See especially Streets (2011).
mandates without abandoning core humanitarian principles is perceived as a crucial challenge.

5. **Implementing partners**: Donors have to find implementing partners that have the capacity and willingness to operate across different forms of aid and to coordinate their activities with other actors.

There are also various strategies adopted by donors to facilitate the linkage between humanitarian aid and development.\(^\text{11}\) Their success strongly depends on whether the respective country is a priority country with long-term presence of the donor or not.

- **Decentralization of decision-making**: In priority countries, respectively countries in which donors maintain fully fledged country offices, country representatives/teams who have decision-making authority can facilitate smooth transitions between funding lines so that continuous project implementation is possible. They can also support coordination among implementing partners and encourage them to take both humanitarian and development interventions into account.

- **The whole-of-government approach (WOGA)**: WOGA encourages coordination and cooperation between different parts of the government and often goes beyond humanitarian aid and development branches by also including security-related, diplomatic or environmental services. WOGA can have different degrees of formality, from coordination meetings, to integrated budget lines and cooperation strategies (e.g. Switzerland) or even inter-ministerial pooled funds with joint decision-making. Switzerland is mentioned in the literature as a pioneer in practicing WOGA with its integrated budget planning.\(^\text{12}\)

- **Encouraging implementing partners in linking humanitarian aid interventions and development cooperation**: Local organisations are usually best placed to facilitate the linkage because of their long-term engagement in the country and their awareness of the regulatory institutions and development needs. Donors can also create incentives for linkages, for example by requiring humanitarian partners to identify potential follow-up projects in their funding proposals (as practiced by Germany).

- **Institutional set-up**: Some donors (e.g. the SDC) have integrated the humanitarian aid and development cooperation units within the same governmental department in order to facilitate the collaboration between them. However, the structure alone does not guarantee that the linkage is implemented in practice. Leadership is a crucial aspect, as well as working procedures to ensure an integrated approach in the headquarter and in the field.

Streets (2011) identified other pragmatic steps:

- Conscious hiring of **staff members with mixed backgrounds** in humanitarian and development contexts

- **Targeted training** on early recovery and recovery for humanitarian staff, as well as disaster risk reduction and conflict prevention for development staff

---

\(^{11}\) See Streets (2011)

\(^{12}\) Streets (2011).
• Inclusion of the different aspects of linking in job descriptions and feedback/evaluation formats
• Joint inter-departmental activities, including for example joint trainings, field visits or evaluations

3.3 The SDC’s framework for linking humanitarian aid and development cooperation

3.3.1 Legal framework
There is no single strategy document or policy on the SDC’s approach to linking humanitarian aid and development cooperation. The information below is mainly based on the current Dispatch to the Parliament on Swiss international cooperation 2017-2020. It shows that the understanding of what it means to link humanitarian aid and development cooperation varies within Swiss international cooperation. It ranges from ensuring the transition between the different instruments, to ensuring their complementary or integrative use.

“Whenever possible, Humanitarian Aid conducts its disaster prevention efforts and its renovation and reconstruction activities in such a way that a linkage with development cooperation programs is possible. If such programs are discontinued, this is done gradually, in close consultation with Switzerland’s local representations and Swiss international cooperation partners. It goes without saying that, in such cases, the sustainability of the results achieved is also taken into consideration.” (Dispatch to Parliament on Swiss international cooperation 2017-2020 – Summary, p. 21).

As the above quote shows, the linkage between humanitarian aid and development is clearly mentioned as a crucial approach of Swiss international cooperation in the Dispatch to Parliament 2017-2020, especially in response to the many protracted crises in which Swiss international cooperation is active and the increasing engagement of Switzerland in fragile countries. The issue is mentioned (often indirectly) in several chapters of the Dispatch:

• The issue of linking both types of instruments is highlighted several times in the chapter on humanitarian aid: “during reconstruction and rehabilitation, special attention is given to the possible take-over of programs and projects by development cooperation and cooperation with Eastern Europe or other development actors”. 13

• In the chapters on Southern cooperation and cooperation with Eastern Europe, the issue is mentioned less clearly. However, it is stated that the linkage between disaster risk reduction and climate change programs will be strengthened. DRR is highlighted as one of the themes in which the integration of different actors and approaches is crucial. 14

• Finally, WOGA is highlighted in the Dispatch and other documents as a crucial element for linking different types of instruments. Whenever possible, joint cooperation strategies between actors of the Swiss government 15 involved in a country are adopted. 16 The joint cooperation strategies of the WOGA partners aim to ensure the coordination and the use of synergies, especially in fragile countries or regions and in contexts where one type of

---

13 Dispatch 2017-2020, p. 2426 (German).
14 Dispatch 2017-2020, p. 2379 & p. 2421 (German).
15 Typically: SDC, SECO and HSD.
16 Dispatch 2017-2020, p. 2433 (German).
instrument is replaced by another type or both types coexist. Today the number of joint country or regional cooperation strategies amounts to 27 out of 44 Swiss cooperation strategies.

3.3.2 International commitment

Swiss international cooperation is oriented towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals in the framework of the Agenda 2030. Seven out of seventeen goals have clear and direct references to humanitarian concerns or disasters, and in several others the links exist indirectly. Therefore, ensuring the complementarity of humanitarian and development instruments is an important condition for implementing this agenda.

In light of the increasing number of people affected by protracted crises and the high ambitions of the Agenda 2030, governments, humanitarian organisations and members of affected communities have come together at the first World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul in 2016. One of the main results of this summit was a commitment of governments (including Switzerland) and humanitarian organisations to “a new way of working that meets people’s immediate humanitarian needs, while at the same time reducing risk and vulnerability over multiple years through the achievement of collective outcomes”.

Efforts to “transcend humanitarian-development divides” are part of this ambitious commitment. Concretely, this should result in “work[ing] together, toward collective outcomes that ensure humanitarian needs are met, while at the same time reducing risk and vulnerability over multiple years and based on the comparative advantage of a diverse range of actors”. Another important commitment is linked to the “Grand Bargain” debate, in which Switzerland is strongly engaged. It calls for “coherent financing that avoids fragmentation by supporting collective outcomes over multiple years, supporting those with demonstrated comparative advantage to deliver in context”.

The international commitment through the Agenda 2030 on the one hand, and more specifically the World Humanitarian Summit on the other hand, serve as guiding principles for Switzerland’s bilateral and multilateral development cooperation and humanitarian aid. At the multilateral level, the SDC works primarily with 14 multilateral development organisations and 5 multilateral humanitarian aid organisations. Several of these organisations are however also combining both types of instruments. The SDC also supports the linkage through contributions to specific efforts of multilateral organisations, for example the UNDP Global Fund which allows a fast and flexible reaction to crises with development cooperation measures.

3.3.3 Previous reviews/evaluations

The last OECD-DAC Peer Review of Switzerland in 2013 concluded that: “Concrete efforts have been made to link its humanitarian and development funding baskets. Interestingly, this has worked both ways: recent examples include the humanitarian team handing over disaster recovery programs to development colleagues in Haiti and Myanmar, and development programs being handed over to

---

17 Dispatch 2017-2020, p. 2379 (German).
18 SDC internal document (2016).
19 Goal 1 (No Poverty), Goal 2 (Zero Hunger), Goal 3 (Good Health and Well-being), Goal 5 (Gender Equality), Goal 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities), Goal 13 (Climate Action) and Goal 16 (Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions).
21 http://agendaforhumanity.org/core-commitments
22 http://agendaforhumanity.org/core-commitments
23 See: https://www.shareweb.ch/site/Multilateral-Institutions/priority%20organisations/Pages/Priority%20Institutions.aspx
24 SDC internal document (2016).
humanitarians following deterioration of the situation in Mali.\(^{25}\) The Peer Review also acknowledged that the level of inclusion of humanitarian issues in country strategies is context-specific: from fully integrated teams to shared country strategies. Moreover, humanitarian risks are mentioned in several country strategies where operations are dominated by development programming (e.g. Nepal).

Some criticism has been highlighted by the independent evaluation of SDC’s instruments in fragile and conflict-affected contexts (2012), i.e. in contexts in which the issue of linking humanitarian aid and development cooperation is seen as particularly crucial. The evaluation found that while individual projects and programs are successful, SDC’s impact on the root causes of fragility is relatively limited. The evaluation from 2012 recommended to intensify joint programming: “Where genuinely joint programming has been achieved there is clear evidence of greater influence and impact, and there are clear advantages visible within the Swiss aid system. This suggests that there is a need to create more mechanisms to encourage such working, and to promote more joint working as a way of breaking down cultural and institutional barriers”\(^{26}\).

Finally, aspects related to the linkage of humanitarian aid and development cooperation have been highlighted in several recent country strategy evaluations (e.g. Niger, Pakistan, Haiti).

### 3.3.4 Some concrete challenges identified by SDC internally

In internal documents and discussions\(^{27}\), the SDC has identified several challenges which can be translated into steps to be taken – some of which are already implemented in some contexts:

- **Strengthening collaboration at the operational level:** enhance division of tasks according to intervention fields rather than types of instruments. This is already done in some cooperation offices (e.g. Horn of Africa, North Africa, Ukraine).\(^{28}\) Collaboration between program officers from the different domains at the headquarters could be strengthened.

- **Identify strategies for countries that are not priority countries** and in which the linkage of humanitarian instruments and development instruments is therefore far more challenging. In particular, identify strategies in contexts of protracted crises.

- **Strengthen the collaboration between the humanitarian aid domain and the global cooperation domain (Global Programmes and Global Institutions division)** since Switzerland is present in many non-priority countries through multilateral contributions and global policy related programmes. There is a potential for strengthened involvement of multilateral cooperation in bilateral and/or humanitarian programming especially in protracted crises.

- **Incite multilateral partners in practicing the linkage**, i.e. support better coordination and complementarity between humanitarian and development partners.

Furthermore, that the SDC’s activities are divided in three different frame credits (Technical Cooperation and Financial Aid for Developing Countries, Transition Aid and Cooperation with Eastern


\(^{27}\) E.g. Diskussionspapier zum Thema „Comprehensive Aid Approach inkl. Übergang HH zu Entwicklungszusammenarbeit“ (2014) or an internal Note to the Head of the FDFA (2016); regular discussions at the annual SDC Humanitarian Aid Seminar.

\(^{28}\) However, even for countries and regions in which the operational cooperation is strong, there are separate Operational Committees (OpKom) at the headquarters that approve the credit proposals for humanitarian aid and development programs respectively.
Europe, and Humanitarian Aid) represents a challenge for implementing the linkage between the different instruments, though there are possibilities to move budgets between the different frame credits.

3.4 Purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation

3.4.1 Purpose

The overall purpose of this evaluation is two-fold:

- **Operational**: to assess the performance of the SDC strategies, programs and partnerships in linking humanitarian aid and development cooperation.
- **Institutional**: to analyse to what extent the working procedures, funding procedures/set-up and ways of collaboration are adequate for implementing this linkage in practice.
- **Benchmarking**: to compare the SDC’s performance in linking humanitarian aid and development cooperation with international practices.

The evaluation process and the knowledge generated by the evaluation serve **to improve SDC’s performance through learning** within the organisation and among its partners. The evaluation results shall be used for **steering and management purposes**. In particular, the evaluation shall identify **difficulties and solutions or best practices within SDC and externally** (partners, other donors, etc.) and assess to which extent and how these best practices could be **systematically applied** within SDC. Therefore, a **benchmarking of SDC’s performance compared to international practices** is an important element of the evaluation.

By conducting such evaluations and being committed to learning from the results, the SDC also renders **accountability** to the Swiss Parliament and taxpayers, its partners and the ultimate beneficiaries of its activities – on achievements, but also challenges. Good communication throughout the evaluation process and of the evaluation results serves both accountability and learning.

This backward and forward-looking evaluation shall thereby support the SDC in achieving the **objectives of the Dispatch to the Parliament 2017-2020** and contributing to the achievement of the **Sustainable Development Goals** as set out in the Agenda 2030. More specifically, it should help the SDC in addressing the challenges mentioned under chapter 3.3.4 and other necessary steps identified by the evaluation. The findings and recommendations shall also serve as guidance for the **elaboration of the new Dispatch 2021-2024**.

This evaluation is mandated by the SDC’s Board of Directors and commissioned by the **Evaluation and Corporate Controlling Division**, which is outside the operational line and reports to the SDC’s Director General. The **contracted evaluation team will be independent** of the SDC and their independence will be safeguarded throughout the evaluation.

---

29 The term “partnerships” in this document refers to core contributions to and mandates with multilateral organisations, international and local NGOs/civil society organisations, private sector, as well as the SDC’s engagement in policy dialogues.
3.4.2 Objectives

In line with the above-mentioned purpose, the evaluation shall, on the one hand, assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the SDC’s strategies, programs and partnerships. On the other hand, it shall also evaluate its working procedures, funding procedures/set-up and ways of collaboration in view of ensuring the complementarity and integrative use of humanitarian aid and development cooperation.

In sum, the evaluation shall assess to which extent the SDC’s operational instruments and institutional processes ensure that:

i) humanitarian strategies and programs, to the extent possible, adopt a systems’ change perspective, taking into account corresponding development requirements and objectives,

ii) that actions are taken to facilitate the interface of relief and development, especially in protracted crises, and

iii) that development actions include activities to respond to conflict and disaster risks.

The evaluation will provide findings, conclusions and recommendations on whether and how the SDC’s approaches can be strengthened from an operational and institutional point of view.

3.4.3 Scope

The framework for this evaluation is set by the Dispatch on Switzerland’s International Cooperation 2013 – 2016 and the current Dispatch. The evaluation shall thus cover a period of five years (2013-2017).

Regarding the operational focus, the evaluation shall concretely comprise the strategies, programs and partnerships of the SDC’s engagement, especially in those SDC partner countries characterized by protracted crises. Given that the approaches are very context-specific, the evaluation shall provide a categorization of partner countries (e.g. presence of SDC humanitarian aid and development cooperation combined, presence of only SDC humanitarian aid, countries with or without protracted crisis, etc.).

Depending on their relevance for the humanitarian aid/development cooperation linkage, the evaluation shall include the SDC’s multilateral partnerships and (to a lesser extent) institutional partnerships with Swiss NGOs. Non-priority countries are not the main focus of this evaluation but could be taken into account in the analysis of the SDC’s multilateral and institutional partnerships. Moreover, the question of how to best link humanitarian aid and development cooperation is also high on the agenda of several multilateral partners (see also chapter 3.3.2 on the “New Way of Working”). Reviewing their best practices could provide important lessons learnt also for the SDC. The views, approaches and needs of the local authorities of the partner countries also have to be considered, especially during the field visits.

The Whole-of-Government Approach constitutes an important element for linking humanitarian aid and development, especially with regards to ensuring the link to security, peacebuilding and human rights aspects. However, as this evaluation is mandated by the SDC, the scope in the area of peacebuilding, security and human rights shall be limited to SDC-mandated interventions. Peacebuilding activities undertaken by the FDFA Human Security Division (HSD) and the collaboration processes between HSD and SDC are only indirectly addressed (e.g. through interviews with HSD stakeholders).
### 3.5 Indicative Key Questions

The question catalogue below is a first draft and has been compiled by evaluation officers at SDC and the Core Learning Partnership. During the inception phase, the evaluation team will further refine and prioritize the questions in consultation with SDC’s evaluation officer and the Core Learning Partnership.

**Relevance**

- Are the SDC’s objectives, respectively the SDC’s operational and institutional approaches, strategies to achieve these objectives, relevant to ensuring the linkage between humanitarian aid and development cooperation in the given context?

- Are the SDC’s objectives, respectively the SDC’s operational and institutional approaches to achieve these objectives, in line with its international commitments with regards to the development/humanitarian linkage (Agenda 2030, World Humanitarian Summit)?

- How is the concept of linkage understood within the SDC and are there differences in interpreting the concept (e.g. between the humanitarian aid staff/divisions and the development cooperation staff/divisions, or between the headquarters and the field)?

- Are the SDC’s strategies and programs taking context and partner country strategies systematically and sufficiently into account and deploying different instruments accordingly?

**Effectiveness**

- How coherent are the SDC’s humanitarian and development instruments in contexts where both types of instruments are implemented and to what extent are they relevant to meeting the humanitarian and development needs of the targeted population? This question refers specifically to:
  - The SDC’s cooperation strategies in priority countries and regions
  - Specific humanitarian and development (or mixed) programs
  - The SDC’s thematic networks and thematic strategies (if relevant for the linkage)
  - Partnerships with other organisations and implementation modalities (bilateral/multilateral; core contributions/mandates)

- Are the SDC’s instruments applied jointly, i.e. to what extent do the SDC’s strategies, programs and partnerships succeed in achieving the three main goals of the humanitarian/development linkage, i.e. ensuring that
  - humanitarian strategies and programs, to the extent possible, adopt a systems’ change perspective, taking into account corresponding development requirements and objectives,
  - that actions are taken to facilitate the interface of relief and development, especially in protracted crises, and
  - that development actions include activities to respond to conflict and disaster risks.
• Building upon the above question: do SDC’s strategies, programs and partnerships contribute to meeting the short- and long-term humanitarian and development needs in countries with protracted crises?

• Which factors contribute to or hinder the complementarity of humanitarian aid and development cooperation, especially in protracted crises?

• How can the SDC’s strategies, programs and partnerships be improved in order to achieve the three goals of the humanitarian/development linkage?

• What are the risks of linking humanitarian aid and development cooperation for guaranteeing the humanitarian principles (neutrality, independence, humanity, impartiality) and the basic principles of development cooperation (sustainability, strengthening local institutions, etc.) and how can these risks be mitigated?

Efficiency

• Are the SDC’s procedures (general and financial in particular) and ways of collaboration conducive to implementing the linkage between humanitarian aid and development cooperation?30

• Referring to the above question: are there differences in terms of efficiency between different types of partner countries (priority country/non-priority country; with WOGA/without WOGA, fragile/stable, with/without conflict)?

• Is the SDC using adequate financial and human resources and finance instruments for ensuring the linkage between humanitarian aid and development cooperation? This question refers both to the resources and instruments used for the headquarters and for the field.

• To what extent does the SDC encourage its bilateral and multilateral partners to practice the linkage?

Sustainability

• How promising are SDC’s strategies, programs and partnerships in developing and implementing long-term solutions in contexts of protracted crises?

• Which factors enhance the sustainability of the SDC’s approaches in these contexts?

• Is the SDC’s development cooperation successful in preventing risks of future humanitarian crises?

3.6 Methodology and Process

3.6.1 Methodology

The overall evaluation approach should represent an adequate mix of formative and summative elements. Selected steps from within developmental evaluation (see Michael Quinn Patton 2010 ) are

30 This question might refer to different types of procedures and collaborations, but should at least include collaboration between the different domains at different hierarchical levels, human resources aspects (recruitment, career development, etc.), funding lines and decisions, etc.
to be considered when appropriate. The evaluation should include a detailed analysis of up to five case studies.

The independent evaluation team will assess the evaluation objectives and questions in a neutral and objective way. The evaluation findings shall review and assess existing facts, processes, tools and instruments (summative part). Their findings, lessons learnt and recommendation shall be evidence based and formulated in an open constructive non-judging manner. The evaluation team shall use or develop adequate rubrics and instruments for assessing all information, interviews etc. within the evaluation.

The evaluation is expected to make use of a series of different methodological instruments, such as the following:

- Review of relevant documents from SDC, partners and other donors (benchmarking);
- Field missions in up to 5 countries (case studies)\(^{31}\), the majority of which should be countries where the SDC is engaged with both humanitarian aid and development cooperation;
- Interviews and/or focus group sessions with SDC staff in Bern from all operational departments (Humanitarian Aid, South Cooperation, East Cooperation, Global Cooperation) and in some cooperation offices via phone;
- Interviews with other relevant persons, especially at HSD, SECO, multilateral partners, eventually other donors;
- One survey and or e-discussion for SDC staff in Bern and in the field in order to enlarge the discussion and create ownership across the whole institution.

The evaluation team will develop a rigorous and appropriate methodology during the inception phase, together with a Theory of Change which will set the framework for the evaluation. It is important that the methodology is appropriate for assessing both the operational and institutional aspects of the evaluation. As already mentioned the indicative key questions are only suggestions and shall be reviewed by the evaluation team during the inception phase.

It is crucial that the involved organisations (SDC and NGOs) understand the evaluation methods as well as the evaluation process, as they are expected to react to the recommendations – this demands for formative evaluation methods and approaches.

The Core Learning Partnership shall be involved in reviewing and refining the recommendations to the SDC management – while the responsibility remains within the evaluation team. Therefore, elements of participatory / developmental evaluation can be integrated. Developmental evaluation is tailored to complex environments and sees the evaluator as combining the rigour of evaluation (evidence-based and objective) with the role of enhancing a program’s capacity, by means of using evidence in reflective thinking on its work. SDC’s staff should learn during the entire evaluation process - not just at the end. Including such an approach will not only increase the utility of the evaluation, but will also support SDC’s on-going commitment to develop stronger analyses, program designs, as well as capacities in monitoring and evaluation.

\(^{31}\) The countries will be chosen by the evaluation team in consultation with the CLP and the evaluation management and according to clear criteria.
### 3.6.2 Process

Important activities, periods and responsibilities are summarized as follows. This work plan will eventually be adapted by the evaluation team during the inception phase. The SDC Evaluation and Corporate Controlling division reserves the right to adapt this work plan if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st CLP meeting in Bern: Finalize Approach Paper</td>
<td>We 04 October 2017</td>
<td>E+C / CLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Board of Directors: Approval Approach Paper</td>
<td>Mo 30 October 2017</td>
<td>E+C, DirKo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline to submit evaluation offers</td>
<td>Mi, 10.01.2018</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the evaluation proposals</td>
<td>Fr 19.01.2018</td>
<td>E+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with candidates, if necessary</td>
<td>Jan 2018</td>
<td>E+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract signed with evaluators</td>
<td>Early Feb. 2018</td>
<td>E+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd CLP meeting: Kick-off in Bern (with evaluation team) + first round of interviews for inception phase (in Bern and on phone)</td>
<td>Mid-Feb 2018</td>
<td>CLP / Evaluators / E+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration of the Inception Report: evaluation objectives and questions, evaluation design, methodology</td>
<td>End March 2018</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd CLP meeting: Feedback to Inception Report (with evaluation team via video call)</td>
<td>Early April 2018</td>
<td>Evaluators / CLP / E+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of the Inception Report (incorporation of SDC comments)</td>
<td>April-May 2018</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistic and administrative preparation of evaluation visits, workshops, etc.</td>
<td>May-June 2018</td>
<td>Evaluators / E+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk study</td>
<td>June-July 2018</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with stakeholders, partners, focus group, workshops, e-discussion if relevant (via phone)</td>
<td>Aug-Sep 2018</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visits in up to 5 countries</td>
<td>Sep 2018</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th CLP meeting: Capitalization workshop on intermediate results (with evaluation team via video call)</td>
<td>Oct 2018</td>
<td>CLP / Evaluators / E+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and elaboration of draft report</td>
<td>Oct-Nov 2018</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th CLP meeting in Bern: Feedback on draft report, Review of lessons learnt and recommendations (with evaluation team)</td>
<td>Early Nov 2018</td>
<td>CLP / Evaluators / E+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>End Nov 2018</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation at Board of Directors and SDC staff</td>
<td>Early Dec 2018</td>
<td>Evaluators, E+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC Management Response</td>
<td>Jan 2019</td>
<td>E+C / Directorate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Deliverables

The following deliverables are required:

3.7.1 Inception Report
An Inception Report is prepared by the evaluation team after an initial review of relevant documentation and some initial interviews. It shall present:

- the results of first round of interviews and desk review
- conceptual framework(s) to be used in the evaluation (including a draft Theory of Change which presents SDC’s logic to link humanitarian aid and development cooperation)
- the key evaluation questions and methodology
- analytical framework for answering the evaluation questions with rubrics or assessment scales that will be used for assessing the information, data sources and collection, sampling and key indicators
- elaboration of categories of countries or contexts (e.g. priority/non-priority, WOGA/non-WOGA, protracted crises, presence of SDC humanitarian aid and/or development cooperation)
- selection of case studies, respectively countries that will be visited
- first portfolio analysis of case studies
- first list of interviewees.

The Inception Report also includes a timeline for the evaluation process. It shall explain the strengths, weaknesses and limitations and the means used to address these limitations. The evaluation team should suggest a tentative structure of the final report.

The Inception Report should be written in English and should not exceed 12 pages excluding annexes. It will be addressed to the evaluation management (E+C), but will be discussed with the CLP in Bern.

3.7.2 Evaluation Report by Evaluation Team

- A fit-to-print evaluation report\(^{32}\) in English containing findings, conclusions and recommendations, whereby the conclusions must be clearly derived from the findings and the recommendations be clearly based on the conclusions.

\(^{32}\) According to the formatting guidelines of the SDC Evaluation and Corporate Controlling division
• The evaluation report should not exceed 50 pages (including an executive summary; excluding annexes), and must be coherent with the E+C formatting guidelines. The report should contain clear references of the important information / data available in the annexes. The executive summary (abstract) should correspond to the DAC-Standards and should not exceed 2 – 3 pages.

• Additionally, a short and concise presentation (PowerPoint) shall be prepared by the evaluation team for SDCs use.

3.7.3 Final Evaluation Report
The final evaluation report consists of the evaluation report by the evaluation team and the Senior Management Response by SDCs Board of Directors. The final evaluation report will be prepared by the evaluation management.

3.7.4 Communication
Communication is key – both for institutional learning within the SDC and accountability towards the Parliament and the public. The following deliverables with regards to communication are required:

• Meetings with the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) at key moments of the evaluation (see chapter 3.6.2)

• Regular exchanges with collaborators responsible for the elaboration of the new Dispatch to the Parliament on Swiss International Cooperation 2021-2024. The moments for these exchanges will be defined by the Evaluation Management.

• Presentation of the Final Report to the Directorate of SDC (and eventually prior to that: presentation of intermediate results to the Directorate).

• Presentation of the Final Report to SDC staff.

• Presentation and discussion with the Advisory Committee on International Cooperation (during or at the end of the process).

• At the end of the process, provide the content for a shorter public report or leaflet, in close collaboration with FDFA/SDC communication specialists.

3.8 Roles and responsibilities during the evaluation

3.8.1 SDC Senior Management
SDCs Board of Directors approves the Approach Paper and expresses their stand on the evaluation recommendations through the Management Response.

3.8.2 Core Learning Partnership (CLP)
The Core Learning Partnership (CLP) accompanies the evaluation process. Throughout the process, the CLP is engaged in learning through interactive reflection with the evaluation team. The CLP comments on the evaluation design (Approach Paper, draft Inception Report) and the draft evaluation report. At the capitalisation workshop, the CLP receives and validates the evaluation findings, conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations.
The evaluation process will include periodic engagement of the CLP members and/or other relevant SDC staff for following activities:

- Provide support to the evaluation team in better understanding SDC’s approaches, structures and working processes.
- Comment the Approach Paper and Inception Report and provide feedbacks to the draft evaluation report.
- Elaborate the Senior Management Response to be approved by the Directorate of the SDC.

The CLP is composed of representatives of each operational domain of the SDC (Humanitarian Aid, South Cooperation, Global Cooperation, Cooperation with Eastern Europe). The members of the CLP are mentioned in Annex 1.

In parallel to the regular consultation of the CLP, the evaluation team will exchange regularly with the SDC collaborators responsible for the elaboration of the new Dispatch 2021-2024 (the process is due to begin in summer 2018). This will allow them to consider findings and recommendations early on in the elaboration process.

Coordination of the CLP and with the collaborators responsible for the elaboration of the new Dispatch will rest upon the evaluation manager Lena Einsele (SDC Evaluation and Corporate Controlling Division).

3.8.3 Independent Evaluation Team

Through this invitation procedure, the SDC’s Evaluation and Corporate Controlling Division will contract an evaluation team that is independent of the FDFA, especially of the SDC, and has not been involved in activities covered by this evaluation. Any interested bidder is invited to submit an offer for this mandate.

The evaluation team should offer expertise regarding evaluation and partnership development, innovative thinking, the ability to combine established methods with new approaches and to critically discuss, evaluate and share results with stakeholders throughout the evaluation process.

The evaluation team shall consist of a team of at least two experts with complementary expertise and experience, plus local consultants if relevant/needed. More particularly, the evaluators are expected to bring along the following evaluation and subject matter expertise and experience:

- Experience and up-to-date knowledge in humanitarian aid and development cooperation and in the linkage of both types of instruments, especially in the context of protracted crises.
- Strong analytical and editorial skills, ability to synthesize and write intelligibly for different audiences.
- Professional experience and skills in robust evaluation methodologies and in evaluating strategies, programs, partnerships, and institutional processes/change.
- Ability to apply the DAC-OECD evaluation standards.

Independence means that the members of the evaluation team shall not have worked for the FDFA, especially the SDC, in the past five years (except having conducted other external evaluation mandates) or have any other strong linkages or dependencies with the FDFA.
• Proven competence in conducting complex evaluations in the fields of humanitarian aid and development cooperation, including field missions in fragile countries.
• Knowledge of the Swiss development cooperation system.
• Experience in multilateral and bilateral development cooperation and proven knowledge of the international multilateral system.

Furthermore, the evaluators are expected to have:
• Ability to steer complex processes involving a multiplicity of stakeholders through participatory methods.
• Competency with gender and governance issues (application of gender sensitive evaluation methodologies).
• Ability to work and communicate in English, plus excellent writing skills in English. French and German comprehension is a must (good reading skills). Good communication in German and/or French is an additional asset.
• Experience in developing communication content for a wider public.

3.8.4 Evaluation Management

The evaluation management’s main responsibility is to manage and supervise the entire process of the evaluation. The evaluation management formulates the Approach Paper, commissions the evaluation team, and approves the Inception Report and the Evaluation Report by the evaluation team in consultation with the CLP. Furthermore, the evaluation manager drafts and administers the contract with the evaluation team and ensures that the evaluators receive appropriate logistical support and access to information.

The management coordinates the CLP and their meetings and shall facilitate the review and validation of lessons learnt and recommendations (evaluation team, CLP, ERG). If required, the management also facilitates the elaboration of the action plan for the Senior Management Response with realistic follow-up actions and it is responsible for the publication and dissemination of the evaluation report.

The evaluation management consists of following staff: Lena Einsele, Program Officer at the Staff of the Directorate and Evaluation and Corporate Controlling Division.

3.9 Time frame, target dates of the procurement process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, 17.11.2017</td>
<td>Publication of the mandate on: <a href="http://www.eda.admin.ch">www.eda.admin.ch</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 04.12.2017</td>
<td>Expression of interest in submitting an offer and questions by email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 07.12.2017</td>
<td>Answers by contracting authority to questions sent by email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 10.01.2018</td>
<td>Deadline for submitting offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, 26.01.2018</td>
<td>Awarding of mandate and notice to unsuccessful bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, 09.02.2018</td>
<td>Signing of contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 12.02.2018</td>
<td>Mandate begins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Formal aspects of the invitation to tender

4.1 Contracting authority
The SDC Evaluation and Corporate Controlling division (Freiburgstrasse 130, 3003 Bern, Switzerland, sektion.evaluation-controlling@eda.admin.ch) manages the award procedure and is also the direct mandating party for the bidder.

4.2 Type of procedure
Procurement in the invitation to tender is in accordance with the Federal Ordinance of 11 December 1995 on Public Procurement, PPO, SR 172.056.11.

The award of contract cannot be contested.

4.3 Composition and content of the offer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Max. No. pages (without annexes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Covering letter with signatures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commenting suitability criteria</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Technical offer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Introduction with motivation for the bid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Understanding of the mandate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Description of the proposed methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Competency, roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Financial proposal</td>
<td>1 narrative page + budget form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be submitted in accordance with budget form in CHF currency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(use Excel sheet budget form in the Annex). The financial proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>must include the estimated costs for (see chapter 3.6.2 Process):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 5 field visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 visits to Bern of the evaluation team (except local consultants) for the Kick-Off/first round of interviews and the discussion of the draft evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 visits to Bern of the team leader for the presentation of the evaluation report to the Directorate and the presentation to the Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- (The other meetings and interviews will take place via video call/phone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- If applicable, TVA must be offered separately.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annexes:
- Profile of the company, including the documentation needed for Suitability Criteria (SC) 1.
- References (SC2, SC7)
- CVs of all team members, max. 3 pages each (SC3, SC7)
- Written confirmation on SPOC (SC4)

n/a
- Written confirmation on independence (SC5)
- Written confirmation on possible replacement for team leader (SC6)
- Written confirmation on temporal availability (SC9)
- Financial proposal; Form Offer Type B (see attachment)
- Two evaluation reports, preferably on a similar topic and in which at least one member of the proposed team has been actively involved
- Others

4.4 Budget

A total number of **160 working days** between February 2018 and April 2019 (see chapter 3.6.2 Process) may be allocated to the evaluation team (international and local experts). These working days should include the activities of the field missions in five countries and the trips to Switzerland as stated under Award Criteria 3. If applicable, TVA must be offered separately.

No reimbursement can be made for the bidder’s work in preparing and submitting his or her offer.

4.5 Contractual terms

The contract to be concluded is subject to the general terms and conditions of business (GTC) of the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA) for mandates Type A and B (see Annex).

The general terms and conditions are considered to be accepted when an offer is submitted.

5 Suitability criteria

The bidder can verify his or her ability to fulfil the mandate in technical, financial and commercial terms, resp. shall confirm this with a self-declaration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Suitability criterion</th>
<th>Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SC1 | Economic, financial and organizational capability | • Excerpts from the commercial and debt recovery register may not be older than 3 months (in original or copy). Bidders from abroad are required to present comparable current foreign official certificates (in original or copy).  
  • Organigram of the firm  
  • External independent audit report or annual report of last financial year. |
  The bidder has sufficient economic/ financial/ organizational capability to carry out the mandate.  
  **For self-employed persons ONLY:**  
  Enclose the certification from the social security authorities where your firm is registered (not older than 3 months). |
| SC2 | Experience | Written proof of the references giving at least the following data:  
|     |           | - Name of company and address of contact person(s) and telephone numbers;  
|     |           | - Time and place of execution of the mandate;  
|     |           | - Volume of the executed mandate;  
|     |           | - Brief description of the provided services;  
|     |           | - Responsibilities of the relevant persons involved in the mandate.  
|     |           | The contracting authority reserves the right to contact the contact persons indicated.  
|     |           |  
| SC3 | Personnel resources | Written confirmation with easily understandable documentation about the human resources employed for the mandate: CV; Description of competency, roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team, reference evaluation reports.  
|     |           |  
| SC4 | Single Person of Contact (SPOC) | Written confirmation.  
|     |           |  
| SC5 | Independence | Written confirmation stating on independence.  
|     |           |  
| SC6 | Replacement of team leader | Written confirmation, giving the family name and first name, contact data and function.  
|     |           |  
| SC7 | Language skills of the key persons | Written confirmation with relevant documentation, e.g. CVs, reference evaluation reports, references.  
|     |           |  
| SC8 | Temporal availability | Written confirmation that the |
The bidder is able to respect the time schedule suggested in the chapter 3.6.2.

The time schedule can be respected. If not, alternative dates have to be clearly stated.

6 Award criteria

Of the valid offers submitted and fulfilling the above Suitability Criteria, the contract will be awarded to the economically most favourable bid.

Offers will be assessed according to the following award criteria and weighting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Award criterion</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC1</td>
<td>Qualification and experience of the proposed team</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required technical evaluation experience of the team:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional experience and skills in robust evaluation methodologies and in evaluating strategies, programs, partnerships</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional experience and skills in evaluating institutional processes and in organizational development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proven competence in conducting complex evaluations in the fields of humanitarian aid and development cooperation, including field missions in fragile countries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Competency with gender and governance issues (application of gender sensitive evaluation methodologies).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to apply the DAC-OECD evaluation standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required thematic expertise and experience of the theme:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experience and up-to-date knowledge in humanitarian aid and development cooperation and in the linkage of both types of instruments, especially in the context of protracted crises.</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the Swiss development cooperation system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experience in multilateral and bilateral development cooperation and proven knowledge of the international multilateral system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualification of the team leader:</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Confirmed experience in the management of an evaluation team comparable in size and scope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to apply the DAC-OECD evaluation standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability in steering complex processes involving a multiplicity of stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong analytical and editorial skills, ability to synthesize and write intelligibly for different audiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication skills of the team:</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experience in developing communication content for a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
wider public.

- Language skills (see also SC7): Excellent oral and written communication in English. Good communication in German and French is an asset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AC2</th>
<th>Understanding of the mandate and suggested methodological approach</th>
<th>30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensible, well-structured offer with a good appreciation and understanding of the requirements and expectations</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of the proposed approach and methodology</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description of the risks, constraints and opportunities as well as the means identified for addressing them</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative and innovative approaches and suggested methods</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AC3</th>
<th>Quality of submitted evaluation reports</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of the executive summary</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description of evaluation methods</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity of conclusions, based on the findings; and related recommendations</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AC4</th>
<th>Financial proposal</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity of the proposition, realistic estimation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity of the proposition and overall amount of financial proposal</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score = \( \frac{P_{\text{min}} \times \text{max. Points}}{P} \)

- \( P_{\text{min}} \) = Price of the lowest Proposal
- \( P \) = Price of the Proposal to be assessed

Award criteria are evaluated on a scale of 0 to 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Fulfilment and quality of the criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cannot be established • Information not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very bad fulfilment • Information is incomplete • Data quality is very poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bad fulfilment • Information relates inadequately to the requirements • Data quality is poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Average fulfilment • Information globally responds inadequately to the requirements • Data quality is adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good fulfilment • Information focuses well on requirements • Data quality is good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very good fulfilment • Information clearly relates to the achievement of outputs • Data quality is excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Additional points to be noted by the bidder

7.1 Address for submission of offers
Via email to SDC Evaluation and Corporate Controlling division: sektion.evaluation-controlling@eda.admin.ch.

7.2 Language of documents, language of bids
The bid must be submitted in English (Annexes may be in English, French or German). The documents are available in English.

7.3 Expression of interest in submitting an offer and receiving documents
Interested bidders can express their interest in submitting an offer by email until Monday 04th of December 2017 (Swiss time) and will receive these terms of reference and additional documents by email in return.

7.4 Answering questions
Questions concerning the awarding of the mandate in question can be sent by Monday 04th of December 2017 (Swiss time) to the contact person named under point chapter 4.1. Please send in questions in writing by email. The answers will be made available by email to all bidders who have expressed an interest in submitting an offer.

7.5 Deadline for submitting a bid and validity
The bid must be sent by email to the contact person named under chapter 4.1 by Wednesday 10th of January 2018 (Swiss time) at the latest with the following note: Offer – Independent Evaluation of the Linkage of Humanitarian Aid and Development Cooperation at the SDC.

The bid is valid for up to 180 days after the aforementioned date for submission.

Please submit the financial proposal in CHF (excl. VAT).

7.6 Negotiations
Remain reserved.

7.7 Confidentiality
All information of any kind that comes to the attention of the bidder in connection with the tendered mandate of the awarding authority is to be treated as confidential. The content of the present tender may only be made available to persons taking part in the preparation of the bid. The tender documentation may not be used for any other purposes than preparation of the bid, even in extracts.
Bidders treat facts as confidential that are not public knowledge or publicly available. In cases of doubt, facts are to be treated as confidential. This obligation to secrecy remains valid even after conclusion of the tender procedure.

The awarding authority undertakes to maintain confidentiality about this bid towards third parties subject to the reserve of statutory publication requirements.

7.8 Integrity clause

Bidders undertake to take all necessary measures to avoid corruption, especially not to offer or accept payments or other advantages.

Bidders who violate the integrity clause are required to pay a contractual penalty to the contracting authority amounting to 10% of the contract sum or at least CHF 3,000 per violation.

The bidder notes that a violation of the integrity clause leads as a rule to the cancellation of the award or to early termination of the contract by the contracting authority for important reasons. The Parties shall inform each other in case of any well-founded suspicions of corruption.

7.9 Protected rights

All protected rights that arise from executing the mandate shall be transferred to the contracting authority.

8 Annexes

Annexes will be sent upon expression of interest, see point 7.3.

8.1 General Terms and Conditions General Terms and Conditions of Business (GTC) of the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA) for Mandates (Type A and B)

8.2 Form to submit an offer Mandate Type A and B

8.3 References used for the ToR/Approach Paper

8.4 List of SDC partner countries