

Request For Proposals

To Conduct

End-Term Evaluation

Integrated Food Security and Livelihoods project in Taita Taveta County.

Document Release Date: 30th October 2023

Last Date for Receipt of Proposals: 8th November 2023

Time: 11:00HRS

Tender Number: PRF15050

Submission Method: email to tenders@redcross.or.ke

Tender Opening Venue and Time: Virtually via Microsoft Teams at 1200HRS

1. Summary of the End-Term Evaluation

1.1. Purpose:

The primary purpose is to conduct the end-term evaluation for the **Integrated Food Security and Livelihoods project in Taita Taveta County**. The end-term evaluation seeks to provide relevant data and analysis against the Project indicators and understand the impact of the project interventions.

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Partners | British Red Cross, Kenya Red Cross Society and County Government. |
| Duration | 30 days |
| Estimated Dates | 22 nd November – 22 nd December 2023 |
| Geographical Location | Mata, Chala and Mahoo wards of Taita Sub-County; Taita Taveta County – Kenya. |
| Target Population | Targeted community members, stakeholders (County Government Representatives & Partners), Project Staff and Volunteers. |
| Deliverables | Inception report and tools, Draft and final report plus all data sets. |
| Methodology | Quantitative and Qualitative methods. |
| Evaluation Management Team | KRCS M&E team and Project representatives and British Red Cross Representatives. |

2. Background Information

Taveta sub county is an arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL) area, with agriculture being the main source of livelihood, contributing to about 95% of the households' income¹. It was further noted that the sector is greatly affected by prolonged droughts, floods, unpredictable and unreliable below average rainfall, and high temperatures caused by climate change. The IFSL project was designed to strengthen the crops and livestock value chains in the target areas and improve on community resilience. The project is funded by the British Red Cross (BRC) and was designed through collaborative efforts between the donor, KRCS, relevant government line ministries at county and sub-county levels as well as the target communities. The project adopted an integrated and multi-sectoral approach to enable address the root-causes of persistent food insecurity and acute malnutrition in the target areas. Main areas of intervention include: a) Food security and livelihoods; b) Nutrition; c) Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH); d) KRCS cash and voucher assistance preparedness; and e) Strengthening social protection delivery systems in Taita Taveta county.

The project adopted an integrated and multi-sectoral approach to enable address the root-causes of persistent food insecurity and acute malnutrition in the target areas of Taveta sub-county, specifically in Challa, Mata, Mbogholi and Mahoo wards to cope and adapt to climate variability and changes through enhanced resilience. The main areas of interventions included:

- 1) Food security and livelihoods – that focused on: undertaking an in-depth livelihoods and market assessment; mapping, sensitization and formation of 30 farmers' groups; promotion of modern farming practices; empowering mother to mother support groups; Village Saving and Loan Association (VSLA) formation and training; linkages to markets, market information and financial institutions and services; strengthening early warning mechanisms; contribute to environmental conservation; and advocacy to the county government and stakeholders.
- 2) Nutrition – which focused on strengthening capacity of KRCS volunteers, health care workers and community health volunteers (CHVs); marking nutrition calendar days (bi-

annual Malezi Bora celebration and World Breastfeeding Week); and support of nutrition surveillance at community level.

- 3) Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) – that focused on: enhancing water supply systems; formation and training of water user committee; training of KRCS volunteers, health care workers and CHVs on community-led total sanitation (CLTS) and participatory hygiene and sanitation transformation (PHAST), sanitation and hygiene campaigns, establishment of farm ponds for mother to mother support groups to enhance kitchen garden operations; procurement and distribution of water treatment chemicals; and marking WASH National/International calendar days.
- 4) KRCS cash and voucher assistance preparedness – which had a focus on: training of KRCS staff and key volunteers in CVA programming, including market-based programming, including market based programming for WASH sector.
- 5) Strengthening social protection delivery systems in Taita Taveta county by creating an enhanced Single Registry for all poor and vulnerable households and increasing access to social and economic inclusion interventions by the Government and other non-state actors.

A baseline evaluation for the Integrated Food Security and Livelihoods Project in Taita Taveta County was conducted by the Kenya Red Cross Society between February and March, 2022 covering Challa, Mata and Mahoo wards with the aim of providing a starting point for the project and the basis by which performance, progress, achievements and impact will be measured during and after the project life.

2.1. Project Objectives

The goal of the project was to promote protection and promotion of sustainable rural livelihoods of poor and vulnerable households in Taita Taveta County, Kenya.

The specific objectives of the project were:

- i. To Improve food production through appropriate irrigation technology, drought tolerant crop farming, mixed subsistence and commercial farming (agribusiness) in Taveta Sub-County.
- ii. To improve access to safe and sustainable drinking water, improved sanitation as well as adaptation of good hygiene practices at household level in Taveta Sub-County.
- iii. To improve inclusion of communities into SP systems / NS integrated into SP systems.
- iv. To Strengthen capacity of KRCS and targeted community groups to support sustainable community owned development.

2.2. Key Project Stakeholders

The project was implemented in close coordination with the National Drought Management Authority (NDMA) – managing the Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP), Ministry of Health, Ministry of Labor and Social Protection, Ministry of Planning and Devolution, Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government, Taita Taveta County Government – KRCS is a member of the County Steering Group (CSG) to coordinate preparedness and response activities with other actors at county level.

At the community level, the programme was implemented by KRCS volunteers' and the community health volunteers (CHVs) supervised by the Community Health Assistants (CHAs) with links to the health facilities structures. The programme staff worked closely the extension officers from the Ministry of Agriculture & Livestock as well as hygiene and sanitation officers. Community members: women, men, boys, and girls, including those with disabilities were also important stakeholders at the community level.

The project reached the community members through the various components as tabulated below:

| Component | Reach | Nature |
|-------------------------------|---------|---|
| Food security and Livelihoods | 372 HH | 123 Livestock/Goat keepers |
| | | 69 Poultry keepers |
| | | 100 Crop farmers |
| | | 80 Cash Grants-Mother to Mother groups |
| Nutrition | 1800 HH | 1,800 Caregivers |
| WASH | 926 HH | 926 HH (4,630 people - clean, safe, potable water |
| | 438 HH | 438 HH with software/ hygiene and sanitation |

3. Evaluation Purpose & Scope

3.1. Purpose.

The end-term evaluation seeks to provide relevant data against the project indicators, to understand the impact of the project's interventions. It will also bring out issues that were affecting the project implementation and things that aided the success of the project as well as looking into the impact of the project.

The specific objectives of the end-term evaluation will be:

- i. To measure project achievements against log frame indicators and compared to baseline findings.
- ii. To understand whether shifts in knowledge, attitudes and social norms around food security & livelihoods occurred amongst the target community/population as a result of the project interventions.
- iii. To provide evidence of the impact of a program or intervention on the target population.
- iv. To highlight the sustainability measures in place, lessons learned from the project and make practical recommendations for improvement of future projects.
- v. To review the proposed indicators within the log-frame and set targets based on the findings that will guide the next phase of the project implementation.

4. Key Questions

The following are the key questions to be addressed during the ETE. The evaluator may however suggest changes/additional questions at the inception stage:

4.1. Measuring against indicators and targets

- What are the endline values for indicators?
- Did the project achieve the targets?
- Are they meaningfully different from baseline?

4.2. Service access and utilization

- How were farmers, volunteers, extension workers, CHVs and health workers trained as part of the project able to apply new knowledge and skills?
- To what extent was the project able to improve food security and livelihoods status of the targeted community members?
- To what extent were the target community members able to utilize the trainings given to them to better their livelihoods.
- In what ways were project interventions inclusive or not inclusive to people with disabilities?

4.3. Effectiveness

- To what extent were the project expected results achieved (objectives, outputs and outcomes)? How does that compare to the target and the baseline findings?

- What changes as reported by the community/stakeholders can be attributed to the project (positive, negative, expected and unexpected)
- What changes could have happened because of other projects in the same area?
- What is the level of resilience amongst the targeted groups?
- Have there been any positive or negative unintended outcomes of the work?

4.4. Efficiency

- Were all activities done within the budget? If there were any significant variances (whether early or late, over or under expenditure), what caused them?
- How did the efficiency affect the effectiveness of the project?
- Was there value for money?
- What has been done in an innovative way?

4.5. Sustainability

- What sustainability measures were put in place – institutional/financial/technical?
- To what extent have socio-cultural factors affected uptake of project interventions? And what measures have been/should be taken to address the same?
- To what extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue?

4.6. Relevance

- How satisfied are the community members with the interventions undertaken by the project?
- What do the beneficiaries feel is the effect of the project on their lives in the short term and in the long run?
- The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to communities' needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.

4.7. Coherence

- How well has the project's intervention been compatible with other interventions in the County.
- Was the intervention aligned with the national development plan and other relevant policies and strategies?
- Did the intervention contribute to the overall development goals of the country?

4.8. Impact.

- What positive and negative changes has the intervention brought about?
- What are the long-term effects of the intervention likely to be?
- How many people have benefited from the intervention?
- What are the main factors that have contributed to the impact of the intervention?

4.9. Community Engagement and Accountability

- To what extent were the KRCS minimum accountability standards integrated?
- How much do the beneficiaries understand the project?
- How much were beneficiaries involved in the project decision making?
- What complaints and feedback mechanism were put in place? What were the common community complaints addressed during the project period?
- Do the community members think that the project respected their culture/religion/daily routines/community calendars etc. and how did that affect the project uptake?

5. Survey Methodology

The consulting firm will propose the most suitable study design, sampling methods, sample size, data collection and analysis approaches that is suitable end term evaluation. This should be clearly outlined in the bidding document/proposal and if qualified to oral stage to have further discussion with the evaluation management team. The consulting firm will also propose targeted respondents to interview or data sources that can answer the log frame indicators and provide comparable statistics to document any changes. The methodology should consider triangulation of findings, adequate and representative sample size for the targeted beneficiaries with clear sampling methods. All the log frame indicators should be given operational definition in the bid submission. Data analysis plan should be embedded indicating how the indicators will be analyzed and presented.

The evaluation will use the following literature and any other for reference and to inform the evaluation process further:

- Final Baseline Survey Report
- Project proposal, theory of change and log frame.
- Existing project reports by the time of data collection.
- Livelihood and Market Assessment reports.
- Documents, policies and frameworks by partners, county and national government.

The project outcome and output indicators are shown in the table below: -

| Hierarchy of Objectives | Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI) |
|---|--|
| Goal: Protection and promotion of sustainable rural livelihoods of poor and vulnerable households in Taita Taveta County, Kenya | |
| Outcome1: Communities have enhanced their food security and reduced malnutrition status due to improved nutrition-sensitive and climate smart food production | 1a: % reduction in the negative coping strategy index of targeted households |
| | 1b: % of target households that have enough food and income to meet their livelihoods protection threshold |
| Output 1.1: Farmers have increased their food production due to the adoption of climate smart | OP1.1a: % of targeted farmers who have adopted one or more climate-smart agriculture practices |
| | OP1.1b: % of targeted farmers who improve their production |
| | OP1.1c: % of farmers engaged in functional agri-businesses at the end of the project |
| Output 1.2: Farmers, especially women, are increasing their bargaining power through increased community networks | OP1.2a: % of farmers who get better prices by selling through cooperatives (disaggregated by gender) |
| | OP1.2B: % of mother-to-mother support groups/VSLAs that are engaged in viable income generating activities at the end of the project |
| Output 1.3: Reduced malnutrition levels among the targeted community members | OP1.3a: % of children and pregnant and lactating women in the community screened using the MUAC and referred |
| | OP1.3B: % decrease in malnutrition cases among the targeted community members |
| Outcome 2: Improved access to safe and sustainable drinking water, improved sanitation as well as adaptation of good hygiene practices at household level in Taveta Sub-County. | OC2a: Proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services. |
| | OC2b: percentage of targeted community members with improved hygiene and sanitation environments. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Output 2.1: Improved water supply systems are in place | 2.1a: Percentage of targeted with improved access to safe and clean water free of fecal and priority chemical contamination. |
| Output 2.2: Improved hygiene and sanitation | 2.2a: percentage of targeted community members with improved hygiene and sanitation |
| Outcome 3: Improved inclusion of communities into SP systems / NS integrated into SP systems | OC3: Increased % of targeted beneficiaries who are aware of social protection systems and how to access them thanks to Red Cross information |
| Output 3.1: Strengthened Cash and Voucher Assistance and Market Based Programming | 3.1: percentage of targeted county branch staff and volunteers with enhanced CVA capacity |
| Output 3.2: Enhanced national single registry thanks to NS inputs | 3.2: Number of community members supported by KRCS to be registered in the single registry. |
| Outcome 4: Strengthened capacity of KRCS and targeted community groups to support sustainable community owned development | OC4.1: percentage of targeted KRCS staff and volunteers having enhanced capacity. |
| | OC4.2: percentage of targeted community members satisfied with KRCS project implementation |
| Output 4.1: KRCS Taita Taveta branch has improved capacity on community engagement and accountability procedures | OP4.1: percentage of targeted KRCS staff and volunteers having enhanced CEA capacity. |
| Output 4.2: Enhanced understanding of the Protection and Gender inclusion and PSEA policies in Taita Taveta county. | OP4.2: percentage of targeted KRCS staff and volunteers having enhanced PSEA capacity. |
| Output 4.3: Improved capacity of the national society | OP4.3: percentage of KRCS branches with enhanced capacity |
| Output 4.4 Enhanced project monitoring and evaluation | OP4.4: percentage of targeted community members satisfied with KRCS project implementation |

6. Quality & Ethical Standards

The consultant shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that the evaluation is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of the people and communities involved and to ensure that the assessment is technically accurate and reliable, is conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organizational learning and accountability. Therefore, the evaluation team shall be required to adhere to the assessment standards and applicable practices as recommended by International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

- **Utility:** Assessments must be useful and used.
- **Feasibility:** Assessments must be realistic, diplomatic, and managed in a sensible, cost-effective manner.
- **Ethics & Legality:** Assessments must be conducted in an ethical and legal manner, with regard for the welfare of those involved in and affected by the assessment.
- **Impartiality & Independence:** Assessments should be impartial, providing a comprehensive and unbiased assessment that considers the views of all stakeholders.
- **Transparency:** assessment activities should reflect an attitude of openness and transparency.
- **Accuracy:** Assessments should be technically accurate, providing sufficient information about the data collection, analysis, and interpretation methods so that its worth or merit can be determined.
- **Participation:** Stakeholders should be consulted and meaningfully involved in the assessment process when feasible and appropriate.
- **Collaboration:** Collaboration between key operating partners in the assessment process improves the legitimacy and utility of the assessment.
- **Inclusion:** The assessment must include clear steps to ensure meaningful engagement and participation of all sections of community, including persons with disability.

It is also expected that the assessment will respect the seven Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross and Red Crescent: 1) humanity, 2) impartiality, 3) neutrality, 4) independence, 5) voluntary service, 6) unity and 7) universality.

7. Qualifications and Experience for Consultants

The lead consultant must possess the following qualifications:

- i. A minimum of a master's degree in Climate Change/Disaster Risk Reduction/Social science/Agri-Business management/community development or related field.
- ii. A minimum of 5 years' extensive experience in carrying out comprehensive evaluations or similar assignments.
- iii. Good understanding of Climate Change, Disaster Risk Resilience, Food security and Livelihood interventions, disability and gender inclusion, and age among vulnerable populations in Kenya.
- iv. Proven experience in participatory and results-based M&E knowledge and practical experience in quantitative and qualitative research methods.
- v. Must have led in at least five participatory assessments. Experience of conducting Baseline, End line, Midterm evaluations monitoring and assessment work in the target or similar communities (preferred)
- vi. High level of professionalism and an ability to work independently and in high-pressure situations under tight deadlines.
- vii. Strong interpersonal, facilitation and communication skills
- viii. The team must have a statistician able to analyze quantitative and qualitative data as well as key technical team members to handle specific components of the project evaluation.

- ix. Team must have experience in participatory data collection methods and using mobile phone technology for data collection, monitoring and reporting.
- x. The lead consultant must have strong analytical skills and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions, make recommendations and to prepare well-written reports in a timely manner.
- xi. Availability for the period indicated and ready to carry out the assignment and deliver results within the specified period/time.

Availability of experts in each of the subject areas, with experience and relevant qualifications for the assignment will be highly preferred.

8. Management of the End Term Evaluation.

8.1. Duration:

The end term evaluation will be conducted between 22nd November to 22nd December 2023 or 30 days from contract signing to delivery of the final report.

8.2. Deliverables:

- 1) Inception report detailing the evaluation design, sampling methodology & sample frame, evaluation tools, agreed budget and work plan.
- 2) Copies of original and cleaned data sets with codebook. The raw data, the database which has been cleaned (both qualitative and quantitative, including original field notes for in-depth interviews and focus group discussions, as well as recorded audio material), should be submitted together with the report. A simple inventory of material handed over will be part of the record. KRCS will have sole ownership of all final data and any findings shall only be shared or reproduced with the permission of KRCS.
- 3) Draft end-term evaluation report that will culminate in the final report with the following elements and as will be guided by KRCS:
 - a. Table of contents
 - b. Clear executive summary with among others major findings and summary of conclusions and recommendations.
 - c. The objectives of the end term, methodology and any challenges encountered in the field.
 - d. A presentation of the results and discussion of the same (including analysis) according to evaluation questions.
 - e. Conclusions
 - f. Recommendations.
 - g. Report annexes.
- 4) A power point presentation highlighting key results and discussion from the end-line evaluation will be presented at a feedback meeting with stakeholders to be held after completing the draft report.
- 5) Final Evaluation report - submit 5 well designed and bound hard copy and one electronic copy of the report by the agreed timeline. The specifications for the hard copies will be guided by KRCS M&E team.
- 6) A power point presentation highlighting key results, findings, and recommendations to be disseminated to the key stakeholders as nominated by KRCS after approval of the end term evaluation report.
- 7) An easy-read version of the end term evaluation report alongside the full end term evaluation report.

8.3. Evaluation Management Team

The evaluation management team shall consist of KRCS MEA&L Unit representatives, KRCS program manager and British Red Cross Representative. They shall ensure that the deliverables agreed upon and approved in the inception report are achieved on time. KRCS MEA&L representative will be the chair of the team.

Role of KRCS (Project and M&E team)

- Lead the recruitment and evaluation process
- Coordinate the evaluation implementation process
- Review of assessment products including the inception report tools, and reports
- KRCS will organize logistics for the assessment team
- Avail data collectors within agreed criteria
- Avail all necessary documents for desk review
- KRCS will be the link between the community, stakeholders and the consultant and will organize all the data collection activities (identifying respondents and setting up appointments)
- Will be the custodian of all data generated from the assessment
- Organize dissemination forums as necessary.

Role of British Red Cross.

- Participate in the TOR development.
- Review the inception report and data collection tools.
- Review and give feedback on all evaluation products.
- Fund the activity budget.
- Final approval of the report.

9. Application Requirements

Application materials shall include:

- A written response to this TOR in terms of a proposal detailing the technical understanding of the task, proposed methodologies of the evaluation, expected activities and deliverables, proposed work plans with schedule, and financial bids. **See Annex 1**
- Detailed **CVs of all professionals** who will work on the evaluation. If there is more than one contractor on the proposed evaluation team, please attach a table describing the level of effort (in number of days) of each team member in each of the evaluation activities. **See Annex 3**
- Professional references: please **provide at least three reference letters** from your previous clients and full contact details of the referees (working and active email & phone number).
- 2 Sample reports of relevant previously completed assignments.

Please also note that the people whose names appear in the team composition template **MUST** be the ones to undertake the evaluation. As such, they **MUST** be the ones to appear in person if the proposal moves to the interview stage.

10. Submission of proposal.

The Technical Proposal **MUST** be prepared in conformance to the outline provided in **Annex 1** while the financial proposal shall conform to the template provided in **Annex 2**. The team composition should conform to **Annex 3**.

*Bidders should provide softcopy technical and financial proposal **in two separate folders** clearly marked “**Technical Proposal – Name of Consultant**” and “**Financial Proposal – Name of Consultant**”. The subject of your email should read “Tender No. PRF15050 – Call for Consultancy for End Term Evaluation for Integrated Food Security and Livelihoods project in Taita Taveta County”*

The proposal should be addressed as below to reach the undersigned (**by mail**) through **tenders@redcross.or.ke** on **Wednesday, 8th November 2023 at 1100HRS.**

Chairperson, Tender Committee

Kenya Red Cross Society

P.O Box 40712 – 00100

Nairobi, Kenya.

ANNEX 1: TECHNICAL PROPOSAL FORMAT

- 1) **Introduction:** description of the firm, the firm's qualifications, and statutory compliance (2 pages)
- 2) **Background:** Understanding of the project, context and requirements for services, Key questions (2 pages)
- 3) **Proposed methodology** - Indicate methods to be used for each indicator and highlight any areas where indicators may need adjustment. The targeted respondents should be indicated for each indicator. Proposed detailed questions should be indicated. Detailed sampling procedure and sample size determination needs to be described and provided. (5 pages)
- 4) **Firms experience** in undertaking assignments of similar nature and experience from the geographical area for other major clients (Table with: Name of organization, name of assignment, duration of assignment (Dates), reference person contacts (2 pages)
- 5) **Proposed team composition** (As per annex 3) - 1 page
- 6) **Work plan** (Gantt chart of activity and week of implementation) - 1 page

ANNEX 2: BUDGET TEMPLATE

The consultant shall only quote for the items below as KRCS will manage all other related costs (logistics and payment of enumerators)

| Item | Unit | # of Units | Unit Cost | Total Cost (Ksh.) |
|--|---------|------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Consultancy Fee (for the whole assessment period) | Per day | | | |
| Office expenses (Printing, photocopy, binding, communication costs etc.) | Lumpsum | | | |
| Grand Total | | | | |

ANNEX 3: PROPOSED TEAM COMPOSITION TEMPLATE

| Name of Team Member | Highest Level of Qualification | General Experience related to the task at hand | Years related to assignment | Roles under this assignment |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

ANNEX 4: TENDER ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

A three-stage assessment procedure will be used to evaluate all proposals from bidders. The total number of points which each bidder may obtain for its proposal is:

- Technical Proposal 50 marks
- Oral presentation 40 marks
- Financial Proposal 10 marks

1. Mandatory Requirements.

The proposal shall ONLY be evaluated on the basis of its adherence to the following compulsory requirements, this applies to both local and international firms or individuals.

| Document/ Requirements | Yes/No |
|---|--------|
| Tax compliance certificate | |
| Certificate of incorporation/registration (only applicable for firms) | |
| Proceed to next stage (Yes/No) | |

2. Assessment of the Technical Proposal

The technical proposal shall be evaluated on the basis of its responsiveness to the TOR. Specifically, the following criteria shall apply:

| Evaluation Criteria | Maximum Points | Bidder's score | Remarks |
|--|----------------|----------------|---------|
| 1) Background: Description of the consultant/Firm's Qualifications, Understanding of the project, context and requirements for services | 10 | | |
| 2) Proposed Methodology: The proposed methodology MUST provide an indication of its effectiveness and added value in the proposed assignment. | 20 | | |
| 3) Firms Experience in undertaking assignments of similar nature and experience from related geographical area for other major clients: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide a summary and supporting information on overall years of experience, and related technical and geographic coverage experience. | 10 | | |
| 4) Proposed Team Composition: Tabulate the team composition to include the general qualifications, suitability for the specific task to be assigned and overall years of relevant experience to the proposed assignment. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed team composition should balance effectively with the necessary skills and competencies required to undertake the proposed assignment.• Lead Consultant Qualifications – should be as per the TOR• Provide CVs for key Consulting team including Statistician/Data Analyst. | 5 | | |
| 5) Work Plan: A Detailed logical, weekly work plan for the assignment MUST be provided. | 5 | | |
| TOTAL SCORE | 50 | | |

Note: The firms/consultants that attains a score of **35 and above out of 50** in the technical evaluation **will be invited to proceed** to oral presentation.

3. Oral Phase Assessment

At the oral phase, the following criteria shall apply:

| Criteria | Maximum points | Bidder's Score | Remarks |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Understanding of the assignment. | 5 | | |
| Clear and scientific methodology: samplings, data collection, understanding indicators, respondents, tools, data analysis etc. | 15 | | |
| Presentation of previous similar assignment (Consultant will be required to show/present at least 2 previous completed assignment reports at the oral stage and at least two reference letters) | 10 | | |
| Preparedness and participation of teams. Attendance of team members listed in the bid and whose CVs are available. | 10 | | |
| Total Score out of 40 | 40 | | |

Note: From this stage, the technical and oral assessment scores are combined. The firms/consultants that **attains a combined score of 70%** in the technical & oral presentations **will be invited to proceed** to the financial stage.

4. Assessment of the Financial Proposal

The Financial Proposal shall be prepared in accordance to Annex 2. The maximum number of points for the Financial Proposal shall be **10% (10 points)**. This maximum number of points will be allocated to the lowest Financial Proposal. All other Financial Proposals will receive points in inverse proportion according to the below formula:

Points for the Financial Proposal being evaluated =

$$\frac{(\text{Maximum number of points for the financial proposal}) \times (\text{Lowest price})}{\text{Price of proposal being evaluated}}$$

A total score obtained including Technical, Oral and Financial Proposals is calculated for each proposal. The bid obtaining the overall highest score shall be awarded to undertake the assignment – subject to budget allocated.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Please read carefully the method of tender submission and comply accordingly.

1.1.1. KRCS reserves the right to accept or to reject any bid, and to annul the bidding process and reject all bids at any time prior to the award of the contract, without thereby incurring any liability to any Bidder or any obligation to inform the Bidder of the grounds for its action.

1.1.2. Cost of bidding

The Bidder shall bear all costs associated with the preparation and submission of its bid, and the Organization will in no case be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the bidding process.

1.1.3. Clarification of Bidding Document

All correspondence related to the contract shall be made in English. Any clarification sought by the bidder in respect of the consultancy shall be addressed at least **five (5) days** before the deadline for submission of bids, in writing to the Administration Coordinator.

The queries and replies thereto shall then be circulated to all other prospective bidders (without divulging the name of the bidder raising the queries) in the form of an addendum, which shall be acknowledged in writing by the prospective bidders.

Enquiries for clarifications should be sent by e-mail to tenders@redcross.or.ke

1.1.4. Amendment of Bidding Document

At any time prior to the deadline for submission of bids, KRCS, for any reason, whether at its own initiative or in response to a clarification requested by a prospective Bidder, may modify the bidding documents by amendment.

All prospective Bidders that have received the bidding documents will be notified of the amendment in writing, and it will be binding on them. It is therefore important that bidders give the correct details in the format given on page 1 at the time of collecting/receiving the bid document.

To allow prospective Bidders reasonable time to take any amendments into account in preparing their bids, KRCS may at its sole discretion extend the deadline for the submission of bids based on the nature of the amendments.

1.1.5. Deadline for Submission of Bids

Bids should reach tenders@redcross.or.ke on or before **8th November 2023 at 1100HRS**. Bids received after the above-specified date and time shall not be considered.

*Bidders should provide softcopy technical and financial proposal **in two separate folders** clearly marked **“Technical Proposal – Name of Consultant”** and **“Financial Proposal – Name of Consultant”**. The subject of your email should read **“Tender No. PRF15050 – Call for Consultancy for End Term Evaluation for Integrated Food Security and Livelihoods project in Taita Taveta County”***

The proposal should be addressed as indicated above to reach the under signed by 8th November 2023 at 1100HRS for the tender to be opened at 1200HRS:

Any bid received by KRCS after this deadline will be rejected.

1.1.6. Cost Structure and non-escalation

The bidder shall, in their offer (Financial Proposal), detail the proposed costs as per the template provided above.

No price escalation under this contract shall be allowed. KRCS shall not compensate any bidder for costs incurred in the preparation and submission of this RFP, and in any subsequent pre-contract process.

1.1.7. Taxes and Incidental Costs

The prices and rates in the financial offer will be deemed to be inclusive of all taxes and any other incidental costs.

1.1.8. Responsiveness of Proposals

The responsiveness of the proposals to the requirements of this RFP will be determined. A responsive proposal is deemed to contain all documents or information specifically called for in this RFP document. A bid determined not responsive will be rejected by the Organization and may not subsequently be made responsive by the Bidder by correction of the non-conforming item(s).

1.1.9. Currency for Pricing of Tender

All bids in response to this RFP should be expressed in Kenya Shillings. **Expressions in other currencies shall not be permitted.**

1.1.10. Correction of Errors.

Bids determined to be substantially responsive will be checked by KRCS for any arithmetical errors. Errors will be corrected by KRCS as below:

- a) Where there is a discrepancy between the amounts in figures and in words, the amount in words will govern, and
- b) Where there is a discrepancy between the unit rate and the line total resulting from multiplying the unit rate by the quantity, the unit rate as quoted will govern.

The price amount stated in the Bid will be adjusted by KRCS in accordance with the above procedure for the correction of errors.

1.1.11. Evaluation and Comparison of Bids

Technical proposals will be evaluated prior to the evaluation of the financial bids. Financial bids of firms whose technical proposals are found to be non-qualifying in whatever respect may be returned unopened.

1.1.12. Confidentiality

The Bidder shall treat the existence and contents of this RFP, and all information made available in relation to this RFP, as confidential and shall only use the same for the purpose for which it was provided.

The Bidder shall not publish or disclose the same or any particulars thereof to any third party without the written permission of KRCS, unless it is to Bidder's Contractors for assistance in preparation of this Tender. In any case, the same confidentiality must be entered into between Bidder and his Contractors.

1.1.13. Corrupt or Fraudulent Practices

KRCS requires that tenderers observe the highest standard of ethics during the procurement process and execution of contracts. A tenderer shall sign a declaration that he has not and will not be involved in corrupt or fraudulent practices.

KRCS will reject a proposal for award if it determines that the tenderer recommended for award has engaged in corrupt or fraudulent practices in competing for the contract in question.

Further a tenderer who is found to have indulged in corrupt or fraudulent practices risks being debarred from participating, please report any malpractices to complaints@redcross.or.ke