



Center for Human Rights

16 September 2020

Consultancy to Conduct a Review of the RWI Programme *Support for Teaching, Research and Community Engagement of the Center for Human Rights, Addis Ababa University*

The Centre for Human Rights, Addis Ababa University (CHR) and the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI) invites you to apply for a consultancy to conduct a review of the RWI Programme *Support for Teaching, Research and Community Engagement of the Center for Human Rights, Addis Ababa University*.

This is a competitive process and suitable candidates shall be sourced through an open call and chosen based on the requirements listed in the Terms of Reference below. The contract will be awarded on the basis of the most economically advantageous proposal according to a best price-quality ratio as described in Annex 3, Eligibility and Selection of Proposals. Please note that there is a budget ceiling amount of SEK 250,000 (including VAT) as concerned fees.

The deadline for submitting the application is **30 September, 2020**, and submissions should be sent by email to Grace Mbogo, RWI Programme Officer (grace.mbogo@rwi.lu.se) with Dureti Abate, CHR Programme Officer (dureti.abate@aau.edu.et) in copy. Any enquiries regarding the assignment should be sent to the same email addresses.

Yours sincerely,

Grace Mbogo
Programme Officer,
RWI Regional Office in Nairobi

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Annex 2 – Form for Submission of Proposals

Annex 3 – Eligibility and Selection of Proposals

Terms of Reference

Consultancy to Conduct a Review of the RWI Programme *Support for Teaching, Research and Community Engagement of the Center for Human Rights, Addis Ababa University*

1. Background

In November 2017, RWI entered into a cooperation ("*the Programme*") with CHR to support CHR's *Project to Support the Human Rights Teaching, Training, Research and Community Engagement of CHR ("STRACE")*, which is financially supported by both Swedish Development Cooperation and the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Addis Ababa. The objective of the cooperation between RWI and CHR, which is fully supported by Swedish Development Cooperation (Sida), is to enhance the capacity of CHR to carry out its mission, including its three main functions of human rights education, research and outreach. Additionally, the programme would ideally create enhanced conditions for strengthened capacity of the CHR to assist other key actors to promote human rights, including gender equality, in Ethiopia contributing to an improved overall environment for the protection of human rights.

As part of effective programming practice and sound results based management, provision has been made in the proposal submitted by RWI and approved by CHR (the Programme Document) for a review ("the review") of the Programme to assess progress and consider the need for any adjustments to be made operationally in terms of ensuring expected results achievement. These Terms of Reference aim at identifying suitable external evaluator(s) to conduct the said review.

2. Purpose and Objectives

The overall aim of the Review is to contribute to good programme delivery for the remaining duration of the Programme, by identifying issues affecting effective and efficient implementation, results achievement, and proposing adjustments (if any) required with respect to results framework(s), strategies, priorities, working approaches, management and implementation arrangements.

The specific objectives of the Review are:

- To assess the operation of the programme for the period under review, in particular as regards the level and efficiency of achievement of / progress towards achievement of expected results, as well as the relevance of results achieved.
- To assess the program document and agreed workplans in terms of their relevance to the actual and evolving needs/status/capacity of both parties.
- To analyse the reasons underlying results achievement or non-achievement, as well as identifying and analysing any unexpected results.
- To assess the efficiency, effectiveness and acceptability of the partnership with both internal (implementing) and external partners.
- To provide recommendations on measures / actions / strategies that partners can adopt to enhance programme relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.

3. Scope of Work and Limitations

The scope of the review will be the evaluation of the programmatic activities as provided for in the programme documents and shall accordingly address questions related to the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance of the Programme. The key question of the review is to what extent the programme has achieved its main objective of strengthening the capacity of CHR to carry out its mission, including its three main functions of human rights education, research and outreach. To this end, the assessment shall assess the relevance of the Programme (as defined in Programme document and work plan and other relevant documents) vis-à-vis the current and evolving capacities of the CHR and RWI. Further, the evaluation shall also focus on the partnership aspect of the intervention i.e. whether there exists a smooth partnership between CHR and RWI, based on dialogue, flexibility, adaptability and mutual respect which will ultimately guarantee a successful process and outcome.

The review shall generate information on the extent to which the Programme has been successful in attaining its expected results to date, the way in which available resources have been used to achieve results, and the relevance of the results, including to beneficiaries. The review shall moreover consider the likelihood that the results achieved to date will be sustained. The review shall also provide suggestions as to how these aspects potentially could be enhanced in the future.

In addressing the review questions, focus should be kept on the period of review. In addressing the questions regarding results of Programme activities, focus should be on general effects as well as the details of individual activities and take account of intended

consequences and other potential effects of the Programme. The established results shall be clearly and thoroughly argued and contain a critical discussion of both arguments for and against believing that such results have taken place. Even when results may not yet have been attained or may be impossible to separate from effects of more general trends, the review shall endeavour to discuss the likelihood of them occurring as a result of the Programme.

Considering that the review will take place during October - November 2020 it is not possible to assess all activities implemented, and their results, after September 2020. In order to maximise the scope of the evaluation however, activities completed, and information received after September 2020 may be considered for inclusion, in discussion between RWI and CHR and in consideration of the agreed schedule for the review. The primary period for the review to consider is therefore 1 November 2017 – 30 September 2020, with possibility to also consider additional developments occurring from 1 October 2020 onwards.

4. Conclusions, Recommendation and Lessons Learned

Well-informed and reliable conclusions and recommendations shall be provided. The conclusions shall inform the dialogue between RWI and CHR on continued cooperation together with recommendations, in terms of lessons learned from Programme results achievement during the time period of the review, also enabling RWI and CHR to act accordingly on any such recommendations.

5. Approach and Methodology

The consultant(s) shall include in their submission, proposals on the methodology and approach for carrying out the assignment.

The review shall be inclusive and participatory and shall comprise a design that draws on and mobilizes the knowledge and experiences of the Programme stakeholders, and that is, for the review conclusions, based on a shared understanding amongst relevant stakeholders as to what generally affects and constitutes effective results achievement within the scope of the Programme and the context within which it operates.

The methodology used will include:

- I. Desk review of programme documents including but not limited to:
 - CHR's Programme Document for STRACE;
 - RWI's proposal to CHR;
 - Sub-Agreement between RWI and CHR;

- Annual work plans and budgets;
 - Annual reports;
 - Activity reports by resource persons/facilitators; and
 - Any other Programme or other documentation of relevance for the review.
- II. Key informant interviews with relevant stakeholders who will include concerned RWI (both Lund and Nairobi), CHR, and Sida and College of Law and Governance (CLG) staff. Due to the travel restrictions and health concerns brought about by the Covid-19 Pandemic, the consultant(s) will make necessary arrangements to conduct the interviews via phone or a reliable online meeting application.
- III. If travel restrictions are lifted and Covid- 19 health concerns are mitigated, the consultant(s) will visit CHR for on-site observation of the results achieved.

The review shall, in all relevant parts, conform to OECD/DAC's quality standards.

6. Review Team Composition and Qualifications of the Consultant(s)

The assignment is to be carried out by an individual consultant or a team of consultants. The individual, or the team, collectively, shall possess the following competences:

- An advanced degree in a social science such as law, development studies, international development, monitoring and evaluation or any other relevant university degree;
- Demonstrable expertise, knowledge, and experience in evaluating similar programmes;
- Demonstrable expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of access to justice, human rights, gender and minority issues;
- Demonstrable expertise, knowledge, and experience in working with international organizations and donors;
- Demonstrable expertise, knowledge, and experience working in similar contexts;
- Demonstrable expertise, knowledge, and experience working with projects in higher education institutions or academic (research) centres setting will be an added advantage;
- Fluency in English as well as excellent writing skills.

In the case of a team proposed to carry out the assignment, one person shall be designated to be the team leader, and shall be responsible for all contact, the contract and deliverables. In the submission, it must be made clear which specific expertise/qualification each team member has.

The individual consultant, or the team, must exercise reasonable skill, care and diligence in the performance of services and shall carry out responsibilities in accordance with recognised professional standards.

7. Time Schedule

The estimated total time of the review is six weeks, commencing preferably on 12 October 2020 and concluding by 23 November 2020. A tentative timeline of the review process is indicated below but can be revised by the consultant(s) with prior consultation with RWI and CHR:

Step 1: Documentation review and development of interview plans and guides (one week)

Step 2: Stakeholder meetings and communications (two weeks)

Step 3: Development of draft review report (one week)

Step 4: Assessment and feedback on draft review report (one week)

Step 5: Review and adoption of final review report (one week)

8. Deliverables

The following are the expected deliverables:

- Inception Report which clearly highlights the approach, methodology, tools (including relevant lists of questions and questionnaire) and workplan that the consultant(s) will adopt;
- Final review report which shall be a maximum of 20 pages, excluding annexes. Annexes, at minimum, shall include:
 - Terms of Reference;
 - Data gathering instruments (interview guides, etc.);
 - Details of documentation reviewed, and other data gathered;
 - Names and contact information of stakeholders met/interviewed.

9. Reporting and Communication

Following data collection, processing and analysis, a draft review report will be prepared by the review team and shared with RWI and CHR for comments to be provided, as noted above, within a period of one week. The review team will further be responsible for the finalisation of the review report in accordance with feedback received, and again within a one-week period.

During the course of the performance of this assignment, the consultant(s) shall at all times remain in close contact and consult with CHR and RWI for purposes of communicating the work done and receiving feedback and input on the on-going work. The consultant(s) shall at all times quickly respond and relate to comments made by stakeholders regarding the process and findings of the review. CHR and RWI will as far as possible, cooperate in the performance of all phases of this assignment.

English should be the language of all written communication including, e-mails, drafts and final versions of the report.

Consultancy to Conduct a Review of the RWI Programme Support for Teaching, Research and Community Engagement of the Center for Human Rights, Addis Ababa University

[This form could be submitted using the Service Provider's official letterhead as applicable]

Location

Date

Dear Madam/Sir,

We, the undersigned, hereby offer to render the following services to RWI in conformity with the requirements defined in the invitation to tender dated 16 September 2020 and all of its attachments.

A. Qualifications of the Service Provider

The Service Provider must describe and explain how and why it is the best entity that can deliver the requirements as per the ToR and invitation to tender by indicating the following:

- a) Profile – describing the field of expertise and accreditations as relevant*
- b) Sample of previous work – list of similar services as those required by RWI, indicating description of scope, duration, value, references*

B. Proposed Methodology for the Completion of Services

The Service Provider must describe how it will address/deliver the demands of the invitation to tender; providing a detailed description of the essential performance characteristics and quality assurance mechanisms that will be put in place, while demonstrating that the proposed methodology will be appropriate to the context of the work.

C. Proposed Schedule of Services

The Service Provider must provide a detailed breakdown of its proposed date schedule for implementing the services required in the invitation to tender, in accordance with Section "Time Schedule" and "Reporting and Communication" in the Terms of Reference.

D. Qualifications of Team

The Service Provider must provide:

- a) Names and qualifications of the contractor. Where a team is proposed, include names and qualifications of members that will perform the services indicating who is Team Leader, who is supporting, etc.*
- b) CVs demonstrating qualifications for the contractor(s)*
- c) Written declaration that the Service Provider and any team members have not been, and are not, subject to any international sanctions or restrictive measures with which RWI is required to comply according to Swedish law*
- d) Written declaration that the Service Provider and all team members are not, and have not been, in any of the situations listed in point 5 of the Eligibility Criteria in Annex 3*
- e) Written declaration that the Service Provider is available for the entire duration of the contract*

E. Fee Breakdown by Team Member

Description of Team Member	Fee per Unit of Time	Total Period of Engagement	Total Rate
<i>a. Expert 1</i>			
TOTAL			

Name and Signature of the Service Provider's Authorized Person
Designation
Date

Eligibility and Selection of Proposals
Consultancy to Conduct a Review of the RWI Programme *Support for Teaching, Research and Community Engagement of the Center for Human Rights, Addis Ababa University*

All proposals submitted will be examined and evaluated by representatives of both CHR and RWI, and assessed according to the following steps and criteria:

If the examination of a proposal or other relevant information received reveals that the proposal does not meet the eligibility criteria (see below), the proposal will be rejected on this sole basis.

The proposals that pass this check will be further evaluated on their quality, including the capacity of the service provider. They will be evaluated using the evaluation criteria in the evaluation grid below.

There are two types of evaluation criteria: selection and award criteria. The selection criteria evaluate the service providers' capacity and are used to verify that they have the professional competencies and qualifications required to successfully implement the assignment. Proposals that do not meet a stated minimum standard in this respect will be rejected on this basis. All criteria, including the selection criteria, are then considered as award criteria, which evaluate the quality of the proposals in relation to the objectives and priorities set forth in the Terms of Reference.

The contract award will be considered on the basis of the most economically advantageous proposal according to the best price-quality ratio, whereby the weighting for price is 25% and for quality 75%. As to price, the lowest bid gets 25 points. The other bids get 25 points reduced with the same percentage as the offered price exceeds the lowest bid, i.e. an offer that is 50% more expensive than the lowest bid gets 12.5 points.

Quality will be assessed in accordance with the quality criteria in the evaluation grid below, which in turn will be divided between the different quality criteria based on their importance in view of points that can be obtained for each criterion.

I. Eligibility Criteria

- 1) Proposal in accordance with requirements of Terms of Reference (annex 1) and Form for Submission of Proposals (annex 2), submitted by 30 September 2020.
- 2) Service Provider and all team members have not been, and are not, subject to any international sanctions or restrictive measures with which RWI is required to comply according to Swedish law.
- 3) Service Provider available for the entire duration of the contract.
- 4) RWI only partners with suppliers that respect and comply with all relevant and applicable human rights as well as ethical business, social responsibility, health, safety, environmental, employment and fiscal regulations. Any known violations in this respect, or inability to provide appropriate evidence, if and as requested, shall disqualify a service provider from (taking part in) the procurement process.
- 5) In addition, a service provider shall also be excluded from taking part in the procurement process if:
 - a) it is bankrupt, subject to insolvency or winding-up procedures, where its assets are being administered by a liquidator or by a court, where it is in an arrangement with creditors, where its business activities are suspended, or where it is in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided for under national laws or regulations;
 - b) it has been established by a final judgment or a final administrative decision that the service provider is guilty of grave professional misconduct by having violated applicable laws or regulations or ethical standards of the profession to which the supplier belongs, or by having engaged in any wrongful conduct which has an impact on its professional credibility where such conduct denotes a wrongful intent or gross negligence, including, in particular, any of the following:
 - i) fraudulently or negligently misrepresenting information required for the verification of the absence of grounds for exclusion or the fulfilment of selection criteria or in the performance of a contract;
 - ii) entering into agreement with other economic operators with the aim of distorting competition;

- iii) violating intellectual property rights;
 - iv) attempting to influence the decision-making process during the procurement; or
 - v) attempting to obtain confidential information that may confer upon it undue advantages in the procurement process.
- c) it has been established by a final judgment or a final administrative decision that the service provider is in breach of its obligations relating to the payment of taxes or social security contributions in accordance with the applicable law;
- d) it has been established by a final judgment that the service provider, or persons having powers of representation or decision-making control over it, is guilty of any of the following: fraud; corruption; involvement in a criminal organisation; money laundering; terrorist financing; child labour (or any other forms of trafficking in human beings); or any other illegal activity detrimental to RWI's interests;
- e) the service provider has shown significant deficiencies in complying with main obligations in the performance of a contract financed by RWI or any donor to RWI, which has led to the early termination of a legal commitment or to the application of liquidated damages or other contractual penalties or which has been discovered following checks and audits or investigations.

II. Evaluation grid regarding quality

The evaluation grid is divided into Sections and subsections. Each subsection will be given a score between 1 and 5 as follows: 1 = very poor; 2 = poor; 3 = adequate; 4 = good; 5 = very good.

Section	Maximum Score
1. Capacity (Selection Criteria)	40
1.1. Does the service provider have demonstrable expertise, knowledge, and experience in evaluating similar programmes;	5 x 2*
1.2. Does the service provider have relevant educational qualifications including an advanced degree in a social science such as law, development studies, international development, monitoring and evaluation or any other relevant university degree?	5
1.3. Does the service provider have demonstrable expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of access to justice, human rights, gender and minority issues?	5 x 2*
1.4. Does the service provider have demonstrable expertise, knowledge, and experience working with or in higher education institutions or academic (research) centres?	5
1.5 Does the service provider have demonstrable expertise, knowledge, and experience in working with international organizations and donors?	5
1.6. Does the service provider have demonstrable fluency in writing English?	5
2. Understanding of Terms of Reference	10
2.1. Does the service provider demonstrate a good understanding of the requirements of the assignment, as described in the Terms of Reference?	5 x 2*
3. Relevance of the proposal	15
3.1. Does the proposal adequately respond to the objectives and priorities as outlined in the Terms of Reference towards achievement of expected results?	5
3.2. Does the proposal reflect an understanding of the context in which this assignment is to be carried out?	5
3.3. Does the proposal contain particular added-value elements (e.g. innovation, best practices)?	5
4. Implementation approach	10
4.1. Is the plan for implementing the assignment clear and feasible? Is the timeline realistic?	5
4.2. Is the organisation of the work clear and purposeful?	5
Maximum total score	75

***this score is multiplied by 2 because of its importance**

If the total score for Section 1 (capacity) is less than 15 points (not considering any multiplication of points), the application will be rejected. If the score for at least one of the subsections under Section 1 is 1 (not considering any multiplication of points), the application will also be rejected.