

**GRC Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Evaluation
of the Anticipation Hub (AH) Strategy 2021-2024
Ref: Evaluation AH 2024 11**

Table of Contents

1. Introduction & Context	2
2. Evaluation purpose and users	3
2.1 Purpose	3
2.2 Users of the evaluation	3
3. Task description	4
3.1 Evaluation scope	4
3.2 Evaluation criteria including specific evaluation questions related to the project/program	4
4. Evaluation design and methodology	5
4.1 Evaluation team	5
4.2 Sources of information	6
4.3 Methodology	6
4.4 Participation of stakeholders	7
5. Evaluation process with timetable and reporting	7
5.1 Timetable	7
5.2 Reporting	8
5.3 Responsibilities and duties	10
6. Evaluation quality and ethical standards	10
7. Dissemination of evaluation results and their application	11
8. Application, award, and contractual details	11
8.1 Qualifications	11
8.2 Application	12
8.3 Tender schedule	12
8.4 Award	14
8.4 Contractual details	16
9. Annex	16
• Anticipation Hub	16

1. Introduction & Context

The Anticipation Hub (hereinafter referred to as AH) is a joint initiative of the German Red Cross (GRC), the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) and the Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre (Climate Centre). The AH was launched in December 2020 and is supported by the German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO).

The AH brings together partners across the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement, universities, research institutes, NGOs, UN agencies, governments, donors, and network initiatives working on anticipatory action. The AH seeks to engage with, facilitate learning and inspire actors to connect, foster collaboration, learning and partnerships between humanitarian, development and the climate sectors to capture synergies across risk reduction, early warning systems, preparedness, response and recovery related policies and interventions. The AH aims to support practitioners, scientists, and policymakers within and beyond the humanitarian sector from global and local levels and bridge the knowledge gap within and between them. The Anticipation Hub is still at the beginning of its journey and is expected to continuously evolve through support from its founders, partners and the wider anticipatory action community.

The AH 2021-2024 strategy presents the shared vision, aims, values and strategic priorities for the Anticipation Hub. It outlines the three strategic priorities to guide and structure its work towards achieving its vision, mission and aims. These priorities are:

Priority 1: Learning, Innovation, and Exchange: Through this priority the AH stimulates learning and exchange across its partners and the wider anticipatory action community to stimulate collaboration, innovation and co-creation on emerging topics.

Priority 2: Guidance and Support: Through this priority, the AH captures the existing evidence and knowledge resource available across the anticipatory action community and make them available in user friendly tools and activities to help guide and support the implementation of more anticipatory action in practice.

Priority 3: Policy and Advocacy: Through this priority, the AH promotes evidence-based policy and advocacy development. In collaboration with global, regional and national partners and working groups, the AH collates new emerging evidence demonstrating the impact and benefits of anticipatory action for communities at risk of disasters. The AH works with partners to strengthen relationships between humanitarian actors and other actors to anchor anticipatory action into their programmes and policies based on evidence generated across practice, policy and science to inform donor policies and promote the integration and mainstreaming of anticipatory action within and beyond the humanitarian sector.

For more information, please visit <https://www.anticipation-hub.org/anticipation-hub-strategy-2021-2024/>

2. Evaluation purpose and users

The AH 2021-2024 strategy is integrated into the Theory of Change of the Global Project II (GP II) funded by the German Federal Foreign Office¹, managed by the German Red Cross. The GP II aims at “strengthening and further developing international humanitarian aid and the international humanitarian system.” It aims at strengthening and further developing the RCRC Movement and the wider humanitarian system to deliver high quality, effective and needs-based humanitarian aid. Building on, developing, and promoting new learnings and innovations, GP II provides support to National Red Cross Red Crescent Societies and to the humanitarian system in three key thematic areas: Anticipatory Action (AA), humanitarian Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), and Health (including water, sanitation and hygiene, WASH). Humanitarian Assistance in the Urban Context, Climate Change (CC) and Digitalization/Information Management (IM) are also cross-cutting topics of GP II. Therefore, this evaluation should also be focused on how the Anticipation Hub’s 2021-2024 strategic priorities and subsequent activities contribute to the GP II Theory of Change.

Since funding for this evaluation comes from the GP II, the GRC will be referred to as the contracting party for this evaluation throughout this ToR.

2.1 Purpose

The main purpose of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability of AH’s activities and strategic priorities. The evaluation aims to provide actionable insights and recommendations to guide the AH in enhancing its work and ensuring sustainability of the AH, by aligning its strategic priorities with changing needs of stakeholders and evolving trends in the field of anticipatory action. The latter will be achieved through a landscape analysis of stakeholders’ needs. Furthermore, the evaluation seeks to contribute to shaping and informing the strategic direction of the AH from 2025 onwards by identifying specific learnings, recommendations, and impacts of its various activities. The evaluation will help ensure that the Anticipation Hub continues to effectively contribute to anticipatory action worldwide and remains responsive to stakeholders’ needs and changing landscape.

2.2 Users of the evaluation

Here is the list of stakeholders who will use the results of the evaluation:

- The Anticipation Hub Steering Committee (GRC; IFRC, Climate Centre)
- The Anticipation Hub Advisory Group (namely Start Network, FAO, the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management (AHA Centre), the National Meteorological Service Argentina (SMN), Welthungerhilfe, Feinstein International Center, Tufts University, University of Reading, the Risk-informed Early Action Partnership Secretariat (REAP), 510 Data Team of the Netherlands Red Cross, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and ICPAC)
- AH Management, AH staff and AH Coordination Team
- GRC International Cooperation Division, and in particular Team 64 (Knowledge and Innovation), Team 63 (Unit for Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL), and T62 (Planning and Risk Management), and T61 (Operations and National Society Cooperation)

¹ The Global Project II funded by the German Federal Foreign Office until December 2025

- RCRC Sister National Societies involved in Anticipatory Action and in AH's work
- AH partners and the wider anticipatory action community
- GFFO Humanitarian Divisions S-07, S-08 and S-09
- Other organizations involved in the AH activities

3. Task description

3.1 Evaluation scope

The evaluation intends to assess the relevance, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the AH's 2021-2024 strategy. The evaluation will provide actionable insights and recommendations to guide the AH's development of its new upcoming strategy, based on needs and emerging trends in the anticipatory action community and beyond

The evaluation will focus on the strategic priorities and corresponding activities outlined in the Anticipation Hub's 2021-2024 strategy, mentioned in Section 1, and seeks to answer the following questions listed in section 3.2.

3.2 Evaluation criteria including specific evaluation questions related to the project/program²

This evaluation will adhere to the OECD-DAC criteria of **Relevance, Effectiveness, and Sustainability**. The team of consultant(s) will detail in the inception report how he/she/they intend to operationalize these questions, and relevant methodologies to collect the necessary data for the analysis. The following evaluation questions are categorized based on the criteria mentioned above:

3.2.1 Relevance:

- Is the Anticipation Hub's approach suitable to help achieve its mission and strategic priorities?
- How can the AH ensure it remains relevant to practitioners, local actors, policy makers, donors?
- How well does the AH align its activities with current external trends and developments?
- What needs to change given the development of AA over the last years?
- What feedback do stakeholders provide regarding the relevance of the AH's activities? How is this feedback reflected in the current planning and implementation cycle?
- What are the gaps in service provision? What are the possible future roles of the AH?
- Is the AH well placed to play a greater coordination role?
- Is the AH reaching the right audiences?
- Is the AH being used by local actors? Is it seen as a helpful/effective resource?
- How the AH can help bridge the humanitarian-development divide

3.2.2 Effectiveness:

- To what extent did the AH reach its planned strategic priorities?
- To what degrees has the AH contributed to bringing Anticipatory Action to scale? Is there evidence of it?
- How well does the AH governance structure support the AH's ambitions, direction of travel and accommodate diversity of perspectives?

² The OECD-DAC reduced and revised the evaluation criteria for development assistance in 2019. For further details, see <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf> (16/5/2023).

- Is the Hub's current governance fit for the future?
- What is the AH doing that no-one else is doing? What is AHs biggest added value based on feedback from stakeholders? To what extent has the AH contributed to global, regional, and local/national advocacy efforts?
- To what extent has the AH supported and empowered practitioners/academia/policy makers through developing and disseminating guidance and fostering learning through innovation, technology and exchanges?
- To what extent has the AH supported evidence generation and dissemination to contribute to the scale-up of AA?
- Is the AH equipped with the necessary resources, skills and infrastructures to meet its strategic objectives, and to adapt to changes in the external environment?

3.2.3 Sustainability:

- Is there a sense of joint ownership amongst AH co-founders (IFRC, GRC and RCCC) and AH partners?
- What changes in strategic priorities and ways of working should the AH consider for the next strategic phase within the evolving external context?
- What aspects should the AH replicate or focus on moving forward? What aspects should be changed?
- What emerging trends and challenges in the anticipatory action community should the AH address moving forward?
- What funding modalities/options/strategies could support a fit for purpose model for the AH?

4. Evaluation design and methodology

The team of consultant(s) will propose an evaluation design and methodology as part of the consultancy's offer. The consultant(s) should include qualitative and quantitative methodologies to triangulate and substantiate findings, in compliance with the [IFRC Standards for Evaluation](#). The consultant(s)'s offer should be detailed enough to clearly understand the rationale behind the choice of the design and methodologies given the evaluation subject and questions, as well as the feasibility and resources involved. A comprehensive version is to be presented as part of the inception report and agreed upon with German Red Cross and the Anticipation Hub at the kick-off meeting.

The proposed design and methodology should consider that the evaluation covers a complex program and is overarching, with a focus on analyzing contribution and distilling learnings. This should be reflected in the design and methodology e.g. by highlighting analytical approaches for tracking contributions, attributing results, and triangulating causal linkages.

The team of consultant(s) is/are furthermore expected to familiarize themselves with the specific understanding of the Anticipation Hub and its 2021-2024 strategy, and the topic of anticipatory action.

4.1 Evaluation team

4.1.1 Consultants:

In general, the GRC strives to provide as much transparency and participation as possible in an evaluation process. Therefore, depending on the evaluation's purpose, the GRC encourages a diverse team made up of national/local and international staff.

The team composition, the team profiles and structure should be communicated and discussed with the Evaluation Steering Committee beforehand. The team composition and the evaluation's design and methodology are subject matters of clarifications between GRC, the Anticipation Hub and the consultant(s). It is also expected that the consultant(s) will be the same as the ones for whom Curriculum Vitae (CV) are submitted in the tender process. The communication will be done with the team lead, as and where applicable.

4.1.2 GRC and Anticipation Hub

Evaluation Steering Committee:

- Head of the Anticipation Hub
- Anticipation Hub's Project Manager
- Anticipation Hub's Learning Manager
- Anticipation Hub's Policy and Advocacy Manager
- GRC Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning and Accountability Manager

Evaluation Commissioner:

- Head of the Anticipation Hub
- AH Steering Committee Members (GRC, IFRC, Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Center)

4.2 Sources of information

The team of consultant(s) will have access to all relevant project documents such as AH strategy, the GPII Theory of Change, GPII project proposal, project management documents (logframe, activity workplan, budget), monitoring tools, project reports (narrative and financial), etc. These documents are confidential and can be cited and used in the evaluation process. Information which could do harm to any stakeholder if published should be treated in a confidential way. The decision about the publication is the right of GRC and the Anticipation Hub. Interviews with key stakeholders will also feed into the evaluation process and its recommendations.

4.3 Methodology

The team of consultant(s) will use mixed methodologies and approaches while combining both qualitative and quantitative data collection. For the collection of primary data, participatory methods should be applied, and the following methodologies should be considered:

- Desk review of relevant AH's documents, e.g. policy, strategy or guidance documents
- Desk review of AH website
- Collection of qualitative data e.g. through key informant interviews (KIIs) or focus group discussions (FGDs) with key stakeholders. The data collection will be carried out remotely.
- A quantitative survey of AH's partners, RCRC Sister National Societies and other key stakeholders from the anticipatory action community
- Interviews with AH Stakeholders

The team of consultant(s) will have access to all organizational (RCRC Movement) and project documents relevant to the evaluation. GRC and the Anticipation Hub will prepare a preliminary document repository for the evaluator(s) at the start of the evaluation through a cloud-based platform. The consultant(s) are expected to review the repository, engage with GRC and the Anticipation Hub on aspects not covered or where the information should be made available in a different form, and commit to using the information made available for analysis. After the evaluation, the team of consultant(s) commit to delete all the documents shared with them for the purpose of this evaluation.

4.4 Participation of stakeholders

The collection of primary data should aim for a high level of participation. Contacts with relevant partners and stakeholders will be facilitated by GRC and the Anticipation Hub. The following will serve as resource persons, as applicable:

- AH staff
- GRC Anticipation Unit
- GRC Team 64 lead
- IFRC staff
- Climate Centre staff
- AH partners
- Sister National Society staff

5. Evaluation process with timetable and reporting

The evaluation process has distinct phases and is described in the following paragraphs.

5.1 Timetable

The contracting parties will guide the evaluation process, namely the Evaluation Commissioners, the Evaluation Manager/Evaluation Steering Committee, and the team of consultant(s). Both parties will agree on a specific timetable. The team of consultant(s) should deliver an inception report detailing the methodology and timeframe. Further reporting will consist of a preliminary report, which will serve as a basis for a validation workshop, the final report and a factsheet summarizing key aspects as deliverables. The final report shall reflect the validated workshop results.

Thirty consultancy days are allocated for the evaluation. The final evaluation report and factsheet should be submitted by 31st March 2025. A proposed timeline of activities should be submitted for the tender. Finalization of the proposed timetable will be done jointly by GRC, the AH and the selected team of consultant(s) – considering further developments.

Phase	Task	Responsible person	Consultancy	GRC days /person
-------	------	--------------------	-------------	------------------

			days/person	
Inception	Introductory meeting with the evaluation team	AH and consultants	1	1
	Desk Review	Consultants	3	
	Delivery of inception report and review	Consultants and AH	2	
	Review Round for Inception Report	AH		2
Data Collection and Analysis	Kick-off meeting	AH and consultants	1	1
	Data Collection (<i>Remote</i>)	Consultants	14	
	Preliminary report	Consultants	5	
Validation and Report	Validation workshop preparation, facilitation, and documentation of consolidated feedback	Consultants and AH	2	1
	Final report adaptation, delivery, and final discussion	Consultants and AH	2	1
	Total		30	6

5.2 Reporting

5.2.1 Inception report

An inception report allows the team of consultant(s), the GRC and the Anticipation Hub to adapt the evaluation's focus after a first study. The inception report should not be longer than 5 pages. The lead consultant will provide feedback to GRC and the Anticipation Hub about the ToR and their feasibility. This is the point where the lead consultant can clarify open questions, based on the secondary data, and possibly adapt the evaluation's direction. The inception report should be delivered before the evaluation starts. It should contain:

- Key data of the evaluation (project title, project data, commissioner of the evaluation, contractors etc.)
- Feedback / Amendment of ToR, and suggestions for ToR amendments, if necessary
- Status of the evaluation preparation (team, timetable, distribution of tasks, reporting)
- Evaluation design: methodologies, approach, steps for their implementation
- A rapid analysis of stakeholders, needs, and evolving trends in anticipatory action based on the secondary data review
- Tools used: questionnaires, data processing and analysis etc.
- A draft implementation plan for the evaluation

The inception report will be discussed with GRC, the AH and the lead consultant. Any changes to the ToR need an agreement from both parties, as this might change the conditions and contract between GRC and the team of consultant(s).

5.2.2 Preliminary report

Following primary data collection and analysis, the team of consultant(s) will deliver a short preliminary report and presentation with the findings from the evaluation as a first working version of the final report. The preliminary report will be based on the desk review of available documents and analysis of primary information collected through qualitative and quantitative methodologies. The evaluation design, methodology, findings, conclusions, recommendations and limitations should be clearly described. Furthermore, the report will contain an analysis of stakeholders and their needs, and evolving trends in anticipatory action (referred to as “Landscape Analysis”) which will be based on the analysis provided in the inception report. The results of the preliminary report will first be discussed with GRC and the AH and will serve as a basis for the preparation of the validation workshop, where the team of consultant(s) will present the preliminary findings and recommendations.

5.2.3 Evaluation and validation workshop

Key stakeholders from the GRC and the Anticipation Hub, and the team of consultant(s) will come together in a validation workshop to discuss and validate the evaluation findings, lessons learned, and recommendations proposed by the team of consultant(s). Stakeholders might formulate additional recommendations if necessary. The team of consultant(s) will present a structure for the validation workshop as part of their preliminary report. The GRC and the Anticipation Hub are responsible for the workshop preparation, including related administrative and logistics requirements.

A validation workshop may cover the following aspects:

- Presentation and discussion of findings and conclusions
- Validation of lessons learnt and recommendations from stakeholders
- Collection of additional observations or recommendations

5.2.4 Final report and Factsheet

The final report and factsheet must be delivered a maximum of 7 business days after the validation workshop and no later than 31st March 2025. The team of consultant(s) will give their recommendations in the final report but should consider and include the validation and recommendations provided by the participants during the workshop. The final report should have a length of approximately 35-40 pages (excluding annexes) and, at a minimum, include the following elements:

- Factsheet with key data of the evaluation, incl. main findings and recommendations (3-5 pages)
- Executive Summary – a tightly drafted, to-the-point, free standing document (about 5 pages max.) with the following, fixed structure:
 - Short project description
 - Key questions of the evaluation
 - Key findings (organized by the Evaluation Criteria)
 - Lessons learned
 - Major recommendations
- Introduction – with purpose of the evaluation, scope, key questions, brief description of the project to be evaluated and relevant framework conditions
- Evaluation design and methodology, including limitations
- Key findings regarding the questions pointed out in the ToR, clearly supported by evidence and analysis

- Conclusions based on evidence and analysis
- Recommendations as expected in the ToR, which are relevant and feasible and targeted to the respective audience and of a strategic nature
- Lessons learned as generalizations of conclusions for wider use
- Annexes (ToR, primary data collection tools, itineraries of field visits, list of consulted persons/organizations, documentation reviewed, literature consulted, full survey findings if applicable etc.)

The structure can be extended by the team of consultant(s) by additional points as and if necessary. GRC and the Anticipation Hub will analyze the final report, particularly the feasibility of the recommendations proposed by the evaluator(s). The final report will have to be approved by GRC and the Anticipation Hub.

5.3 Responsibilities and duties

GRC and Anticipation Hub:

- Will provide all relevant documentation to the team of evaluator(s).
- Will facilitate the arrangement of interviews (online and in-person) with evaluation participants
- Will prepare required administration and logistics for the validation workshop
- Will provide timely feedback on and approve the deliverables from the evaluation
- Will keep overall coordination between GRC headquarters, GRC and IFRC field offices, and other AH partners and stakeholders as deemed appropriate

The team of consultants:

- Will define and specify the design, methodology, tools, timeframe and intended outputs/outcomes of the various stages of the proposed work
- Will conduct the necessary meetings, interviews, workshops, focus groups etc.
- Will specify any arrangements required for potential field visits
- Will specify arrangements required to organize the validation workshop
- Will submit all deliverables (inception report, preliminary report and presentation, final report, validation workshop workplan/presentation, factsheet, landscape analysis) in English based on agreed structure and timeline
- Will revise the preliminary report based on the feedback received from GRC and the AH
- Will follow the agreed timeframe and shall communicate any unforeseeable change as soon as possible.

It should be expected that regular calls will be conducted between the Evaluation Steering Committee and the consultant(s) as a platform for updates and relevant discussions.

6. Evaluation quality and ethical standards

The team of consultant(s) should take all reasonable steps to ensure that the evaluation is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of people and the communities of which they are

members, and to ensure that the evaluation is technically accurate, reliable, and legitimate, conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organizational learning and accountability. As stated above, the team of consultant(s) should adhere to the IFRC Standards of Evaluation (see above). The final report will be evaluated by the GRC, and the Anticipation Hub based on a checklist of criteria. The team of consultant(s) will receive feedback from GRC and the Anticipation Hub before the final payment of the consultancy contract is approved.

7. Dissemination of evaluation results and their application

The Anticipation Hub and the GRC will receive the full final report, including the factsheet. The report should be delivered in both PDF and Word format. The factsheet/executive summary will be made publicly available on the AH and GRC websites. The factsheet and executive summary may be shared as deemed appropriate.

The evaluation results and accepted recommendations will be used as a basis for the AH's future strategy development and future programming, as well as by GRC, IFRC and the Climate Centre, and any other relevant partners and stakeholders as appropriate.

8. Application, award, and contractual details

8.1 Qualifications

Essential (compliance required for admission to tender):

- All key members of the evaluation team have at least 3 years' experience in conducting evaluations in international development cooperation and/or humanitarian assistance
- Experience in working in the field of international development cooperation, humanitarian assistance with RCRC Movement, United Nations agencies, international, national/local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or civil society organizations (CSOs) or other international organizations or development banks
- Strong research, methodological and analytical skills, and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions, make recommendations, and prepare well written reports
- Strong communication skills, including the ability to write clearly and concisely
- Excellent facilitation skills, with the ability to engage effectively with diverse stakeholders
- Fluency in English

Preferable (without rating):

- Expertise with international standards and best practices in anticipatory action and disaster risk management
- Demonstrated experience and expertise in disaster risk management, early warning systems, early action, anticipatory action, and humanitarian response
- Knowledge of additional languages (French, Spanish or Arabic) are an asset

Evidence of fulfillment of the above-mentioned essential aspects is assessed based on the documents submitted with the application dossier, notably the letter of motivation and team of consultant(s)´ CVs.

8.2 Application

The tender is handled via a **public invitation to tender**.

The tender documents consist of the following:

- Terms of Reference
- Code of Conduct of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement
- Rules of Conduct for staff and volunteers on GRC missions
- Draft contract
- Declaration of Conformity
- Draft Data Processing Agreement
- Questions from the bidders answered by the client and corrections made by them to the tender documents.

All documents are published on GRC´ s website:

<https://www.drk.de/das-drk/aktuelle-ausschreibungen/>

Revisions, additions, answers to questions etc. are likewise published under the link quoted. All documents and information as well as only those documents and information published under this link are authoritative, regardless of information provided in other fora where the tender may be advertised in addition.

8.3 Tender schedule

Tendering steps	Tender schedule
Publication of the public invitation to tender:	17.10.2024
Bidder questions on the tender by:	01.11.2024, 12:00 h noon CET
Deadline for submission of tenders:	07.11.2024, 12:00 h noon, CET
Client queries regarding the submitted tenders by:	13.11.2024
Proposed timeframe for presentations:	Estimated 14. – 15.11.2024
Information on planned award of contract:	Estimated 20.11.2024
Signing of contract:	Estimated 27.11.2024
Start of the collaboration:	Estimated 27.11.2024

Binding period by which offers must be binding: (Bids that do not meet the binding deadline will be excluded)	27.11.2024
---	------------

Submission of tender

The **complete and binding** offer must be submitted to the client by **07.11.2024 at 12:00 noon CET** inclusive. The binding period, by which the offers must be binding, applies up to and including 27.11.2024. Please refrain from using clauses such as 'subject to change' or 'non-binding' as this may lead to the exclusion of your offer.

Please submit your offer as follows:

- as an **encrypted and password-protected attachment**
- in English language
- to: German Red Cross, Team 64, Anticipation Hub
- by e-mail to **Team64-support@drk.de**
- Subject: **Evaluation AH 2024-11**
- The **password** must be sent with a second separate e-mail.
- **Please note that we are unfortunately unable to consider offers that have not been submitted in encrypted form.**

The **dossier** to be submitted must contain the following documents/ information as a pre-requisite for admission to the tender, **both with regards to the documents as well as the aspects to be covered therein** – **incomplete dossiers may not be considered:**

- Letter of motivation:
 - Summarizing relevant experiences and qualifications for the consultancy
 - Provision of 2 references with at least the title, timeframe, client and reference person.
- Technical proposal, including:
 - Brief summary/outline of the team of consultant(s)' understanding of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, the Anticipation Hub, and the area of Anticipatory Action
 - Evaluation design and methodology
 - Timetable for the evaluation(s) proposal
- Financial proposal
 - Financial proposals need to be in Euro (EUR) and show value-added tax (VAT) separately. Interested consultants who are registered outside of Germany must not include VAT in their offer. The evaluation of all offers will consider the net price. Based on the "reverse-charge procedure," GRC will pay respective statutory VAT in Germany. Please indicate your VAT number/taxpayer ID and bank account with your offer.
 - Stating the validity of the offer until min. 27 November 2024
- Examples of recent comparable work, max. 5 years old, with clear authorship by the evaluator(s) mentioned in the application. Two evaluations (if full reports may not be shared for confidentiality reasons, executive summaries and/or factsheets including at least a description and outline of the approach and methodology applied).
- Curriculum Vitae (CV) of all team members
- Signed Declaration of Conformity.

Alternate offers (“Nebenangebote”) are permitted.

Based on an initial ranking as per the criteria stated below, three candidates with the highest score will be invited to present their offers in an online meeting via MS Teams of approx. 45 minutes in English with representatives of the evaluation commissioners. In the case of a tie for rank three, both candidates shall be invited for a presentation. The presentations are expected to have a length of max. 20 minutes and to highlight relevant experience and qualifications; the consultant(s)´ understanding of the Anticipation Hub and the task at hand; the evaluation design and methodology; and the proposed workload and timetable. These aspects will also be discussed during the meeting. The proposed timeframe for presentations is **14 – 15 November 2024**. The presentation will be documented.

Used tool for the presentation:	Microsoft Teams Meeting
Length of presentation:	Max. 20 minutes
Time for questions from the AH:	Max. 25 minutes

Note: The bidders are prohibited to present new documents that were not submitted with the offer or give additional and/or other information which is not stated within the tender documents. Presentations may not exceed 20 minutes.

Interested applicants must raise questions in writing by **01.11.2024, 12:00 h noon CET** to the above-mentioned email addresses. Questions and answers will be published in an anonymized form on GRC´s procurement website under the link referenced above. They then form an integral part of the contract documents. Candidates are strongly encouraged to contact GRC/Anticipation Hub to clarify questions about the documents to be submitted, their content, and the presentation's content.

GRC reserves the right to continue further communication after submission of quotes via a combination of media (e.g., post, email, phone). GRC may – but is not obliged to – ask each tenderer individually for clarification regarding their quote within a reasonable time limit, to be determined by the evaluation committee.

8.4 Award

The decision for the award of contract will be determined via credit points assigned to the dossiers submitted according to the following criteria:

- The offered technical proposal demonstrates a high level of (45%):
 - Understanding of the overall task at hand (20%) with consideration to Anticipatory Action
 - Suitability of methodology proposed to cover the scope and complexity of the task at hand with a sufficient level of detail to generate reliable results (15%)
 - Feasibility of timetable/ workplan given the proposed timeframe (10%)
- The quality of the submitted work samples with regards to the suitability of the design and methodology applied to the task at hand (10%)
- The presentation demonstrates a high level of understanding, professionalism in presentation and engagement (15%)
- Price (30%)

The total number of points achieved by the respective offer is calculated by determining the price point value (PPV) and the quality point value (QPW). Based on the point values calculated in each case, the total number of points is determined according to the weighting of price and quality, as outlined below:

8.3.1 Price Point Value (PPV):

- For the price, the quotient of the cheapest offer and the offer to be evaluated is formed and multiplied by 100 and the percentage weighting: $((\text{price of the cheapest offer} / \text{price of the offer to be evaluated}) \times 100) \times \text{weighting factor} = \text{PPV}$
- The school grading system is of course not applicable to the evaluation of the price.

8.3.2 Quality Point Value (QPV):

- The quality for each award criterion is evaluated as follows: $(\text{points achieved} \times 20) \times \text{percentage weighting} = \text{QPV}$

*Each QPV will be calculated according to the following scoring system:

Score	Scoring Criteria
5 points	<p>Technical Proposal: Demonstrates exceptional understanding of the evaluation requirements, specifically the strategic aspects and the changing environment, with detailed and comprehensive evaluation methodology that address all aspects of the ToR within a minimal timeframe</p> <p>Work Samples: Offers outstanding and highly relevant work samples that are of very high quality, showing a concise understanding of their subject matter, highly suitable methodology as well as relevant and realistic outcomes tailored to the target audience.</p> <p>Presentation: Provides a highly professional and engaging presentation, capturing the strategic focus and context of the evaluation, and outlining approach, methodology, and expected outcomes in a concise way, as well as reflecting a thorough insight into the subject matter.</p>
4 points	<p>Technical Proposal: Shows a strong understanding of the evaluation requirements, including strategic and contextual aspects, with detailed evaluation methodology that address most aspects of the ToR within a feasible timeframe.</p> <p>Work Samples: Provides high-quality and relevant work samples that demonstrate a strong relevance with the ToR, showing a strong understanding of their subject matter, suitable methodology and relevant outcomes.</p> <p>Presentation: Delivers a clear and professional presentation, capturing the focus and context of the evaluation, that effectively communicates the approach, methodology, and expected outcomes, showing good insight into the subject matter.</p>
3 points	<p>Technical Proposal: Demonstrates a sufficient understanding of the evaluation requirements, with an adequate methodology that address the requirements of the ToR, within an acceptable timeframe.</p> <p>Work Samples: Presents acceptable work samples that are relevant and to the ToR content of sufficient quality, showing sufficient understanding of their subject matter, acceptable methodology and answering to the main purpose.</p> <p>Presentation: Offers a satisfactory presentation that communicates the approach, methodology, and expected outcomes of the evaluation adequately.</p>

<p>2 points</p>	<p>Technical Proposal: Shows a limited understanding of the evaluation requirements, with methodologies that address some aspects of the ToR, in a timeframe that is not suitable.</p> <p>Work Samples: Offers few relevant work samples, with a lower quality and minimal alignment with the contract's objectives.</p> <p>Presentation: Provides an incomplete or partially clear presentation that only partially communicates the approach, methodology, and expected outcomes, with limited references to the Evaluation requirements.</p>
<p>1 point</p>	<p>Technical Proposal: Demonstrates an inadequate understanding of the project requirements, with insufficient solutions that fail to address the key aspects of the ToR.</p> <p>Work Samples: Provides work samples of low quality and relevance to the contract's objectives.</p> <p>Presentation: Delivers a poor presentation that lacks clarity and does not effectively communicate the approach, methodology, or expected outcomes, with minimal or irrelevant references to the evaluation requirements.</p>
<p>0 points</p>	<p>Technical Proposal: Shows no understanding of the evaluation requirements, with no methodology provided.</p> <p>Work Samples: No work samples are provided, or those provided are of poor quality and/or entirely irrelevant.</p> <p>Presentation: Does not present any approach, methodology, or expected outcomes.</p>

8.3.3 Total Points:

Total points achieved would then be calculated according to the following formula: PPV + QPV = Total points achieved

8.4 Contractual details

Applicants will be requested to sign and abide by the Code of Conduct and have to complete the Data Protection Form as part of the contract.

GRC will pay the consultant(s) awarded the contract **30% upon signing of contract, 30% upon approval of the inception report, and 40% upon approval of final report.** The team of consultant(s) must provide an invoice containing his/her/their contact details, the services provided, bank details, and VAT number/taxpayer ID and should allow at least two weeks for the processing of the payment.

Should there be any additional payment obligations on the part of GRC as agreed in the contract, e.g. related to travel expenses, the submission of original receipts is required for the payment.

9. Annex

- [Anticipation Hub](#)
- [AH's 2021-2024 Strategy and relevant annexes](#)