



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS: Performance Evaluation of Child Care Reform Project in Uganda

Issuance Date: **October 10, 2014**
Deadline for Questions: **October 16, 2014 at 5PM EDT**
Closing Date: **November 7, 2014 at 5PM EST**

The Advancing Partners & Communities (APC) project invites qualified U.S.-based private voluntary organizations, international or national non-governmental organizations, for-profit organizations, faith-based organizations, and universities, to submit proposals for an independent performance evaluation of a child care reform project that will be implemented in Uganda by a consortium of non-governmental organizations led by ChildFund International (hereinafter referred to as “Implementing Partner”).

One Fixed Price Contract is anticipated to be awarded under this Request for Proposals (RFP). It will be issued by JSI Research & Training Institute, Inc. (JSI) under the APC project.

Proposals, including reference documents, must be submitted by November 7, 2014 at 5PM EST. Proposals must be submitted online. One (1) electronic copy of the proposal should be sent to grants-APC@jsi.com.

RFP Questions and Answers

Questions about this RFP should be submitted to APC at grants-APC@jsi.com, in English, no later than October 16, 2014 at 5PM EDT. A list of all questions and answers will be posted on the APC website by October 22, 2014.

The RFP will consist of this announcement and the following:

- Section A – Proposal Description
- Section B – Proposal Instructions
- Section C – Eligibility and Selection Criteria
- Attachment 1 – Past Performance Information Table
- Attachment 2 – Summary and Detailed Budget Templates

Issuance of this RFP, or the submission of a proposal, does not constitute an award commitment on the part of the United States Government (USG), JSI, and/or FHI 360, nor does it commit the USG, JSI and/or FHI 360 to pay for costs incurred in the preparation and submission of a proposal. JSI reserves the right not to fund any of the proposals received.



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Performance Evaluation of Child Care Reform Project in Uganda

Table of Contents

SECTION A: PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION	1
A1. Introduction.....	1
A2. Project to be Evaluated	1
A3. Background.....	2
A4. Purpose and Use of the Evaluation	3
A5. Evaluation Questions	3
A6. Evaluation Methods	4
A7. Deliverables and Timeline	5
A8. Expected Deliverables.....	5
A9. Composition of the Evaluation Team	7
Team Leader	8
A11. Scheduling, Logistics and Other Support.....	8
A12. Requirements for Reporting.....	8
SECTION B: PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS.....	9
B1. Proposal Guidelines.....	9
B2. Proposal.....	10
SECTION C: ELIGIBILITY AND SELECTION CRITERIA.....	12
C1. Introduction	12
C2. Eligibility.....	12
C3. Selection Process.....	12
C4. Evaluation Criteria	12
C5. Weighing of Evaluation Criteria	13
Attachment 1: Past Performance Information Table.....	14
Attachment 2: Summary and Detailed Budget Template	15

SECTION A: PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

A1. Introduction

This solicitation is for an independent performance evaluation of a child care reform project that will be implemented in Uganda by a consortium of non-governmental organizations led by ChildFund International. The project that will be evaluated is 36 months in duration and will be implemented in 12 districts in Uganda. The independent performance evaluation will be designed to measure the performance and sustainability of the project activities and will identify broader lessons related to preventing unnecessary separation of children from families and facilitating family reintegration.

The evaluation will include baseline, mid-term, and end-line data collection and reports. The organization awarded the contract (hereinafter referred to as “Evaluating Agency”) will be expected to work closely with the Implementing Partner to develop and operationalize indicators that will be used to measure the project’s performance and to produce a detailed research design. A research design document will be produced by the Evaluating Agency in consultation with USAID Displaced Children and Orphans Fund (DCOF), JSI/APC, and the Implementing Partner. This design document will provide details on the methods and plans for carrying out the baseline, mid-term, and end-line studies.

A2. Project to be Evaluated

The project that will be evaluated is responding to the situation of children outside of family care in Uganda. This project has two main objectives: 1) To reduce unnecessary separation of children from their families, and 2) To place children outside of family care in nurturing families. By the end of the project, the implementers expect to achieve the following outcomes:

- Approximately 43,000 vulnerable children living in target households show an improvement in selected child- and household-level outcomes in the two years following their enrollment in the project.
- Approximately 2,000 children living in institutional care or in the streets are reunified with birth families or placed into alternative family-based care and have improved positive outcomes in the twelve months following reintegration.

The project will pilot an integrated package of interventions that will:

1. Create opportunities for existing care institutions to re-conceptualize their role and acquire relevant knowledge and skills to support the aims and implementation of the Alternative Care Framework and to ensure family based care for all children. This process will be undertaken in close collaboration with government agencies with

oversight authority over child care institutions, and will build on a model of social work best practices.

2. Reintegrate girls living on the street.
3. Strengthen Uganda's Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development and the capacity of district governments to monitor institutions and effectively implement the country's new Alternative Care Framework.
4. Strengthen informal child protection mechanisms and mobilize communities to monitor children's wellbeing.
5. Strengthen household economy and parenting skills. The project will use proven community mobilization strategies– using role models, training community leaders, and mobilizing faith-based organizations to support family-based care.

The project will work in the 12 districts that concentrate 50% of the institutions in Uganda and that are located across four regions: East, West, North, and Central region. Activities at the community level will be concentrated in the four most vulnerable parishes in each district.

The independent evaluation for this project should collect baseline data and produce a baseline report at the beginning of the project, produce a midterm review near the middle of the project, and collect end-line data and produce a final evaluation report at the end of the project.

The Evaluating Agency will be expected to work closely with the Implementing Partner during project design and roll-out to revise a performance monitoring plan (PMP) that will provide guidance for project M&E and will facilitate the collection of baseline, midterm, and end-line data. The project M&E team will work with the Evaluating Agency to refine the logical framework and household data collection tools and agree on data that will be collected, stored, and shared with the Evaluating Agency.

A3. Background

In Uganda, an estimated 57,000 children are living in child care institutions, an increase from less than 1,500 in 1997. Residential care facilities have multiplied from approximately 35 in the mid- 1990s to over 500 in 2012. If unaddressed, these conditions risk causing serious delays in the social, behavioral, and cognitive development of these children, as well as attachment disorders. The major factors thought to be causing children to leave home to live on the streets or in institutions are: violence and abuse within the home, family breakdown, poverty, high prevalence of alcoholism and substance abuse, psychosocial distress, gender-based violence, and harmful cultural practices that precipitate child abandonment and pre-mature exit of children from the family unit. These conditions are more severe in war-affected Northern Uganda where trauma and depression are common and poverty is widespread.

Uganda's social services system is overwhelmed by a very young and rapidly growing society and the HIV/AIDS crisis that has resulted in over 1 million deaths and produced an estimated 1.1 million orphans. As a result of the increased number of orphans, combined with fewer caregivers, the extended family is no longer the safety net that it once was. Faith-based and women's groups such as voluntary associations, faith-based groups, and self-help groups have been the most effective actors to respond to and support orphans using local resources. The Government's legislative, policy, and programmatic initiatives to protect orphans and vulnerable children include Chapter 59 of the Children's Act, the National Orphans and Vulnerable Children policy (2004), and the 2nd National Strategic Program Plan of Interventions for Orphans and other Vulnerable Children (NSPPI-2). The National Framework for Alternative Care (2012) is a clear call to action.

The project that will be evaluated aims to prevent family separation, strengthen local capacities to care for and protect children, strengthen the institutional and policy environment, and strengthen child protection mechanisms. This project is intended to directly contribute to Objectives 2 and 4 in the USG *Action Plan on Children in Adversity*. It will also contribute to USAID's Country Development Cooperation Strategy for Uganda 2011-2015, particularly with programs targeting vulnerable groups, persons with disabilities, and gender dynamics.

A4. Purpose and Use of the Evaluation

USAID/ DCOF will use the results of the performance evaluation to inform future programming. The evaluation should effectively measure the performance and sustainability of activities associated with prevention of separation and reintegration of children who have been reunified or placed in family-based alternative care.

A5. Evaluation Questions

The research questions will be finalized by the Evaluating Agency during an in-country consultation workshop with the Implementing Partner, USAID, and other stakeholders, and approved by USAID/DCOF.

Illustrative questions include:

1. Have reintegration methods resulted in stable and sustained placements for children?
2. Did the project measurably improve outcomes related to the safety, wellbeing, and development of children in highly vulnerable households or for those who were living without adequate family care?
3. Have prevention methods employed by the project increased nutrition, education opportunities, care, and protection for children in targeted households?

4. Did the project bring about systemic changes at the community, regional, and national levels that are enabling children to live in family care and preventing inappropriate placements in institutional care?
5. By project end, to what extent have structures been established that can continue to provide, on an ongoing basis, adequate case-management services for children at risk?
6. Did the project offer models and approaches for expansion, adaptation, and/or replication?
7. Did the project influence national care reform measures?
8. By what percentage did the number of children living in institutions and on the streets in the targeted districts decrease?

A6. Evaluation Methods

Proposals must include a detailed description of the proposed research design and methodology. The methods and evaluation design must be as rigorous as reasonably possible. Research subjects will include children in residential care, children who have been reunified or placed in family-based care, and children in households where they are vulnerable to separation. The performance evaluation should track the situations of a sample of children in each of these circumstances to understand the results of their involvement with the project. Given the fact that the Implementing Partner will be identifying beneficiaries gradually for inclusion project activities, the evaluation sampling will have to take place on a rolling basis. Exact details and timing for evaluation sampling will have to be coordinated with the Implementing Partner.

The evaluation must include baseline, mid-term, and end-line data collection and reports.

Methods of data collection may include:

- Review of relevant national documents and technical resource material
- Group interviews
- Focus group discussions
- Surveys
- Key informant interviews
- Direct observation techniques
- Participatory appraisal methods

Since this evaluation potentially includes collecting sensitive data from human subjects, particularly children, the proposals must adequately describe how ethical review requirements will be met and estimates on how long approvals will take.

A7. Deliverables and Timeline

The Evaluating Agency is expected to provide a detailed timeline with the research design document. This timeline should be aligned with the Implementing Partner’s work-plan. The Evaluating Agency is expected to work with the Implementing Partner to develop a plan for data collection. Specific due dates for deliverables will be subject to approval by USAID/ DCOF.

Activities	6-MONTH SEMESTERS						Details
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
1. Develop research design							Completed in close collaboration with USAID/DCOF and the Implementing Partner before starting the baseline data collection.
2. Contribute to PMP							Completed with the research design document, also in close collaboration with the Implementing Partner.
3. Produce baseline report							Data collection completed within first three months of implementation
4. Produce mid-term review report							Review including FGDs, Direct Observation, and KI interviews
5. Produce final evaluation report							Data collected during the last three months of implementation.
6. Provide on-going remote technical support to Implementing Partner.							The Evaluating Agency will be expected to be on call for periodic technical follow-up with USAID/DCOF and Implementing Partner.

A8. Expected Deliverables

The assignment will be comprised of the following steps:

- **Research Design:** The Evaluating Agency will be expected to work remotely with the Implementing Partner and USAID/DCOF to develop a research design document. This document will include a detailed description of research methods and plans and clearly defined and operationalized indicators that will be used in the evaluation. The document will also include a division of responsibilities regarding data collection for the evaluation and a detailed timeline for all activities associated with the evaluation. A draft of the Research Design document will be submitted to USAID/ DCOF for approval before finalization.
- **Performance Monitoring Plan:** The Evaluating Agency will work closely with the Implementing Partner to develop a PMP that is aligned with the evaluation’s research design.
- **Data Collection Tools:** The Evaluating Agency will develop or adapt existing data collection tools (e.g. questionnaires, FGD guides, observation checklists) that will be submitted to USAID/DCOF for approval.

- **Training of Enumerators:** The Evaluating Agency will recruit, hire, train, and manage interviewers for data collection. Evaluation team members who are key personnel will be expected to be in Uganda to carry out this training and ensure adequate management of data gathering.
- **Baseline Data Collection:** Depending on what is agreed upon for the research design, some data may be collected by the Implementing Partner and some will be collected by the Evaluating Agency. The Evaluating Agency will be expected to work with the Implementing Partner and interviewers to ensure the quality of data collection. This will entail periodic in-country training and supervision. Evaluation team members who are key personnel will be expected to be in Uganda for relevant data collection activities.
- **Produce Baseline Report:** The Evaluating Agency will provide a draft of the report for USAID/DCOF's review and approval before finalization.
- **Presentation of Baseline Results:** The Evaluating Agency will present the results of the baseline study to USAID/DCOF and the Implementing Partner in person or via a live webinar.
- **Midterm Review Data Collection:** The Evaluating Agency will collect qualitative data for the mid-term review. Evaluation team members who are key personnel will be expected to be in Uganda for data collection.
- **Produce Midterm Report:** The Evaluating Agency will provide a draft of the report for USAID/DCOF's review and approval before finalization.
- **Presentation of Mid-term Results:** The Evaluating Agency will present the results of the mid-term review to USAID/DCOF and the Implementing Partner in person or via a live webinar.
- **End-line Data Collection:** Depending on what is agreed upon through the research design, some data will be collected by the Implementing Partner and some will be collected by the Evaluating Agency. The Evaluating Agency will be expected to work with the Implementing Partner to ensure the quality of data collection. This will entail in-country training and supervision. Evaluation team members who are key personnel will be expected to be in Uganda for data collection.
- **Produce Final Evaluation report:** The Evaluating Agency will provide a draft Final Evaluation Report that will incorporate analysis of the findings of the baseline, midterm, and end-line studies. The draft will be submitted for USAID/DCOF's review and approval before finalization.
- **Presentation of Final Results:** The Evaluating Agency will present the results of the end-line study and final performance evaluation to USAID/DCOF and the Implementing Partner in person or via a live webinar.
- **On-going Technical Support:** The Evaluating Agency will be expected to be on-call for remote technical input and support.

USAID will own all data and each work product produced through this evaluation.

A9. Composition of the Evaluation Team

Resumes of the proposed Evaluation Team members must be submitted with the Proposal. At least one team member must have research credentials and experience in evaluation design and methods with data collection and analysis expertise. The team must also have a subject matter expert in the area of child care reform with professional experience in Uganda. The team leader must have strong team management skills, and sufficient experience with evaluation standards and practices to ensure a credible product. The team leader is expected to have a working partnership with the funder as the team moves through the evaluation research design and planning process. He/she is also a person who must be able to deal effectively with senior U.S. and host country officials and other leaders.

A10. Required experience and skills of key personnel:

Research Specialist

- At least five years of experience supervising monitoring, evaluation, and research efforts, preferably with respect to child protection, capacity building, and service delivery.
- Strong quantitative or mixed-method and analytical skills.
- Ability to articulate technical information clearly and effectively to both technical and non-technical audiences.
- Master's Degree or higher in public health, demography, health management, social science, biostatistics, statistics, or a related field is preferred.

Subject Matter Expert

- At least 8 years of experience in social welfare particularly relating to child welfare.
- High level of understanding of current issues relevant to vulnerable children, including child protection systems, family strengthening, processes for family (re)integration of children, and international development.
- High level of understanding of care and care reform, including application of the UN Guidelines on Alternative Care.
- Understanding of current research and research questions on children's placement and care.
- Working knowledge of programming in international contexts (preferably in sub-Saharan Africa) with family strengthening, alternative care, family reunification, and adoption

and solid work experience in an international environment, including experience in sub-Saharan Africa and preferably Uganda.

- Master's Degree or higher in social science, social policy, or related field.

Team Leader

- The team leader may also serve another function on the team, but should have 5 or more years of experience managing a project in an African country.
- Excellent communication and diplomatic skills and ability to work with a diverse group of professionals from NGO, government, and donors.
- Ability to manage priorities and to accomplish time sensitive goals with a small team.
- Prior experience managing an evaluation.

A11. Scheduling, Logistics and Other Support

Neither USAID or JSI nor the Implementing Partner will be expected to provide assistance with logistics or administrative support for the evaluation. However, the Implementing Partner will be collecting potentially relevant information through their own M&E systems. The availability of this data will be discussed and negotiated during the three-day evaluation planning workshop in Uganda. USAID/DCOF will make arrangements for this workshop and the Evaluating Agency will be responsible for costs of sending its own representatives.

The Evaluating Agency is also responsible for hiring, training, and supervising enumerators and any other staff hired for the evaluation. The Evaluating Agency must specify their sources for administrative support in Uganda, including scheduling of appointments, finding translators and interpreters, and arranging vehicles. The proposal must provide a description of how this support will be provided. The budget should appropriately reflect this local support.

A12. Requirements for Reporting

The evaluation team will provide oral briefings when mid-term and final drafts are submitted. USAID/DCOF will be provided with two weeks to review submitted drafts and to provide comments before finalization of the reports.

The reports must clearly differentiate between findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

The evaluation reports should cover the following:

- Executive Summary;
- Purpose, scope, and audience of the evaluation;
- Evaluation questions;

- The context (relevant history, demography, socio-economic status, and basic political arrangements of the community, country, or region) in which the project or policy intervention was designed and implemented and aspects of the social, economic, and political/administrative context relevant to the separation of children from families and for reintegration into family care;
- Description of the project, its objectives, scope and activities;
- The conceptual framework underlying the project;
- Data collection: the unit of analysis, sample, type of data collected, quality of data, and analytic techniques used;
- Evaluation findings: Findings are the empirical facts gathered by an evaluation team about the performance, cost effectiveness, relevance, sustainability or impacts of an intervention, strategy, policy or organization;
- Conclusions: These represent the evaluators' interpretations and judgments based on the findings and empirical data gathered and analyzed, and these should include attention to the potential wider influence within Uganda of the project on care reform, as well as its specific results;
- Recommendations: These refer to the actions which the evaluation team recommends for the project, USAID, and other actors with current or potential roles related to preventing unnecessary separation of children from families and supporting the (re)integration of children into families. These should be logically derived from findings and conclusions;
- Lessons learned: These are broader implications.

SECTION B: PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

B1. Proposal Guidelines

Applicants are encouraged to read the RFP in its entirety, and ensure that a proposal addresses all the items cited in the proposal instructions and meets the eligibility criteria. Proposals may be submitted by U.S. Private Voluntary Organizations, international or national non-governmental organizations (NGOs), for-profit organizations, faith-based organizations, and universities. All proposals must be submitted by **November 7, 2014 at 5PM EST**. Proposals submitted after the closing date and time will not be considered. The proposal must be accompanied by a cover letter typed on official organizational letterhead and signed by a person who has signatory authority for the Applicant. Submit the complete proposal package (electronic format) on or before the due date and time to grants-APC@jsi.com.

RFP Questions and Answers

Questions about this RFP may be submitted to APC at grants-APC@jsi.com, in English, by October 16, 2014 at 5PM EDT. A list of all questions and answers will be posted on the APC website by October 22, 2014.



Receipt of a proposal to this request does not constitute an award commitment on behalf of the USG, JSI, and/or or FHI 360, nor does it commit the USG, JSI, and/or FHI 360 to reimburse any costs incurred in the preparation and submission of a proposal. JSI, FHI 360, and the USG reserve the right not to fund any and/or all of the proposals received.

All proposals received on or before the due date and time will be reviewed by APC staff for responsiveness to the specifications of the RFP. Proposals determined to be non-responsive will be eliminated as not being eligible for review by the technical evaluation committee. Eligible proposals will then be evaluated according to the criteria provided below. The committee will determine which organization will be funded based on the submitted proposals. The award of a contract is contingent on the availability of funds and the approval of JSI/APC. The successful Applicant will be awarded a contract from JSI on behalf of USAID. All Applicants will be notified in writing whether or not their proposal is recommended for funding.

B2. Proposal

The Proposal describes how the Applicant intends to carry out the Proposal Description (Section A). It should be concise, specific, and complete, and demonstrate a clear understanding of the work to be undertaken and the responsibilities of all parties involved. It must demonstrate the Applicant's eligibility, as well as its capabilities and expertise. The proposal must be submitted in English.

Proposals may be no more than ten (10) pages in length (including logical framework). The following are NOT included in the 10-page proposal limit: cover page, table of contents, acronym list, executive summary, budget documents, up to five Past Performance Information Tables and resumes of key personnel. All proposals should be prepared on standard letter-sized pages (8 ½ x 11") with 1" margins, using a font size of 12 Times New Roman, except within tables and in the budget section where the font size may be smaller but must be easily readable. At this initial stage, Applicants should NOT submit any additional documents with their proposal. JSI/APC will confirm receipt via email of all proposals within ten (10) calendar days of the submission deadline.

Applicants should submit all documents as email attachments. It is not necessary to send a hard copy of the Technical Proposal via mail or fax. The Technical Proposal and the corresponding Budget Documents (budget narrative and budget summary) should be submitted as separate attachments. Applicants should not include photographs as part of their proposals.

Applicants must use the following format to outline their proposal. This outline corresponds to the evaluation criteria (Section C).

Cover Page (1 page)

Include the name of the organization submitting the proposal, evaluation title, proposed evaluation dates, requested amount (in USD) of USAID funding, and name, office address, phone, fax, email of the primary individual responsible for the proposal and one alternate.

Executive Summary (1 page)

The Executive Summary should provide an overview of key features of the proposed evaluation. The summary should include a brief description of the overall evaluation, objectives, methods, intended results, and level of funding requested.

Core Proposal (10 pages)

- Technical Approach to Evaluation
- Methods used: Specifics on research methods that will be used
- Data collection: Detailed description of how data will be collected, by whom and timeframe
- Child protection and ethical considerations for data collection and use
- Evaluation limitations
- Evaluation timeline and deliverables
- Staffing structure
- Logical framework

Summary and Detailed Budget (See Attachment 2)

A detailed line-item and a summary budget should be prepared based on the responsibilities described above and presented in the format specified in Attachment 2. All budget estimates must be in U.S. Dollars. The Budget should include the following categories of cost (exclude any do that do not apply): Personnel, Staff Benefits, Consultants, Travel, and other Direct Costs. The category Overhead or Indirect Costs may be used only if the organization has a Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (NICRA) from a US federal agency or an Indirect Rate calculated and certified by an acceptably recognized public accounting firm. Otherwise please include all overhead costs (share of rent, utilities, management costs, etc.) within the other categories. No profit or fee may be charged.

A detailed budget narrative/notes that justifies the costs as appropriate and necessary for the successful completion of proposed activities should be attached to the budget. The budget narrative/notes should clearly describe the project and cost assumptions. All proposed costs and estimates must be reasonable and allowable in accordance with the US government's Cost Principles. In summary, all proposed costs must be directly applicable to performing the work under the award; and budgeted amounts should not exceed the market cost/value of an item or service.

The proposed budget should not exceed \$400,000.

Supporting Information

- Past performance tables (see Attachment 1)
- Resumes of evaluation team



SECTION C: ELIGIBILITY AND SELECTION CRITERIA

C1. Introduction

Applicants should note that the selection criteria presented in Section C4 serve: (1) to identify the significant matters which Applicants should address in their proposals; and (2) as the standard against which all proposals will be evaluated. Applicants must organize the narrative sections of their proposals in the same order as the selection criteria. Proposals found to be ineligible and proposals that deviate significantly from this structure will not be reviewed. The Technical Proposal will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set forth below. The contract shall be made to the Applicant whose submission, based on indicated evaluation criteria, represents the most solid technical approach and addresses the identified results.

Proposals will undergo a preliminary review by APC project staff for completeness and responsiveness. Incomplete proposals, proposals judged to be unresponsive to the solicitation, and proposals submitted after the due date and time will be considered to be ineligible and will NOT be considered for an award.

C2. Eligibility

Proposals may be submitted by U.S. Private Voluntary Organizations, international or national non-governmental organizations (NGOs), for-profit organizations, faith-based organizations, and universities. The Applicant must have adequate financial controls and expect to meet requirements defined by 22 CFR 228 (see <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2012-01-10/pdf/2011-33240.pdf>).

Applicants should demonstrate that they have significant and relevant experience concerning the issues, populations and/or interventions that they are proposing to address in the evaluation. Familiarity with USAID policies and procedures is valued.

C3. Selection Process

Eligible proposals will be reviewed and evaluated by Technical Evaluation Committee against the selection criteria described below.

The APC project Finance Director will use the conclusions and recommendations of the Technical Evaluation Committee together with an evaluation of costs to determine if negotiations with an Applicant will be required. The costs involved in preparing the Proposal shall not be directly reimbursed regardless of the outcome of the negotiations.

C4. Evaluation Criteria

The Proposal will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set forth below. Thereafter, the proposed Budget of an acceptable proposal will be reviewed for general reasonableness, allowability, and allocability of costs. A contract will be offered to the Applicant whose proposal

offers the greatest value, and will be made based on the ranking of proposals according to the technical selection criteria identified below.

The APC project reserves the right to request further information from all organizations deemed to have met initial selection criteria, as needed to make a final selection of a contractor.

The proposal will be evaluated against the following criteria:

A. *Technical Approach to Evaluation [40 points]*

- Is there a clear explanation of what the proposed evaluation will do, how, and by whom?
- Are the specific approaches and methods to be used clearly described, technically sound, appropriate, and likely to be effective?
- Is the proposed approach to project evaluation realistic, technically sound, and likely to produce meaningful results?
- Are viable indicators specified for proposed outcomes?
- Are the roles of and relationships with the Implementing Partner clear, viable and appropriate?
- Does the logical framework lay out a clear, credible process for achieving intended evaluation results?
- Are there plans to ensure that protective and ethical procedures are in place with regard to the collection and use of data?

B. *Management, Implementation, and Staffing [30 points]*

- Is there a clear overview of the timeline for the major stages of the proposed evaluation?
- Do proposed evaluation personnel appear well-qualified and have relevant experience in relation to their proposed positions?
- Are there policies or procedures in place to mitigate the risk of child abuse, exploitation, violence, or neglect by evaluation personnel?
- Is the proposed evaluation plan cost-effective with regard to the use of resources to produce results?

C. *Institutional Capabilities and Past Performance [30 points]*

- Does the organization have a strong track record for evaluating this type of project?
- Does it have the necessary technical expertise?
- In the experience of the reviewers, has the organization demonstrated success with similar evaluations in the past?

C5. Weighing of Evaluation Criteria

A. *Technical Approach to Evaluation* 40 points

B. *Management, Implementation, and Staffing* 30 points

C. *Institutional Capabilities and Past Performance* 30 points

TOTAL 100 Points

Attachment 1: Past Performance Information Table

Organization Name	
Evaluation Objectives	
Description of evaluation	
Activities undertaken	
Geographic Location (district, sub-county, village, parish)	
Funding Agency's Contact Information (name and address of the Agency and name and phone number/email address of project contact)	
Period of Implementation	
Total Budget	

Attachment 2: Summary and Detailed Budget Template
ORGANIZATION NAME

Summary Budget

Line Item	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
1 TOTAL STAFF/PERSONNEL	0	0	0	0
2 TOTAL STAFF BENEFITS	0	0	0	0
3 TOTAL CONSULTANT COSTS	0	0	0	0
4 TOTAL TRAVEL COSTS	0	0	0	0
5 TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS	0	0	0	0
6 TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0

Total by Line Item		Exchange Rate 1 USD =	0	YEAR 1		YEAR 2		YEAR 3		PROGRAM	
		Annual Inflation	0%							TOTAL	
		Annual Staff Salary Increase (if applicable)	0%								
Line Items	Unit Cost	Units	Amount	Units	Amount	Units	Amount	Units	Amount	Units	Amount
I. STAFF/PERSONNEL											
A. Project Full-Time Staff (Level of Effort = 100%)											
1.	Name Title	\$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
2.	Name Title	\$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
3.	Name Title	\$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
4.	Name Title	\$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
<i>Subtotal Project Full-Time Staff</i>				\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	
B. Project Support Staff (Level of Effort < 100%)											
1.	Name Title	0% \$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
2.	Name Title	0% \$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
3.	Name Title	0% \$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
<i>Subtotal Project Support Staff</i>				\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	
TOTAL STAFF/PERSONNEL				\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	
II. STAFF BENEFITS											
A. Benefits - Project Full-Time Staff											
1.	Name & Title of Staff Member or Type of Benefit	\$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
2.	Name & Title of Staff Member or Type of Benefit	\$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
3.	Name & Title of Staff Member or Type of Benefit	\$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
4.	Name & Title of Staff Member or Type of Benefit	\$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
<i>Subtotal Allowances/Benefits - Project Full-Time Staff</i>				\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	
B. Benefits - Project Support Staff											
1.	Name & Title of Staff Member or Type of Benefit	\$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
2.	Name & Title of Staff Member or Type of Benefit	\$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
3.	Name & Title of Staff Member or Type of Benefit	\$ - /mo	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
<i>Subtotal Allowances/Benefits - Project Support Staff</i>				\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	
TOTAL ALLOWANCES/STAFF BENEFITS				\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	
III. CONSULTANT COSTS											
A. International Consultants											
1.	Name or Purpose of Contract	APC Request for Proposals – Performance Evaluation of Child Care Reform Project in Uganda	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00	\$ -	0.00
TOTAL CONSULTANT COSTS				\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	
			16								
IV. TRAVEL COSTS											

A. International Travel									
1. Staff Travel									
From:	To:								
Origin	Destination	\$ - /roundtrip	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$ -
2. International Consultant Travel									
From:	To:								
Origin	Destination	\$ - /roundtrip	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$ -
3. Airport transportation (for Staff and International Consultant Travel)									
		\$ - /trip	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$ -
<i>Subtotal International Travel</i>									
			\$ -	-	\$ -	-	\$ -	-	\$ -
B. In-Country Travel & Ground Transportation									
1. Air Travel									
		\$ - /trip	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$ -
2. Ground Transportation									
		\$ - /day or trip	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$ -
3. Specify Other In-Country Travel Cost									
		\$ - /	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$ -
4. Specify Other In-Country Travel Cost									
		\$ - /	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$ -
<i>Subtotal In-Country Travel & Ground Transportation</i>									
			\$ -	-	\$ -	-	\$ -	-	\$ -
C. Per Diem									
1. Staff - International Travel									
Destination		\$ - /day	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$ -
Destination		\$ - /day	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$ -
2. Consultant Travel									
Consultant Name or Purpos	Destination	\$ - /day	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$ -
<i>Subtotal Per Diem</i>									
			\$ -	-	\$ -	-	\$ -	-	\$ -
TOTAL TRAVEL COSTS									
			\$ -	-	\$ -	-	\$ -	-	\$ -
VI. OTHER DIRECT COSTS									
A. Office Costs									
11	Specify Other Direct Cost	\$ - /	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$ -
12	Specify Other Direct Cost	\$ - /	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$ -
13	Specify Other Direct Cost	\$ - /	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$	-	0.00 \$ -
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS									
			\$ -	-	\$ -	-	\$ -	-	\$ -
IX. INDIRECT COSTS (IF APPLICABLE)									
A. Indirect Costs									
		0.00%							\$ -
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS									
			\$ -	-	\$ -	-	\$ -	-	\$ -
TOTAL BUDGET									
			#REF!		#REF!		#REF!		#REF!