Terms of Reference

Meta evaluation of the disaster responses
implemented by the Bangladesh Red Crescent Society 2017-2023

1. Background

The German Red Cross (GRC) and the Bangladesh Red Crescent Society (BDRCS), long-standing partners in providing support to the population of Bangladesh in case of crises, seek to draw strategic lessons from the evaluations of the disaster responses implemented by BDRCS 2017-2023 with a view to support improving BDRCS´ responses as well as evaluation practice in the future. This effort shall be undertaken in the context of the Pilot Programmatic Partnership (PPP) funded by the European Commission´s Directorate-General for Humanitarian Assistance and Civil Protection (DG ECHO), an important frame for the cooperation of both Red Cross Red Crescent National Societies (NS). Against the background of natural hazards and climate change facing Bangladesh as well as the COVID-19 pandemic/ health are two areas of strategic importance in which BDRCS provides services to and assists the population, these will also constitute a primary focus of the evaluation.

With a population of over 172 million, Bangladesh is one of the most densely populated countries globally. Two-thirds of this low-lying country live within five metres of sea level, many of them in rapidly expanding informal settlements and on marginal agricultural land, which, coupled with the country´s geographic location, makes Bangladesh highly vulnerable to disasters and climatic variability. With 32 percent of the population living in rapidly urbanising areas, frequent fires, urban floods, heat, twisters and earthquakes pose a massive risk to millions of people in the country. The northern and eastern regions such as Sylhet as well as overcrowded urban areas of the country such as Dhaka are particularly susceptible to earthquakes. Other natural hazards such as cyclones, floods, river erosion and landslides threaten lives and livelihoods. Heatwaves remain one of the most understated yet dreadful hazards aggravated by the climate crisis that continue to impact lives and livelihoods of significant parts of the population across the country, especially the northern regions. Measures taken by the Bangladesh government to enhance its preparedness and response include enacting/ revising related policies, increasing investments in resilient infrastructure, intensifying public awareness campaigns, and collaboration with international organizations and neighbouring countries, among others.

Health care in Bangladesh has improved remarkably in the last two decades and the economy has experienced rapid recovery following the adverse impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, less than half of the population is covered by essential health services. Inequitable access to those services is a key concern, with wide differences in coverage between districts and economic groups. As the country becomes more urbanized and industrialized, it faces a triple burden of communicable diseases, non-communicable diseases, and injuries. Poor water and sanitation conditions contribute to high levels of vulnerability to illnesses and diseases, mainly affecting populations living in poor urban areas. Furthermore, Bangladesh faces many infectious disease challenges, from long-established diseases such as cholera, malaria, and dengue to emerging infections such as Nipah and Chikungunya.

The Bangladesh Red Crescent Society was constituted on 31 March 1973 by the country's President Order No. 26 with retrospective effect from 16 December 1971. It is the oldest humanitarian organization in Bangladesh following the country's independence. BDRCS operates through 68 branches located across the country, with one branch in each of the country's 64 districts as well as an additional four city branches in Dhaka, Chattogram, Rajshahi, and Khulna. BDRCS has a total of 840 staff consisting of 339 permanent staff and 484 project or contractual staff, 83,346 life

members, and 10,102 Red Crescent Youth (RCY) volunteers. The Cyclone Preparedness Programme (CPP), a globally recognized community-based disaster preparedness programme, is a flagship initiative jointly run by BDRCS and the Government of Bangladesh (GOB) in the field of disaster management. It covers early warning systems, search and rescue, evacuation, shelter, first aid, relief distributions, and rehabilitation activities. The CPP's strength lies in its 76,000 community volunteers. In the field of healthcare, BDRCS runs eight blood centres, two eye hospitals, one general hospital and one medical college hospital, which provides comprehensive healthcare services. It has 57 mother and child healthcare (MCH) centres providing primary and maternity healthcare services, three outdoor clinics, three diploma nursing institutes and six Red Crescent midwifery training institutes.

The National Society's mandate, as stated in its Strategy 2021-2025 and the country's Standing Order on Disasters, is to complement the GOB efforts particularly in preparedness and response to both humanitarian and health crises. The Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief (MoDMR) is the National Society's key partner, in addition to the direct line Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. The BDRCS effectively manages emergencies and crises with the support that it receives from the network of the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies an from collaborating with external agencies, and has positioned itself as one of the key actors in preparedness, response, recovery, rehabilitation, and reduction of risks in the country. The National Society has been a pioneer in forecast-based and anticipatory actions for floods, cyclones and heatwaves, and is now piloting community-based surveillance for health. Its cash programmes and volunteer deployments for response are well appreciated by the communities.

2. Evaluation purpose and users

2.1 Purpose

Evaluation is a systematic and impartial examination of a specific project/ programme with intentions to draw lessons to improve policy and practice and enhance accountability. It clearly articulates findings, draws conclusions and make recommendations for the organization whose performance is being evaluated. A meta evaluation quantitively and qualitatively compares and summarizes findings of studies based on an agreed framework. Further, the OECD defines meta-evaluation as an assessment of an evaluation (or a body of evaluations) to judge its quality or scrutinize the performance of the evaluators or methodologies used.

BDRCS is at the forefront of humanitarian response in Bangladesh largely due to its mandate coupled with nationwide presence, pool of volunteers, developed expertise in various sectors and support from RCRC Movement Partners. As an organization with this footprint and scale and in view of evolving humanitarian landscape, it is imperative for BDRCS to continue delivering appropriate, timely and effective interventions based on a policy influenced by structured and independent analysis. Of the multitude of disaster response relevant documentation, the BDRCS Strategic Plan 2021-2025, Multi-hazard Contingency Plans, Pre-disaster mechanisms, DRM Strategy and highlighted procedures[1] from the IFRC Preparedness for Effective Response (PER) report for BDRCS are the identified critical guidance for framing and guiding its emergency programming. The BDRCS Strategic Plan will end in 2025 while the PER was last published in 2019. As such, an

---

[1] The 2019 PER report identified the following components as "high priority": The DRM Policy; Emergency Response Procedure; Emergency Operation Center; Pre-Disaster Meetings and Agreements; Information Management; NS-Specific Areas of Intervention – Health in Emergencies; Resource Mobilization; Logistics; Safety and Security Management; Staff and Volunteer Management; and Finance, Administrative and Emergency Procedures.

opportune moment is at hand for providing recommendations in updating the policy and procedures based on the result of this meta-evaluation and thereby making significant inputs to its future strategy and foresight.

Therefore, against the backdrop of its role in the national disaster risk management (DRM) system of Bangladesh and the opportunity to shape BDRC strategic considerations and policies at this point in time, the **overall objective** of this meta evaluation is: **To contribute to improving BDRCS policy and procedures relevant to disaster response programming through review and aggregation of lessons learnt from past evaluations of recent disaster responses.**

Specific objectives:
- Compile and identify key lessons to be learnt from the implementation of disaster responses focusing on the period from 2017 to 2023;
- Assess the progress made in improving BDRCS disaster response implementation based on recommendations of evaluations and status of 2019 PER priority recommendations;
- Provide overarching and specific recommendations to address policy or procedural gaps in BDRS disaster response programming, including better integration of health in disaster response.
- Review the evaluation approaches of emergency responses (particularly how the poly-crises/ intersecting crises phenomena was considered) and provide recommendations for improving future evaluation practice by identifying limitations and challenges associated with the existing evaluation processes.

2.2 Users
- BDRCS Senior Management;
- Movement Partners (IFRC, the International Committee of the Red Cross – ICRC, and Partner National Societies - PNS) cooperating with BDRCS, including the German Red Cross Delegation.

3. **Task description**

3.1 Scope
The evaluation will systematically analyse the disaster responses implemented by BDRCS between 2017 and 2023, with the exception of BDRC´s refugee response in Cox´s Bazar, with a view to
- Aggregating findings and recommendations, including measuring the application of lessons learnt in succeeding disaster responses and capturing procedural changes based on evaluation.
- Developing concrete recommendations for improving existing BDRCS policy and procedures relevant to disaster response (e.g. BDRCS Strategic Plan 2021-2025, DRM Strategy etc.) according to the components prioritized by the 2019 PER report[2], including the integration of health programming.
- In addition, the evaluation shall review the quality and usefulness of past (internal and external) evaluations of BDRC disaster responses and provide recommendations for

---

[2] The 2019 PER report identified the following components as "high priority": The DRM Policy; Emergency Response Procedure; Emergency Operation Center; Pre-Disaster Meetings and Agreements; Information Management; NS-Specific Areas of Intervention – Health in Emergencies; Resource Mobilization; Logistics; Safety and Security Management; Staff and Volunteer Management; and Finance, Administrative and Emergency Procedures.

improving future evaluation exercises, using specifically the criteria evaluation design/ methodology and implementation; soundness of analysis; quality of lessons learned and recommendations; quality of report structure and executive summary; and management response.

The evaluation will primarily rely on a review of existing appraisals of BDRCS disaster responses covering the period from 2017 to 2023 in the form of evaluations, lessons learnt workshops and ~~or~~ internal exercises related to reviewing disaster responses of BDRCS. In addition, it shall engage with selected key stakeholders such as from relevant departments from BDRCS HQ (disaster response, planning and development etc.), unit staff and volunteers, interested Movement Partners, government and non-government agencies involved in disaster response at various levels etc.

List of BDRCS disaster responses implemented 2017-2023:

Date disaster struck	Hazard	IFRC crisis category[3]	Response name
05-10-2023	Flood	Yellow	BGD: Flood - 2023-10 - Bangladesh Flood 2023
07-08-2023	Flood	Yellow	BGD: Flood - 2023-08 - Flash Flood and Landslide' in Chattogram Region
15-07-2023	Flood	Yellow	BGD: Flood - 2023-07 - Bangladesh Flood-2023
14-05-2023	Cyclone	Orange	BGD: Cyclone - 2023-05 - Cyclone Mocha
15-04-2023	Fire	Yellow	BGD: Fire - 2023-04 - Massive fire breaks out at New Supermarket
24-10-2022	Cyclone	Yellow	BGD: Cyclone - 2022-10 - Bangladesh, Cox's Bazar- Cyclone SITRANG
04-06-2022	Fire	Yellow	BGD: Fire - 2022-06 - Fire incident in Chattogram
18-05-2022	Flood	Orange	Bangladesh - Flash Flood 2022
11-05-2022	Cyclone	Yellow	BGD: Cyclone - 2022-05 - Cyclone Asani
24-12-2021	Fire	Yellow	Bangladesh Ferry Fire Incident
03-12-2021	Cyclone	Yellow	Bangladesh Cyclone Jawad
24-08-2021	Flood	Yellow	Bangladesh Monsson Flood 2021
27-07-2021	Other	Yellow	Cox's Bazar-Bangladesh: 2021 Monsoon Incident
25-06-2020	Flood	Orange	Bangladesh - Floods
18-06-2020	Other	Yellow	Bangladesh-Cox's Bazar: 2020 Monsoon Incident
17-05-2020	Cyclone	Orange	Bangladesh - Tropical cyclone AMPHAN
11-03-2020	Fire	Yellow	Fire Incident of Rupnagar slum, Dhaka, Bangladesh
07-11-2019	Cyclone	Orange	Bangladesh - Cyclone Bulbul
17-07-2019	Flood	Yellow	Bangladesh Monsoon Flood 2019
13-07-2019	Flood	Yellow	Heavily Rainfall in Bangladesh
06-07-2019	Other	Yellow	Heavy Rainfall in Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh
01-05-2019	Cyclone	Orange	Tropical Cyclone FANI-19
20-09-2018	Other	Yellow	Bangladesh: Displacement Due to Embankment Collapse
17-06-2018	Flood	Yellow	Bangladesh: Flood
09-05-2018	Other	Yellow	Lightning strikes in Bangladesh
19-04-2018	Cyclone	Yellow	Bangladesh: Monsoon early warning - Cox's Bazar
23-08-2017	Flood	Yellow	Bangladesh - Floods
31-05-2017	Cyclone	Yellow	Bangladesh - Cyclone Mora

---

[3] IFRC crisis category definitions: Yellow - responds to a localised emergency covering a small area or number of beneficiaries. This is normally managed at a country level (by a NS), with any necessary technical or management support provided by the IFRC Regional Office (RO). If necessary, the RO seeks support from IFRC HQ (e.g. DREF). Orange - responds to an emergency affecting a wider area (or areas) and a higher number of beneficiaries (including potential spread), and may also receive a level of international attention or experience a level of complexity. Technical and management support is still provided by the RO, but HQ is engaged at the start-up of the operation to provide DREF, technical quality assurance on Emergency Appeals and technical support or global surge capacity as

3.2 Specific evaluation questions

The different areas of analysis with specific questions to be answered through the evaluation are outlined below, with percentages meant to to be an indicative guide of the anticipated focus of the evaluation. The consultancy partially applies the standards of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The following questions shall guide the evaluation.

(i)   What are the main lessons learned from the disaster responses implemented by BDRCS 2017-2023 with regards to the criteria below, noting enabling/ hindering factors for each, esp. related to BRDCS policies and procedures? (50%)

Relevance:
- To what extent were BDRCS´ responses in line with the needs and priorities of the targeted disaster-affected communities?
    - (aspects for consideration: community participation in program design, inclusion of most vulnerable groups such as persons with disability, feedback mechanisms)
- To what extent were BDRCS´ responses in line with the organization´s national strategy and/ or response plan?

Effectiveness:
- To what extent did BDRCS´ responses achieve their intended objectives, including in a timely manner?
    - (aspects for consideration: measures to reduce risks of tensions, use of routine monitoring data and community feedback for adjustments, realistic planning, coordination with external stakeholders, synergies between interventions, participation of target groups and stakeholders, ensuring beneficiary protection)
- To what extent was the integration of health programming achieved?

Efficiency:
- How well did BDRCS use its resources in the responses? How could resources have been used more economically?
    - (aspects for consideration: BDRCS´ branch structure, volunteer network, pre-positioned supplies, logistics infrastructure, partnerships)

Impact:
- What difference did BDRCS´ responses make to the targeted disaster-affected communities?
- What were wider intended/ unintended, positive/ negative effects on the communities/ different groups and partners? Were there any consequences that were not intended?

Sustainability:

---

required and ensure global coherence and compliance with standards. Red - responds to an emergency of scale, affecting a wide area and high number of beneficiaries, with level of complexity or risk that makes it an organisation-wide priority for the IFRC secretariat at all levels. Technical and management support is coordinated by the RO, but provided by both RO and HQ, and regular task force meetings are held to ensure effective management and information flow. Regional and global surge capacity is activated per default (upon the request of the NS). HQ takes on a stronger role in terms of global coherence and compliance with standards and there may be the need to establish support functions at the HQ level, as well as the regional level.

- To what extent did the benefits resulting from BDRCS´ responses last and contribute to improved resilience among the targeted communities (e.g. through purposeful integration of longer-term objectives or linkages with longer-term programs)?
- How did the responses contribute to institutional capacity building for response delivery within BDRCS?

Coherence:
- How well were the contributions of the different RCRC Movement actors (IFRC, PNS) aligned towards common response objectives?
- How well did BDRCS´ responses adhere to the Code of Conduct and Fundamental Principles of the RCRC Movement?
- To what extent did BDRCS´ responses align with the policies of external stakeholders (Government, Clusters) with a view to achieving synergies in a harmonized effort to respond? To what extent did BDRCS reach the most vulnerable, facing life-threating suffering and groups least well served by the overall humanitarian response?

(ii) **Collection and analysis of changes implemented by BDRCS based on evaluations (40%):**
- What progress has BRCDS made in improving its disaster responses and national society development on these dimensions based on the recommendations from evaluations, and with what results?
- Which factors have enabled/ hindered lessons to be applied, in particular concerning changes in BDRCS´ policies and procedures?

(iii) **Review of the approaches taken in BDRCS response evaluations with a view to formulating recommendations for improving evaluation practice: (10%)**
- How relevant and useful have the evaluations been, specifically the recommendations? (realistic and appropriate given the realities of beneficiaries and implementing partners) What improvements can be made for a more effective, impactful, useful and credible evaluations and related exercises?
- How appropriate were evaluation designs/ methodologies to yield the desired information? (field missions designed to receive maximum information from participants, sample and types of interviewees appropriate etc.)
- To what extent were international evaluation standards such as IFRC Framework for Evaluation adhered to and covered appropriately? To what extent have evaluations considered multiple and intersecting crises phenomena?
- To what extent have the evaluations yielded quality deliverables (with findings, conclusions, and recommendations clearly stated, based on sound empirical analysis and supported by relevant examples; logical and easy to grasp structure/ presentation and main points tailored to target audience)

4. **Evaluation design and methodology**

The consultant(s) are expected to propose an evaluation design and methodology as part of their offer and adhere to the IFRC Standards for Evaluation[4]. **The design should include a mix of methods suitable to triangulate and substantiate findings, and the offer should allow for understanding the rationale behind the selection in view of the evaluation subject and questions as well as the resources involved.** A more comprehensive version is to be presented as part of the inception report and to then be agreed upon with the evaluation steering committee. **At a minimum, the following methods should be considered**:

- Desk review of relevant BDRCS documents, e.g. policy, strategy or guidance documents;
- Desk review of evaluation/ review/ lessons learnt workshop reports;
- Collection of qualitative data e.g. through key informant interviews (KIIs) or focus group discussions (FGDs) with key persons relevant to the evaluation subject.

The consultant(s) will have access to all BDRCS documents relevant to the evaluation, which will be made available by the GRC Delegation in the form of a document repository at the start of the evaluation. The evaluator(s) are expected to review the repository, engage with the evaluation steering committee on aspects not covered or where the information should be made available in a different form, and commit to using the information made available. The documents are confidential but 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 BDRCS. Following the conclusion of the evaluation, the evaluator(s) commit to deleting the documents shared.

The collection of primary data should aim for a high level of participation. Contacts with relevant interview partners will be facilitated by the GRC Delegation. The following persons may serve as resource persons/ interview partners, as applicable:

- Heads of relevant BDRCS departments;
- Heads of in-country RCRC Movement Partners (IFRC, ICRC, Delegations of Partner National Societies);
- Other select groups as required (e.g. specific RCRC unit staff and volunteers, Movement working groups on specific topics, or consortia between Movement partners);
- Government and non-government agencies involved in disaster response at various levels.

5. Evaluation process with timetable, deliverables, responsibilities and duties

The evaluation process will be steered jointly by the contracting parties, namely the evaluation steering committee on behalf of the client and the communicated team lead/ main consultant of the contracted evaluator(s), with evaluation commissioners respectively contracted evaluation team members involved as required. The specific timetable will be agreed by both parties. The consultant(s) shall deliver an inception report detailing the methodology and timeframe. Further reporting will consist of a draft version of the final report, which will serve as basis for a validation

---

[4] ***The IFRC Evaluation Standards*** *are:* 1. Utility: Evaluations must be useful and used. 2. Feasibility: Evaluations must be realistic, diplomatic, and managed in a sensible, cost effective manner. 3. Ethics & Legality: Evaluations must be conducted in an ethical and legal manner, with particular regard for the welfare of those involved in and affected by the evaluation. 4. Impartiality & Independence; Evaluations should be impartial, providing a comprehensive and unbiased assessment that takes into account the views of all stakeholders. 5. Transparency: Evaluation activities should reflect an attitude of openness and transparency. 6. Accuracy: Evaluations should be technical accurate, providing sufficient information about the data collection, analysis, and interpretation methods so that its worth or merit can be determined. 7. Participation: Stakeholders should be consulted and meaningfully involved in the evaluation process when feasible and appropriate. 8. Collaboration: Collaboration between key operating partners in the evaluation process improves the legitimacy and utility of the evaluation.

workshop, and the final report including an executive summary, which will be the products to be delivered. The final report shall reflect the validation workshop results.

5.1 Timetable

A total of **35 consultancy days** are allotted for this evaluation, with a suggested allocation per phase outlined below. **Consultants may amend the allocation of days between phases as part of their offer provided they give a rationale, though not exceed the total number of days**. Details will be agreed jointly by the evaluation steering committee and the selected consultant(s).

Inception phase, including: - Introductory meeting with evaluation steering committee - Review of available documents, potentially introductory interviews, preparation of detailed methodology and timetable - Presentation and discussion of inception report	7 days
Data collection and analysis, including: - Analysis of documents provided - Primary data collection and analysis, including field travel to Bangladesh	15 days
Report preparation, including: - Report writing - Presentation and discussion of draft final report	7 days
Validation workshop	1 day
Preparation and presentation of final report	5 days
Total number of days	35 days

5.2 Deliverables

The deliverables for this evaluation consist of (i) an inception report, (ii) a draft final report, (iii) a validation workshop, and (iv) a final report including an executive summary. All consultant(s) works must be delivered **in English**.

(i) Inception report

The inception phase and in particular the inception report as the key document of this phase offer the opportunity for the evaluator and the evaluation steering committee to clarify the Terms of Reference following a first study of the available documentation and potentially introductory interviews. The evaluator shall give feedback on the ToR and their feasibility and provide details on how he/ she/ they intend(s) to implement and execute the evaluation. In addition to obtaining clarity on open questions, the evaluator(s) can suggest changes to the content or direction of the exercise, prior to its actual start. The inception report will be discussed with the evaluation steering committee. Any changes to the ToR need agreement by both parties, in particular as they might imply changes to the contract. The report should be no longer than **15 pages** (excluding annexes) and contain the following **elements**:

- Basic information about the evaluation exercise (context, purpose, expected results etc.)
- Feedback on/ suggested amendments to the ToR
- Evaluation design/ approach/ methodology, including detailed operationalization of evaluation questions, sources of information, methods for data collection, analysis matrix

- Preliminary insights from a first review of available documents and potentially introductory interviews
- Draft version of primary data collection tools (KII/ FGD guides, survey etc.)
- Status of the evaluation preparation (timetable/ implementation plan, team, distribution of tasks)

(ii)   Draft final report

Following data collection and analysis, the evaluators will prepare and present a draft version of the final evaluation report for discussion (structure **see final report**). In addition to the main information about the evaluation exercise, design and methodology including data collection process and limitations, the report shall set forth findings and conclusions as per the evaluation questions based on clear and sound analysis of available data, and provide evidence/ examples. Recommendations shall be realistic and actionable as well as tailored to the target audience. The report will be discussed with the evaluation steering committee and will serve as basis for the validation workshop.

(iii)   Validation workshop

The evaluators will present the main findings and recommendations in a workshop with representatives of the various stakeholders of this evaluation for the purpose of discussion and validation. At a minimum, the consultants are expected to present their findings in **PowerPoint** and open up space for feedback; alternative methods for presentation as well as for facilitating exchange and discussion among participants are highly welcome. The structure of the workshop shall be discussed with the evaluation steering committee beforehand. The GRC Delegation and BDRCS will take care of workshop preparations and logistics. The evaluators shall take up the feedback and additional recommendations emerging from the workshop in the final version of the evaluation report. Possible content of the workshop:

- Presentation and discussion of preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations, specifically recommendations to BDRCS regarding their disaster response policy and frameworks and future evaluation methodologies
- Validation of lessons learnt and recommendations by all stakeholders
- Collection of additional observations or recommendations

(iv)   Final report

The final evaluation report must be delivered a maximum of 5 business days after the validation workshop. The consultant(s) will give his/ her/ their recommendations in the final report but should consider and include the validation and recommendations provided by the participants during the workshop. The evaluation steering committee will analyse the final report, especially the feasibility of the recommendations proposed by the evaluators. The report will have to be approved by BDRCS. The final report should have a length of approximately **35-40 pages** (excluding annexes) and, at a minimum, include the following **elements**:

- **Executive summary** (about 5 pages, giving an overview of the evaluation purpose, main findings, and key recommendations) **for publication**
- Introduction (including context and purpose of the evaluation, brief description of the evaluation exercise and relevant framework conditions)
- Evaluation design and methodology, data collection and analysis process, methodological limitations
- Key findings as per main evaluation area and related sub-question, clearly supported by analysis of the different information sources and stating both noteworthy evidence and gaps

- Sound and logical conclusions clearly based on the findings
- Relevant, realistic and actionable recommendations tailored to the main evaluation users and of strategic nature
- Lessons learned as generalizations of conclusions for a wider use
- Management response plan template

Annexes can be provided separately and shall include ToR, inception report, primary data collection tools, analysis tools, list of documents reviewed, list of persons interviewed and schedule of interviews, full survey findings if applicable, bibliography of additional literature consulted, documentation of validation workshop if applicable etc.)

5.3 Responsibilities and duties

The GRC Delegation:
- Will be facilitating the evaluation steering committee in close partnership with BDRCS;
- Will coordinate all relevant stakeholders in the process;
- Will provide all relevant documentation to the evaluator(s);
- Will facilitate the arrangement of interviews (online and in-person) with evaluation participants;
- Will facilitate logistics in-country of field travels and provide security briefings as per GRC/ IFRC regulations;
- Will prepare the logistics for the validation workshop.

GRC HQ as contract holder / evaluation commissioner:
- Will handle all contractual aspects related to the sourcing and execution of the evaluation and cover all fees as specified in the contract signed by both parties;
- Will provide support on technical matters, including participation in the evaluation steering committee as needed;
- Will support during inception phase and validation workshop;
- Will review and provide feedback as well as have final approval over the evaluation deliverables based on feedback provided by the steering committee.

Members of the evaluation steering committee (may include GRC, BDRCS, IFRC etc.):
- Will actively participate throughout the evaluation process and provide guidance and feedback;
- Will provide support to all practical matters of the evaluation, including the facilitation of logistics and travel, the provision of the needed documents, facilitating interviews with relevant staff and volunteers;
- Will actively participate in the kick-off and validation workshops;
- Will review and provide feedback on and approve all deliverables.

Evaluation consultant(s):
- Will define and specify the design, methodology, and tools, timeframe and intended outputs/ outcomes of the various stages of 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 and final report, and validation workshop workplan/ presentation) in English based on the agreed structure and as per the agreed timeline;
- Will revise the preliminary and final report based on the feedback received;
- Will follow the timeframe agreed and shall communicate any unforeseeable changes as soon as possible.

6. Evaluation quality and ethical standards

The evaluator(s) should take all reasonable steps to ensure that the evaluation is designed and undertaken in a way that respects and protects the rights and welfare of the persons interviewed and the communities/ organizations of which they are members. They should furthermore ensure that the evaluation is technically accurate, reliable, and legitimate, conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributing to organizational learning and accountability. The evaluator/s should adhere to the evaluation standards of the IFRC (see above).

7. Dissemination of evaluation results and their application

The final evaluation report will be shared with the German Red Cross Delegation and HQ, the Bangladesh Red Crescent Society, ECHO, and potentially other Movement partners cooperating with BDRCS. An executive summary of the report may be published on GRC, BDRCS and IFRC webpages.

The accepted recommendations should be used by BDRCS to improve its policy and frameworks for its disaster response and in the conduct of future evaluations for their organizational learning. The follow-up should be organised and a respective management response and implementation plan should be developed and implemented in an agreed timespan to ensure the application of the recommendations.

8. Application process and award of contract

8.1 Key tender information

Type of tender	Open invitation to tender/ **public tender** **Alternate offers** are **permitted**
Tender documents	1. Terms of Reference 2. Code of Conduct of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement 3. Rules of Conduct for staff and volunteers on GRC missions 4. Draft contract 5. Declaration of Conformity 6. Data Protection/ Order Processing Agreement *All documents are an integral part of the contract.*

	In addition, questions answered by the contracting party as well as corrections made to the tender documents published on the GRC website are part of the contract.
Publication	https://www.drk.de/das-drk/aktuelle-ausschreibungen/ *This link contains the only binding version of all documents, regardless of information shared in other portals/ through other ways. Revisions, additions, answers to questions etc. are also published here and constitute an integral and binding part of the documents. Interested applicants are encouraged to check regularly for updates.*

Schedule		
	Publication of tender	20.12.2024
	Deadline for questions from applicants *GRC HQ is closed from 21.12.2024-01.01.2025. Questions from applicants submitted during this time will be answered starting 02.01.2025.*	**21.01.2025 12:00 CEST**
	Deadline for submission of offers	**24.01.2025 12:00 CEST**
	Envisioned timeframe for **online presentations**	27.-31.01.2025
	Envisioned timeframe for award of contract	03.-07.02.2025
	Envisioned timeframe for signature of contract	10.-14.02.2025
	Estimated start of evaluation exercise	17.02.2025
	Binding period	28.02.2025

Submission of questions and applications	**Via email** in **English** language To: Ms. **Katherina Ziegenhagen**, Country Manager Bangladesh, k.ziegenhagen@drk.de Reference: **"Meta evaluation of the disaster responses implemented by the Bangladesh Red Crescent Society 2017-2023"**

8.2 Application dossiers

Incomplete dossiers may not be considered, which applies to both formal requirements and content requested.

1. Letter of motivation	Including: • Brief overview of relevant experiences and qualifications
2. Curriculum vitae	• Of all members of the team undertaking the exercise • Must provide evidence for the essential qualifications sought *It is expected that the evaluator(s)/consultant(s) executing the evaluation are the same as the ones for whom CVs are submitted in the application dossier. In case data collection in Bangladesh is foreseen to be undertaken with national (local) consultant(s) partners, the application should include their profiles as well. Any changes in the team composition between application and evaluation start as well as during the evaluation must be discussed and agreed with the evaluation steering committee.*
3. Technical proposal	Including:

	• **Brief summary/ outline of the consultant(s)´ under-standing of the task at hand, the local DRM context in Bangladesh, and the auxiliary role of Red Cross Red Crescent National Societies** • Proposed evaluation design and methodology • Timetable
4. Financial proposal	• Showing net rate per day in Euro, exclusive of the travel cost stated below as covered separately by GRC. Financial offers will be compared based on the net price. • Country of taxation and taxpayer ID. GRC will cover VAT of consultants registered outside of Germany as per reverse-charge procedure (for consultants registered in the common European area) or applying this procedure accordingly (for consultants registered in third countries). • GRC will cover transport and accommodation cost for field travel to Bangladesh incurred in line with the Bundesreisek-ostengesetz (Federal Travel Cost Act). GRC does not cover other travel-related cost such as per diems/ food allowance, insurance, visa fees etc., **which the consultants have to cover in their financial proposal and which should be stated separately from the daily rate**. In case transportation and accommodation are not directly arranged by GRC, the consultant´s cost are reimbursed up to the threshold stated in the BrkG upon submission of original receipts.
5. Work samples	• 2 evaluation reports, or, if full reports cannot be shared for confidentiality reasons, executive summaries/ factsheets that should, however, cover the points mentioned below • Max. 5 years old, with clear authorship of evaluation team members • Outlining client, purpose/ objective, approach and methodology, implementation, results, lessons learned/ recommendations
6. Declaration of Conformity	

8.3 Qualifications, admission and scoring

Evidence of fulfillment of the criteria noted below is assessed based on the documents submitted with the application.

Criteria for admission to tender	Application dossiers are complete and cover all content requested, and are submitted on time in the way specified
	Essential qualifications of evaluation team: 1. All key members of the evaluation team have at least 3 years' experience in conducting evaluations in international development cooperation and/or humanitarian assistance 2. Key members of the evaluation team need to have at least 5 years of experience in working in the field of international development

	cooperation/humanitarian assistance with RCRC Movement, international/local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or civil society organizations (CSOs) or other aid organizations such as international organizations or development banks 3. Strong research, methodological and analytical skills, and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions, make recommendations, and prepare well-written reports 4. Fluency in English

Criteria for evaluating admitted offers	1. The offered technical approach demonstrates a high level of (50%):
	   • **Understanding of the overall task at hand, with consideration to the DRM context in Bangladesh and the auxiliary role of Red Cross Red Crescent National Societies (20%)**
	   • Suitability of methodology to cover the scope and complexity of the task at hand with a sufficient level of detail to generate reliable results (20%)
	   • Feasibility of timetable/ workplan given the envisaged timeframe (10%)
	2. The quality of the submitted work samples with regards to the suitability of the design and methodology applied to the task at hand (10%)
	3. The presentation demonstrates a high level of understanding, professionalism in presentation and engagement (10%)
	4. Price (30%)

Preferable qualifications sought among applicants (not required for admission):
- Experience and expertise in conducting complex/ overarching/ strategic evaluations;
- Knowledge of the disaster risk profile and DRM set-up in Bangladesh;
- Knowledge of the Red Cross and Red Crescent;
- Experience and expertise in policy formulation, organizational procedures, and/ or management in larger organizations;
- Experience with conducting as well as managing evaluations;
- Expertise and experience in research methods as well as process facilitation, with a diverse range preferred.

Method for evaluating offers:

Offers are awarded points based on the criteria and the weight assigned to them outlined above. The total number of points achieved by an individual offer is determined by calculating a point value for the financial proposal (Price Point Value – PPV) and a point value for the qualitative criteria (Quality Point Value – QPV), which are then summed up. PPV and QPV are calculated as follows:

PPV = ((price of cheapest offer / price of offer to be evaluated) x 100) x 30%
QPV = Σ((points for 1st criterion x 20) x % weight of 1st criterion) + (2nd criterion) + (...))
Total points = PPV + QPV

Points for quality criteria are assigned based on the following considerations:

Points	Technical proposal	Work samples	Presentation
5	Demonstrates exceptional understanding of the evaluation requirements, specifically the strategic and contextual aspects, with detailed and comprehensive evaluation methodology that address all aspects of the ToR within a minimal timeframe	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	Provides a highly professional and engaging presentation, capturing the strategic focus 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
4	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	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	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
3	Demonstrates a sufficient understanding of the evaluation requirements, with an adequate methodology that address the requirements of the ToR, within an acceptable timeframe	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.	Offers a satisfactory presentation that communicates the approach, methodology, and expected outcomes of the evaluation adequately
2	Shows a limited understanding of the evaluation requirements, with methodologies that address some aspects of the ToR, in a timeframe that is not suitable	The work samples submitted are only partly relevant, with a lower quality and minimal alignment with the assignment´s objectives	Provides an incomplete or partially clear presentation that only partially communicates the approach, methodology, and expected outcomes, with limited references to the evaluation requirements
1	Demonstrates an inadequate understanding of the project requirements, with insufficient solutions that fail to address the key aspects of the ToR	Provides work samples of low quality and relevance to the contract's objectives	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
0	Shows no understanding of the evaluation requirements, with no methodology provided	Work samples provided are of poor quality and/or entirely irrelevant	Does not present any approach, methodology, or expected outcomes

8.4 Application and selection process

Questions on tender	**Applicants are strongly encouraged to raise their questions on the tender in the way and within the deadline specified above.** Questions and answers will be published in an anonymized form under the link provided. They form an integral part of the contract.
Bid opening/ admission to tender	Offers received will be screened for compliance with formal requirements and admission criteria. **GRC reserves the right to communicate with the applicants after submission of offers to seek clarifications within a reasonable time limit and within the boundaries set by procurement regulations. This is documented.**
Scoring of admitted dossiers	Offers fulfilling admission requirements will be evaluated based on the criteria and method outlined above. At minimum the three (3) offers with the highest score will be invited for an online presentation; in case of a tie for the last rank, both applicants shall be invited.
Online presentation	Estimated timeframe for presentations: — 27.-31.01.2025
	Total length: — 45 minutes
	Presentation: — Max. 20 minutes Covering (i) experiences and qualifications, (ii) understanding of the task at hand, (iii) proposed methodology, (iv) timetable **Candidates may not present new content compared to their application dossier**
	Discussion: — 25 minutes
	Language, means, documentation: — English – MS Teams – note taking/ protocol
Information on award of contract	GRC will inform the candidate(s) about the decision reached. Candidates may enquire for feedback on their individual application

9. Further information on contractual requirements and payment

By signing the contract, the selected consultant(s) commit to abide by the Code of Conduct of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement as well as the Rules of Conduct for staff and volunteers on GRC missions. The consultant(s) are furthermore required to submit information on their data protection arrangements and conclude the "Order Processing Agreement" with GRC.

Payment schedule:
- 30% upon contract signature
- 30% upon GRC approval of the inception report
- 40% upon GRC approval of the final report

Payments require receipt of an invoice showing the consultant(s) contact details, referencing the services provided, and the consultant(s)´ bank details and VAT number/ taxpayer ID. Consultant(s)

should anticipate a minimum of two (2) weeks for GRC to process the payment. Additional payment obligations on GRC´s part as per ToR/ contract, such as travel cost, require the submission of original receipts.

10. Abbreviations

BDRCS	Bangladesh Red Crescent Society
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
ECHO	Directorate-General for Humanitarian Assistance and Civil Protection of the European Commission
EUR	Euro
GRC	German Red Cross
HNS	Host National Society
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
ID	Identification document
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
NS	National Society
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PNS	Partner National Society
PPP	Pilot Programmatic Partnership
RCRC	Red Cross Red Crescent
SNS	Sister National Society
ToR	Terms of Reference
VAT	Value-added tax