



## **Request for Proposal – RFP#FY25 005**

Dear Sir or Madam,

CRS, under the **McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program**, (MGDFFE-II), known locally as *Promotion of Educational and Economic Performance in Educative Communities* (Melhoria de Rendimento Escolar e Económica das Comunidades Educativas na Guiné-Bissau phase 2) MeREECE-II, is issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the selection of an international consultancy firm or organization to conduct **Baseline Study, Mid-Term and Final Evaluation** in Guinea-Bissau. The attached RFP contains all the necessary information for interested Bidders.

MeREECE-II projects, in Guinea-Bissau, is a 4-year project funded through the United State Department of Agriculture-USDA, the MeREECE project aims to strengthen the education system in Guinea-Bissau and improve literacy of school-aged children in the regions of Oio, Cacheu, Quinara, Bafata and Gabu.

Evaluator firms or organizations should indicate their interest in submitting a proposal for the anticipated contract by sending an email indicating their intention to Aly Kanoute by January 7<sup>th</sup>, 2025, at 23:59 GMT.

CRS anticipate that Bidders may have additional questions after reading this RFP. Interested Bidders can submit their questions to [aly.kanoute@crs.org](mailto:aly.kanoute@crs.org) according to the instructions in the RFP. If necessary, CRS will provide answers to all relevant questions by email to all firms or organizations that expressed interest.

This RFP does not obligate CRS to execute a contract, nor does it commit CRS to pay any costs incurred in the preparation and submission of the proposals. Furthermore, CRS reserves the right to reject any and all offers, if such action is considered to be in the best interest of CRS.

Sincerely,

Aly Kanoute

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Aly Kanoute", written over a white background.



## Request for Proposals

For the MGDFFE MeREE-II

Contracting Entity: **Catholic Relief Services (CRS)**

Guinea-Bissau Country Office, Rua 5 de Julho Bairro Tchada, Bissau

Funded by: **United State Department of Agriculture-USDA**

Prime Contract Number: **FFE-657-2024/008-00**

## **RFP Table of Contents**

### **Section I General Information**

- 1.1.Introduction
- 1.2.Offer Deadline
- 1.3.Submission of Offers

### **Section II Proposal Requirement and Documents and bidders' instruction**

- 2.1. Required Proposal Documents
- 2.2. General Requirements
- 2.3. Required Proposal Documents
- 2.4. Technical Proposal
- 2.5. Financial Proposal
- 2.6. Source of Funding
- 2.7. Chronological List of Proposal Events
- 2.8. Bid language
- 2.9. Tender Currency
- 2.10. Validity Period

### **Section III Proposal Evaluation & Basis for Award**

- 3.1. Evaluation and Basis for Award Negotiation
- 3.2. Technical evaluation criteria
- 3.3. Financial evaluation criteria
- 3.4. Negotiations
- 3.5. Protest
- 3.6 Payment Method

### **Section IV - Annexes**

Annex 1-Supplier / service provider code of conduct

Annex 2- CRS General Terms and Conditions applicable to goods and services

Annex 3-Conflict of Interest

Annex 4- Acknowledgement of CRS declaration of conflict of interest and the code of ethics

Annex 5- No Adverse Action Confirmation Form

Annex 6- ToR



## **Section I. General Information**

### **1.1.Introduction**

The MeREECE program aims to strengthen the education system in Guinea-Bissau and improve literacy of school-aged children in the regions of Oio, Cacheu, Quinara, Bafata and Gabu. CRS is working with its partners, Caritas Guinea-Bissau to fully implement the project in 350 elementary schools to reach 183,518 individuals in the five proposed regions. The project will run from October 1, 2024, to September 30, 2028.

### **1.2.Offer Deadline**

The deadline for receiving proposals is January 7<sup>th</sup>, 2025. Bidders shall submit their proposals electronically by email only to: [aly.kanoute@crs.org](mailto:aly.kanoute@crs.org)

Bidders are responsible for ensuring that their offers are received in accordance with the instructions stated herein. Late offers may be considered at the discretion of CRS. CRS cannot guarantee that late offers will be considered.

### **1.3.Submission of Offers**

Separate technical and financial proposals must be submitted by email no later than the time and date specified in 1.2.The proposals must be submitted to the point of contact designated in 1.2.

The Bidder must submit the proposal electronically with up to 35 Mo per email compatible with MS Word, MS Excel, readable format, or Adobe Portable Document (PDF) format in a Microsoft XP environment. Bidders must not submit zipped files. Those pages requiring original manual signatures should be scanned and sent in PDF format as an email attachment.

## **Section II Proposal Requirement and Documents and bidders' instruction**

### **2.1. Requirements**

To be determined responsive, bidders should comply with the administrative requirement by providing all administrative documents requested in this RFP and present the technical and financial proposal as per the points 1.3 submission of offers.

### **2.2. General Requirements**

CRS anticipates issuing a contract to an international consultancy firm or organization that has the ability to conduct effective Baseline Study, Mid-Term and Final Evaluation in Guinea-Bissau. While CRS will provide the contractor with a letter of invitation, it will be the responsibility of the selected contractor to obtain all related travel documentation such as visas, vaccinations, insurance for it stay in Bissau, etc

Firms and organizations that submit proposals in response to this RFP must meet the following requirements:



i. Firms or organizations, whether for-profit or non-profit, must be legally able to conduct business in Guinea-Bissau and can conduct Baseline Study, Mid-Term and Final Evaluation in Guinea-Bissau upon award of the contract.

Bidders are required to meet the following criteria to be eligible to participate in this procurement:

- a) Have the legal capacity to enter into a contract.
- b) Not be insolvent, in receivership, bankrupt or being wound up or subject to legal proceedings for any of these circumstances.
- c) Not be suspended or debarred from public procurement by the United States Government, the United Nations, the World Bank, or DFID
- d) Not have any conflict of interest in this process and no adverse actions against the bidder within the past 05 years

The firms in the excluded party list system (EPLS) are not eligible as suppliers of commodities and services.

**The Bidder must verify that it does not appear on:**

- 1) The website of the System for Award Management (SAM) formally known as the Excluded Party List System (EPLS): <https://www.sam.gov>;
- 2) The website of the United Nations Security (UNSC) sanctions committee established under UNSC Resolution 1267 (1999) (the “1267 Committee”): [http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq\\_sanctions\\_list.shtml](http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq_sanctions_list.shtml),
- 3) The Office of Foreign Assets Control Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List <https://www.treasury.gov/ofac/downloads/sdnlist.pdf>

**2.3. Required Proposal Documents**

Cover Letter

The Bidder’s cover letter shall include the following information:

- i. Name of the firm or organization
- ii. Type of firm or organization
- iii. Address
- iv. Telephone
- v. E-mail
- vi. Full names of members of the Board of Directors and Legal Representative (as appropriate)
- vii. Tax Registration or equivalent document.
- viii. DUNS Number
- ix. Copy of registration or incorporation in the public registry, or equivalent document from the government office where the Bidder is registered.



- x. Copy of trade license, or equivalent document.
- xi. A signed copy of the conflict-of-interest form (Annex 4)
- xii. A signed copy of the “Adversed action form” (Annex 5)

## 2.4. Technical Proposal

The technical proposal shall comprise the following parts:

**Part 1:** Technical Approach, Methodology and Detailed Work Plan. This part may not exceed 20 pages.

**Part 2:** Management and Key Personnel. This part may not exceed 10 pages. CVs for key personnel may be included in an annex to the technical proposal and will not count against the page limit.

**Part 3:** Corporate Capabilities, Experience, and Past Performance. This part may not exceed 20 pages. Part 3 must include a description of the firm and organization, with appropriate reference to any parent firm and subsidiaries. Bidders must include details demonstrating their experience and technical ability in implementing the technical approach/methodology and the detailed work plan. Additionally, Bidders must include three (3) past performance references of similar work (under contracts or contracts) previously implemented as well as contact information for the firms for which such work was completed. Contact information must include at a minimum: name of point of contact who can speak to the Bidder’s performance, name and address of the firm for which the work was performance, and email and phone number of the point of contact.

The sections of the technical proposal stated above must respond to the detailed information set out in Section II of this RFP, which provides the background, states the scope of work, describes the deliverables, and provides a deliverables schedule.

## 2.5. Financial Proposal

The financial proposal is used to determine which proposals represent the best value and serves as a basis of negotiation before award of a contract. The financial proposal will include all costs associated with implementation of the technical proposal include the travel-related costs, which will be incurred by the firm.

The price of the contract to be awarded will fixed price including all costs. Bidders must provide a budget with major line items such as daily fees. All financial information must be expressed in USD.

The financial proposal shall also include a budget narrative that explains the basis for the estimate of each line item. Supporting information must be provided in sufficient detail to allow for a complete analysis of each financial element or line item. CRS reserves the right to request additional financial information if the evaluation committee has concerns of the reasonableness, realism, or completeness of a Bidder’s proposed cost.

If it is a Bidder’s regular practice to budget indirect rates, e.g. overhead, fringe, G&A, administrative, or other rate, Bidders must explain the rates and the rates’ base of application in the budget narrative. CRS reserves the right to request additional information to substantiate a Bidder’s indirect rates.



Under no circumstances may financial information be included in the technical proposal. No financial information or any prices, whether for deliverables or line items, may be included in the technical proposal. Financial information must only be shown in the financial proposal.

## **2.6. Source of Funding**

Any contract resulting from this RFP will be financed by USDA FAS funding and will be subject to USDA regulations.

## **2.7. Chronological List of Proposal Events**

The following calendar summarizes important dates in the solicitation process. Bidders must strictly follow these deadlines.

RFP advertisement December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Deadline for written questions December 26<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Feedback to the question will be provided no later than December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2024

Proposal due date January 7<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Contract award (estimated) January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2025

The dates above may be modified at the sole discretion of CRS. Any changes will be published in an amendment to this RFP.

## **2.8. Bid language**

The proposal of the bidder, as well as all correspondence and documents relating to this tender exchanged between the firm or organization and CRS, shall be written in English.

## **2.9. Tender Currency**

All prices will be quoted in US Dollars.

CRS reserves the right to reject bids submitted in a currency other than the currency required in the invitation to tender and indicated above. CRS may accept bids submitted in a currency other than that indicated above if the bidder confirms, during the clarification of bids (paragraph 4), in writing, that it accepts a contract in the currency selected and that, for conversion, the exchange rate indicated on the OANDA website on the day of the bid closing date indicated in the request for quotation will prevail.

## **2.10. Validity Period**

Bidders' proposals must remain valid for 90 calendar days after the proposal deadline.

## **Section III: Proposal Evaluation & Basis for Award**

### **3.1. Evaluation and Basis for Award**



A Contract will be executed with the Bidder whose proposal is determined to be responsive to this solicitation document, meets the eligibility criteria stated in this RFP, meets the technical, management/personnel, and corporate capability requirements, and is determined to represent the best value to CRS. Best value will be decided by evaluation process.

This RFP will use the value for money to determine best value. That means that each proposal will be evaluated and scored against the evaluation criteria and evaluation sub-criteria, which are stated in the table below.

In evaluating proposals, CRS will use the following evaluation criteria:

### 3.2. Technical evaluation criteria (70 points)

Evaluation Criteria	Description	Requirement	Score
<b>Eligibility</b>	Administrative Documents	Provide a copy of updated TIN certificate, Business registration, License to provide consultancy services and all relevant administrative documents	Minimum requirement for all applicants
<b>Understanding of requirement and the proposal</b>  <b>20 points</b>	Methodology and approach	The proposal clearly articulates the objective(s) of the research/evaluation. The proposed approach and methodology is robust, appropriate (actionable, sensitive, responsible) and indicates that it will achieve the requirements of the research/evaluation.	10
	Project Management	Demonstrated understanding of the activities to be implemented, defined roles and responsibilities of team members, a project plan with proposed timelines for each major activity/deliverable, use of project management tools/practices and commitment to deliver on time	10
<b>Demonstrated experience</b>  <b>30 points</b>	Experience in impact/outcome evaluation	Minimum of 10 years' experience in conducting impact/outcome or economic evaluation using [experimental or quasi-experimental] design and mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis).	5 points ( <b>Over to 10 years</b> ) 3 points ( <b>Between 5 to 9 years</b> ) 0 point ( <b>under 5 years</b> )
	Experience in the thematic area	Minimum of 10 years' experience in conducting research and/or evaluation in the field of [Education], particularly in relation to [Child literacy and nutrition]	5 points ( <b>Over to 10 years</b> ) 3 points ( <b>Between 5 to 9 years</b> ) 0 point ( <b>under 5 years</b> )
	Experience in both the country and/or the broader region and within the cultural context	Minimum of 5 years' experience leading research, evaluations or consultancy work in Guinea Bissau and/or broader regions that is sensitive to the local context and culture, particularly child rights, gender equality, ethnicity, religion and minority groups and/or other factors	5 points ( <b>Over to 5 years</b> ) 3 points ( <b>Between 2 to 4 years</b> ) 0 point ( <b>under 2 years</b> )
	Experience - Humanitarian development context-	Minimum of 5 years' experience of leading research, evaluations or consultancy work in a similar development context	5 points ( <b>Over to 5 years</b> ) 3 points ( <b>Between 2 to 4 years</b> ) 0 point ( <b>under 2 years</b> )
	Experience – Donor	Experience in conducting evaluations funded by USG, particularly in relation to Education	5



	Experience –Working with children and marginalized and/or vulnerable groups	Experience in conducting ethical and inclusive research and/or evaluations involving children	5
<b>Bidder Capacity</b>  <b>20 points</b>	Leadership	Team Leader's 15 years of experience in leading large scale consultancy work, research and evaluations, and managing a team of diverse team of specialists	5
	Staffing	The combined team resources (number of members), skills and experience adequately cover all areas of expertise and experience required (e.g. research design, sampling, quantitative and qualitative data collection, quantitative and qualitative data analysis, stakeholder liaison and knowledge translation/reporting back etc. as indicated in the TOR)	5
	Language	Fluency in the main language spoken by the (e.g. Portuguese, English)	5
	Gender	The team should include at least one member with demonstrated expertise in gender analysis, gender-responsive programming, or experience integrating gender considerations into research and evaluation.	5

CRS reserves the right to accept or reject any or all bids, without incurring any liability on the part of the bidder(s), who may not in turn make any claim or claim compensation.

### 3.3. Financial Evaluation Criteria (30 points)

The maximum score for the financial evaluation is 30 points

The committee will then open the financial offers from technically qualified bidders.

The financial component is evaluated based on **30 points**. The financial offer with the lowest amount receives the maximum score of 30.

The other proposals receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest price, the formula being as follows: **Points attached to the financial offer = (30 x LA) / PS**

**LA: Lowest amount**

**PS: Submission Prize**

The total score will be calculated as follows: **Total score /100 = Technical score out of 75 + Financial score out of 30**

The committee will provisionally award the contract to the bid with the highest total score.

CRS reserves the right to accept or reject any or all bids, without incurring any liability on the part of the bidder(s), who may not in turn make any claim or claim compensation.





The financial evaluation criteria have 30 points of the total scores and will be as per the table below.

Evaluation Criteria	Description	Score
<b>Personnel allocations and rates - Coverage</b>	Comprehensive coverage of costing elements/units and adequacy of budgeting into specific costing elements. There are no important cost elements that are not being budgeted for.	10
<b>Personnel allocations and rates - Reasonableness</b>	The allocated amounts, unit cost and number of required units are reasonable to achieve the objectives of this study; those amounts are necessary to achieve the objectives of the evaluation effectively	10
<b>Cost elements</b>	The budget line items are relevant for the successful implementation of the activities of the whole evaluation process. There are no unnecessary or unrelated cost elements being budgeted for.	10

**NB:** Cost element should include the following:

Compensation

Incidental Expenses

Unit Price and Total Amount

Other if applicable

### 3.4.Negotiations

Best offer proposals are requested. It is anticipated that a contract will be awarded solely on the basis of the original offers received. However, CRS reserves the right to request clarifications prior to award. Furthermore, CRS reserves the right to conduct a competitive range and to limit the number of Bidders in the competitive range to permit an efficient evaluation environment among the most highly rated proposals. Highest-rated Bidders, as determined by the technical evaluation committee, may be asked to submit their best prices or technical responses during a competitive range. At the sole discretion of CRS, Bidders may be requested to conduct oral presentations. If deemed an opportunity, CRS reserves the right to make separate awards per component or to make no award at all.

### 3.5.Protest

By submitting a response to this request for proposals, Bidders understand that USDA is NOT a party to this solicitation.

Bidders agree that any protest to this request for proposals must be presented in writing with a full explanation of the Bidders concerns to CRS's for consideration. USDA will not consider protests made to that USDA under that USDA -funded projects. At its sole discretion, CRS will make a final decision on the protest.



### 3.6. Payment method

CRS makes payment after delivery, 15 days after receipt of invoices, including:

- **20%** of the value of the consultancy will be paid upon presentation and approval of the work plan and schedule;
- **30%** of the value of the consultancy will be paid upon submission and approval of a first draft of the evaluation report;
  
- **50%** of the consultancy value will be paid upon submission and approval of the final evaluation report which must include an overall assessment of the project, constructive measures and specific recommendations on actions to be taken to improve project performance and must incorporate all comments provided by tCRS project and other relevant personnel, partner staff and other key project stakeholders.



## Section: IV Annexes

### 1. SUPPLIER / SERVICE PROVIDER CODE OF CONDUCT

Catholic Relief Services (CRS) has committed to the principles of responsible sourcing, and we expect our suppliers and service providers to fully follow the applicable contractual obligations to include CRS terms & conditions, local and relevant/otherwise applicable laws and to adhere to internationally recognized environmental, social, and corporate governance standards. We also expect our suppliers to implement these standards with their suppliers and subcontractors, as inspired by the United Nations Global Compact initiative, the United Nations Guiding Principles and Human Rights, the International Labour Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, ETI Base Code, and applicable CRS' Policies, Procedures and Standards.

#### 1) SOCIAL

Prohibit all forms of harassment, sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse, including sexual exploitation and abuse, and trafficking in persons.<sup>1</sup> All sexual activity with a child, defined as person under the age of 18 years, is considered sexual abuse regardless of local age of consent.

Have mechanisms in place to actively prevent, address, and respond to harassment, sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse, including sexual exploitation and abuse, and trafficking in persons.

Support the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights and prohibit forced, bonded, and involuntary labor and child labor.

Do not recruit or employ children under the age of 15 years. Do not recruit or employ children under 18 years for work that is mentally or physically dangerous or interferes with schooling.

Treat employees with dignity and respect and supply a workplace that is safe and hygienic, complies with national laws, and is free from discrimination on the basis of race, gender, age, religion, sexuality, culture or disability.

Provide accessible and confidential reporting mechanisms for employees and other stakeholders to report concerns or suspicions of any forms of harassment, abuse and exploitation described above and potentially unlawful practices by management or employees.

Commit to protecting reporters or whistleblowers from retaliation.

Uphold the freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining as set out within applicable laws.

Ensure wages and working hours meet national legal standards.

#### 2) GOVERNANCE



Abide by all applicable national and international trade laws and regulations including but not limited to antitrust, trade controls, and sanction regimes.

Consider business integrity as the basis of business relationships.

Prohibit all types of bribery, corruption, money laundering and terrorism financing

Forbid gifts to private or public officials that aim to influence business decisions or otherwise encourage them to act contrary to their obligations.

Respect the privacy and confidential information of all your employees and business partners as well as protect data and intellectual property from misuse.

Have data protection and managements standards in place that address data collection, safeguarding, sanitation and disposal. The data owner is aware of the data provision terms and conditions and supplies consent as per CRS Responsible Data Values and Principles

Implement a proper Compliance Management policy and procedure, which facilitate compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and standards.

### 3) ENVIRONMENT

Follow all applicable environmental, health and safety regulations.

Promote the safe and environmentally sound development, manufacturing, transport, use and disposal of your products.

Ensure by using proper management policies and procedures that product quality and safety meet the applicable requirements.

Protect your employees' and neighbors' life and health, as well as the public at large against hazards inherent in your processes and products.

Use resources efficiently, apply energy-efficient and environmentally friendly technologies and reduce waste, as well as emissions to air, water, and soil.

Because CRS is a recipient of numerous grants or contracts provided by governmental, public, and private donors, all suppliers and service providers are hereby notified that other donor-specific compliance measures may be included in the legal instrument through which goods or services are procured.

CRS reserves the right to conduct due diligence audits or assessments to ensure your compliance and will take reasonable steps to investigate or otherwise take appropriate action to address concerns. CRS reserves the right to terminate any relationship for non-adherence to the abovementioned requirements.



Should you have any concerns or suspicions of any forms of harassment, abuse and exploitation described above and in CRS' Safeguarding Policy, illegal or improper conduct, CRS requires you to report through any of the following channels:

- CRS Management
- CRS Whistleblower site: <http://bit.ly/crshotline>
- Email: [alert@crs.org](mailto:alert@crs.org)
- Phone/Skype: 1-866-295-2632
- Mail: (mark "Confidential")

Attention: General Counsel Catholic Relief Services  
228 W. Lexington Street Baltimore, MD 21201

Ensuring the principles of sustainable development in our supply chain is important to CRS. We hope that as our partner you show your commitment via compliance with your own code of conduct or company policies that embrace these standards.

In accepting business from CRS in the form of a purchase order, contract, or agreement, you are implicitly accepting your organization's roles and responsibilities outlined in this document.

<p>Recognition</p> <p>I, the undersigned.....Identified part..... representative</p> <p>of.....hereby declare that I have read, understood and accepted this code of conduct.</p>
---

Any possible breaches or any violations of CRS's Code of Conduct and Ethics can be reported confidentially through the third party, EthicsPoint. Reporting can be done by:

- Submitting an online report on the secure and confidential website: [www.ethicspoint.com](http://www.ethicspoint.com)
- Calling the EthicsPoint hotline: 1-866-295-2632



2. CRS General Terms and Conditions applicable to goods and services can be downloaded at the following address: <http://crs.org/vendor-terms/vendor-terms.pdf> or obtained on request from the CRS office and are applicable in the national legal context.

### 3. **Conflict of Interest**

A conflict of interest arises when the private interests of an implementing partner, supplier, consultant, or contractor conflict with the best interests of CRS and/or when their interests or loyalties could prevent them from deciding only in the best interests of CRS. Should a partner, supplier, consultant, or contractor have an actual or potential conflict of interest, this needs to be disclosed in writing (Annex 4)



**Annex 4: Acknowledgement of CRS declaration of conflict of interest and the code of ethics**

To be with the bidder's letterhead

Date:

Catholic Relief Services (CRS), *Senegal Country Program*

I, the undersigned, Mr. or Ms.: \_\_\_\_\_

acting in my capacity as: \_\_\_\_\_

representing the company: (company name, address) \_\_\_\_\_

declare that:

- A) our firm and our personnel have no conflict of interest in any activity that would put it if selected for this assignment in a conflict of interest with CRS
- B) our firm confirms that the offeror or sub-contractors have not been associated, or had been involved in any way, directly or indirectly with the preparation of the design, terms of reference and/or other documents used as part of this solicitation
- C) Our firm, its affiliates or subsidiaries – including any sub-contractors or suppliers for any part of the contract – has not been declared ineligible by CRS in accordance with clause 2 – **Conditions to be met to participate in the bidding**
- D) We have not offered and will not offer gifts and/or favours of kind in exchange for this invitation to bid and will not engage in any such activity during the performance of any contract awarded

Finally, I authorize CRS to verify this information. I also agree to assume the consequences for any breaches of this contract in the course of the execution of this contract.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of the company's legal representative



**Anex 5: No Adverse Action Confirmation Form**

This is to certify that *[delete unwanted option]*:

- a. No adverse action has been taken against the Bidder *[insert Bidder's name]* and the manufacturers *[insert manufacturer's name]* whose products are being offered by the Bidder against this Invitation to Bid, in the last 5 (Five) years.
- b. The following instances of previous past performance have resulted in adverse actions taken against the Bidder *[insert Bidder's name]* and the manufacturers *[insert manufacturer's name]* whose products are being offered by the Bidder, in the last 5 (Five) years. Such adverse actions included:

*(indicate date and reasons for adverse actions and result of adverse actions; i.e. suspension or cancellation of manufacturing license by regulatory authorities, product recalls, blacklisting, debarment from bidding etc.)*

Signature\_\_\_\_\_

Name\_\_\_\_\_

Designation with stamp\_\_\_\_\_

Date\_\_\_\_\_





# **Terms of Reference for Baseline Study, Mid-Term and Final Evaluation**

(TENTATIVE BASED ON DONOR APPROVAL)

-----

**McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program**

-----

**Melhoria do Rendimento Escolar e Economico das Comunidades  
Educativas na Guiné-Bissau**

**(MeREECE Phase II)**

**Agreement: FFE-657-2024/008-00**

**Program Period: October 2024 - September 2028**

<a href="#">1. Purpose</a>	19
<a href="#">2. Background</a>	19
<a href="#">3. Program Evaluation Process</a>	19
<a href="#">3.1. Purpose and Scope of the baseline Assessment</a>	20
<a href="#">3.1.1. Schedule of Baseline Survey Activities</a>	22
<a href="#">3.2. Purpose and Scope of Midterm Evaluation</a>	22
<a href="#">3.2.1. Schedule of Midterm Evaluation</a>	24
<a href="#">3.3. Purpose and Scope of the Final Evaluation</a>	24
<a href="#">3.3.1. Schedule of Final Evaluation</a>	26
<a href="#">4. Evaluation Approach and Methodology</a>	26
<a href="#">4.1. Sampling Approach</a>	27
<a href="#">4.2. Data Processing and Analysis Procedures</a>	28
<a href="#">5. Audience and Key Stakeholders</a>	28
<a href="#">6. Evaluation Management</a>	29
<a href="#">7. Deliverables</a>	29
<a href="#">8. Ethical considerations</a>	32
<a href="#">9. Evaluation Resources</a>	32
<a href="#">10. Evaluation Budget</a>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
<a href="#">Annex (attached as separate documents)</a>	32
<a href="#">MeREECE Phase II Evaluation Plan</a>	33
<a href="#">MeREECE Phase II Indicator Performance Tracking Table</a>	33
<a href="#">CRS Report Review Template for USDA Evaluations</a>	33
<a href="#">CRS Standard Tools</a>	33

## 1. Purpose

The main purpose of the terms of reference (TOR) is to describe the methodological requirement for the baseline, midterm and final evaluations *and* to outline the conditions and responsibilities of the consultant(s) who will undertake evaluations for the McGovern-Dole project, *Promotion of Educational and Economic Performance in Educative Communities* (Melhoria do Rendimento Escolar e Economico das Comunidades Educativas na Guiné-Bissau – phase 2), or **MeREECE Phase II**. The TOR will also provide the tasks and responsibilities for an external consultant to conduct these evaluations. CRS will engage an independent consultant, following a competitive international bidding process. Assuming a satisfactory work product, the same consultant will be hired for the midterm and final evaluations, thus CRS requests bids for all three evaluations, with a separate budget broken out for each.

As per USDA requirements, a separate Scope of Work (SOW) will be submitted for approval for both the midterm and final evaluations, in addition to the baseline SOW.

Please note this ToR and its annexes are subject to donor approval, and thus may change before contract signing.

The external evaluator should be very familiar with the program Evaluation Plan (Annex 1), and Indicator Performance Tracking Table (IPTT) (Annex 2), in addition to the [USDA's Food Assistance Indicators and Definitions](#) and its [Monitoring and Evaluation Policy](#). All evaluation reports will be reviewed in line with Annex 3: Checklist for Evaluating USDA Evaluation Reports (CRS internal).

## 2. Background

The MeREECE program aims to strengthen the education system in Guinea-Bissau and improve literacy of school-aged children in the regions of Oio, Cacheu, Quinara, Bafata and Gabu. CRS is working with its partners, Caritas Guinea-Bissau to fully implement the project in 350 elementary schools to reach 183,518 individuals in the five proposed regions. The project's funding amount is \$27,713,462 including cost share, freight and commodities. The project will run from October 1, 2024 to September 30, 2028.

*For more details on the context please refer to the evaluation plan (Annex 1) section 2), Pages 2 to 5)*

## 3. Program Evaluation Process

The **MeREECE** evaluation process will involve three phases: baseline assessment, midterm, and final evaluation. CRS will recruit an external consulting firm to lead its external evaluation process from the baseline to endline. The midterm and final evaluation contracts are dependent on

satisfactory completion of the baseline assessment. The methodology and sampling detailed below were revised based on the results of the baseline and suggestions from the consulting entity.

### **Purpose and Scope of the baseline Assessment**

The baseline study will establish a reference point and identify any underlying factors impacting literacy, nutrition and health of school-aged children. The consultant will collect baseline values for all indicators with non-zero values through a random sample of schools across all targeted regions (See Table 1 Below). The results will serve as a basis for comparison with the midterm and final evaluations.

CRS also will draw on baseline data to adjust the project's intervention logic as necessary. The project will share the baseline study and periodic monitoring of indicators to inform all stakeholders of the progress. CRS will update the baseline values in the reference documents and adjust the targets for the life of the project and the yearly goals accordingly.

CRS will provide USDA with a Performance Management Plan (PMP) for review within 90 days of the contract signing. The PMP will include definitions, data sources, and methods/approaches for all indicators. This document will also incorporate our reading benchmarks and targets to ensure clear performance expectations and measurable outcomes. CRS will revise the baseline report to incorporate feedback from USDA and submit it within 90 days of the end of collection per USDA M&E Policy. The report will contain an Indicator Performance Tracking Table for the indicators with non-zero baseline values, including relevant disaggregates, information to document the quality of the data, including a list of the data collection tools, number and gender of people interviewed, any information about stratification and any data limitations and an annex on personnel and their qualifications.

**Key Evaluation Questions:** The key evaluation questions for the baseline study address the conditions of performance indicators before the program starts. The baseline study also will collect information on the relevance of the project design to the context and its potential for sustainability. The mid-term and final evaluations will cover the following questions:

#### **Relevance**

1. To what extent are the project interventions aligned with Guinea-Bissau's Education Sector Strategic Plan (2017-2025), particularly the government's priorities, the MGD Development Goals, community needs, and the 2019 School Canteen Law or the Directorate of Social Affairs and School Feeding's objectives, to demonstrate relevance to the Government of Guinea-Bissau's school feeding goals?
2. How have the strategies and intervention been adjusted in MeREECE Phase 2 to better align with the unmet needs and main challenges identified in Phase 1?

3. What potential risks or external factors could impact the project’s implementation across political, environmental, economic, and socio-cultural domains, and what preemptive or recommended strategies could be put in place to effectively mitigate these risks prior to the rollout of activities?

**Coherence**

4. How does the MeREECE Phase 2 complement other stakeholders' interventions, particularly in school feeding programs, quality of education, and other educational supports in Guinea-Bissau, while avoiding duplication? Additionally, what other existing interventions could be leveraged to address any identified gaps or unmet needs?

**Sustainability**

5. What are the key barriers to transitioning McGovern-Dole schools and activities to the Government of Guinea-Bissau (GOGB) and communities for continuation after the project, and are the project activities effectively designed to address those barriers?

**Table 1. Performance Indicators With no Zero Value**

#	Result	Performance Indicator	Standard or Custom	Comments
1	SO 1	Percent of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text	Standard #1	
6	IR 1.2	% of students in target schools who are identified as attentive during class/instruction	Custom	
7	IR 1.3	Average student attendance rate in USDA-supported classrooms/schools	Standard #2	
8	Sub-IR 1.1.1	Average teacher attendance rate in USDA-supported schools	Custom	
21	Sub-IR 1.3.4	Number of students enrolled in school receiving USDA assistance	Standard #9	
30	SO 2	Percent of children in growth monitoring cohort with acute malnutrition (weight/height)	Custom	
33	IR 2.4	Number of schools using an improved water source	Standard #27	By Project Team
34	IR 2.4	Number of schools with improved sanitation facilities	Standard #28	By Project Team
35	IR 2.4	Number of schools with adequate handwashing facilities where water and soap are present.	Custom	By Project Team
36	IR 2.4	Number of targeted schools with adequate WASH (water, sanitation, & hygiene) services.	Custom	By Project Team
37	IR 2.5	Number of students receiving deworming medication(s)	Standard #29	
38	LRP	Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #12	

#	Result	Performance Indicator	Standard or Custom	Comments
39	LRP	Cost of transport, storage and handling of commodity procured as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity)	LRP Standard #4	
40	LRP	Cost of commodity procured as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity and source country)	LRP Standard #5	
41	LRP	Quantity of commodity procured (MT) as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity and source country)	LRP Standard #6	

### 3.1.1. Schedule of Baseline Survey Activities

Dates	Baseline Study Activities
October 31, 2024	Develop project evaluation ToR and Update Evaluation Plan
November 11, 2024	CRS Internal Review process (CP-RO-HQ)
November 12, 2024	Submit Evaluation plan & ToR to USDA for review and approval
November 12, 2024	Launch BID Process (SOW..
December 04, 2024	Submit revised version of Evaluation plan & ToR and PMP
December 12, 2024	Recruit independent evaluation consultant
December 20, 2024	Contract signed with the selected consultant (USDA approval requested by this date)
<b>December 20, 2024</b>	<b>Adaptation of EGRA – CRS Team</b>
January 15, 2025	Develop data collection tools and pilot testing
January 15 to February 28, 2025	Conduct study (Training of enumerators, data collection)
March 10, 2025	Consultant Submit baseline study report to CRS for internal review
March 28, 2025	CRS Submit baseline study report to USDA
March 28 to April 30, 2025	USDA review and feedback
April 30, 2025	Discuss actions to address findings and recommendations with USDA
May 15, 2025	Final revision to incorporate USDA feedback
May 15, 2025	Develop action plan to address baseline recommendations
May 30, 2025	Submit a final report to USDA
June 15, 2025,	Hold a workshop for sharing evaluation results
June 30, 2025	Update project targets or activities based on baseline findings and recommendations

### 3.2. Purpose and Scope of Midterm Evaluation

The MeREECE Phase II midterm evaluation will be a summative exercise that will examine the implementation of the program and provide information and feedback on these aspects, while also determining the extent of the results achieved.

Additionally, the midterm evaluation will help CRS and stakeholders learn more about successes, identify obstacles to achieving results, and analyze the initial effects of the program.

The midterm evaluation will apply the same methodology and tools used in the baseline assessment. The findings will document lessons learned and provide recommendations for better management and operations. The evaluation will assess progress in the implementation of project activities using the criteria of effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact based on the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) framework, in order to identify the first indications of the project's impact.

#### Effectiveness:

- 1.1. To what extent is the project achieving its expected outcomes across the two key objectives (school-age literacy and education, health, nutrition, and dietary practices) and their sub-objectives? What factors are contributing to or hindering the achievement of these results?
- 1.2. How effective are the proposed implementation strategies in improving school-age literacy and increasing the use of health, nutrition, and dietary practices?
- 1.3. How effective has the distribution of school kits and community-based communication and awareness-raising been in addressing cultural and gender barriers to enrollment in both rural and urban areas?
- 1.4. To what extent does the school feeding service package partially contribute to improving the nutritional status of targeted children over time?
- 1.5. What are the unforeseen circumstances and lessons learned that should be taken into account for the remainder of the project? What are some good/effective practices under each objective that should be replicated to improve the impact of the project?

#### Efficiency:

- 1.6. Did the MeREECE project staff have adequate resources and capacities, including data, training, standard operating procedures (SOPs), and feedback channels to management, to implement the project within cost, time, and quality constraints? Why or why not?
- 1.7. Were the intermediate results obtained at the right time to generate substantial changes as an outcome to improve school-age children's literacy? Why or why not?
- 1.8. How well has the project implemented recommendations from the baseline evaluation, and how have these actions contributed to the improvement of project implementation and results?

#### Sustainability:

- 1.9. How well has the sustainability plan been executed so far, and what milestones have been reached?
- 1.10. Which activity components have demonstrated the greatest and least potential for continuation and sustainability, and why? What factors are contributing to these outcomes?
- 1.11. What has worked well and what has not in terms of sustainability? What should the project do additionally or differently to ensure that the sustainability plan is achieved by the final evaluation?

**3.2.1. Schedule of Midterm Evaluation**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Midterm Evaluation Activities</u>
October 2026	Update ToR and Submit to USDA for review and approval
December 2026	Retain an external evaluator or recruit new team, if necessary
January 2027	Update data collection tools
February to March 2027	Conduct evaluation (collect, process, and analyze data)
April 2027	Submit first draft report to CRS for internal review
May 2027	Submit final midterm evaluation report to USDA
June 2027	Discuss actions to address findings and recommendations with USDA
July 2027	Hold workshop for sharing evaluation results
July 2027	Report on implementation of follow-up actions

**3.3. Purpose and Scope of the Final Evaluation**

The purpose of the final evaluation is to measure overall project impact and sustainability as well as desired or unintended outcomes observed in the targeted communities. The final study will present a clearer view of the constraints, lessons learned, best practices, opportunities as well as successful aspects of the project’s implementation. Evaluation criteria will cover the DAC criteria of impact and effectiveness of project strategies, the efficiency of project interventions, and the extent to which objectives have been achieved. The evaluation will also assess sustainability including: the targeted communities’ capacity and willingness to take over project activities (e.g. school feeding); Parent Teacher Associations (Associações de Pais e Educadores - APEs’) motivation for maintenance of school infrastructures and resources and; stakeholder engagement to maintain the benefits of the project.

The final evaluation will be based on the key questions below with additional questions related to lessons learned and other recommendations made by key stakeholders (MoE, MoH, implementing partners, USDA, etc.).

**Key evaluation questions**

The final evaluation will rely on the same questions presented in the midterm, with additional questions related to lessons learned (see the Learning section) and recommendations for USDA,



project participants, CRS, international and other key stakeholders. To strengthen the measurement of the intervention's effectiveness, impact and sustainability, CRS will include the questions below:  
Effectiveness:

- 1.1. How does the introduction of bilingual (Portuguese and Creole) educational materials and pedagogies impact literacy outcomes among first and second grade students in targeted schools, based on both baseline and mid-term measures?
- 1.2. How did increased access to both food through school feeding and WASH services by MeREECE project influence the use of health behaviors in schools and communities?

Impact:

- 1.3. To what extent did the project achieve its strategic objectives?
  - 1.3.1. To what extent has the project improved the literacy of school-age children (SO1)?  
What are the current reading levels of students in the target schools, and how have they changed since baseline? Did the project meet or exceed its targets for improved literacy outcomes?
  - 1.3.2. To what extent did the project increase the use of health and dietary practices (SO2)?  
What are the current levels of use for nutrition and health practices, and how have they evolved compared to baseline? Did the project meet or exceed its targets for improved health outcomes?
- 1.4. What factors contributed to or hindered the achievement of the strategic objectives and how?
- 1.5. Did the project have any unintended impacts, both positive or negative? What changes were perceived as most valuable to the target communities? Why?

Sustainability:

- 1.6. What has the project done to strengthen local organizations (INDE, Caritas, others), community associations (PTA, SMC, SILC) so that they can continue to meet community needs and maintain the impact of the project? Are these measures sufficient?
- 1.7. What key activities or strategies should constitute the focus of the project sustainability strategy?
- 1.8. Are the outcomes of the LRP strategies sufficiently sustainable to ensure school feeding sustainability in 2029? What should be the community-level systems of governance and management and the government's ownership to ensure continuity after USDA cash or in-kind assistance ends?

### 3.3.1. Schedule of Final Evaluation

<u>Date</u>	<u>Final Evaluation Activities</u>
January 2028	Update ToR and submit to USDA for review and approval
February 2028	Retain an external evaluator or recruit new team, if necessary
February 2029	Update data collection tools
March-April 2028	Conduct evaluation (collect, process and analyze data)
May 2028	Submit first draft report to CRS for internal review
June 2028	Submit first draft of final evaluation report to USDA
July 2029	Discuss actions to address findings and recommendations with USDA
August 2029	Submit a final report to USDA
September 2029	Hold workshop for sharing evaluation results

## 4. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

CRS will engage an independent evaluation firm to work with implementing partners and stakeholders to conduct evaluations that assess relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability per USDA requirements. Based on satisfactory performance, CRS will contract the same consultant to carry out all the project evaluations.

CRS is committed to working with integrity and respect for the people it serves and ensuring community participation in all projects. Through its participatory approach, CRS will work with stakeholders involved in MEAL during the design and preparation of evaluations. Government stakeholders will be involved in the formulation of the methodology. Impact evaluations based on experimental and quasi-experimental approaches with counterfactuals are the most rigorous methods to measure the causal effects of interventions.

Although a randomized experiment would offer a higher degree of rigor, this methodology would not be feasible in this context as other interventions are occurring in the same geographic areas by organizations such as WFP and the World Bank, FEC for the Quality of Education. Moreover, the selection of comparable groups as a counterfactual will be complex and the risk of results bias is very high.

Therefore, CRS will undertake a performance evaluation to gather and analyze information on progress the objectives set for performance indicators. Evaluations also will address the relationship between expected results and actual outcomes. This approach will enable CRS to test the theory of change and to determine the effectiveness of the project by measuring results related to literacy, school feeding, health and nutrition activities. CRS will collaborate regularly with partners to collect and analyze monitoring data, to respond to community feedback, to meet USDA requirements and to maintain high program quality.

The evaluation will employ a mixed methodology and collect data cross-sectionally at the baseline, midline and endline. Data on key outcome indicators from the baseline, midterm and final evaluations will track progress toward the project targets using the unit of measurement and data source established in the Performance Management Plan (PMP). CRS intends to use the existing Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) tool to assess student reading comprehension. The MeREECE project previously utilized the EGRA tool during the mid-term evaluation in 2023 in accordance with MoNE. To assess the quality of literacy instruction, such as teacher attendance and the utilization of new skills and knowledge, student attentiveness and attendance, the project team and evaluator will collect quantitative data through questionnaires and also classroom observation tools (Stallings observation tool, CRS classroom observation tool) with students, teachers, school administrators, classroom observations using electronic data collection tools. A survey of community members will solicit perceptions of the projects contributions to improved health nutrition and dietary practices of primary school children. Using anthropometry, CRS will engage the local health department to conduct children's growth and weight relative to their age twice per year to assess the partial effects of nutrition activities. The sample will identify any acutely malnourished children (refer if required) and monitor growth. For those who may have been malnourished, it will identify catch-up growth. Using BMIZ, the measures will take into account malnutrition in terms of both under and over nutrition for boys and girls at each age. Evaluators will use structured and/or semi-structured key informant interview guides to gather information from implementing partners, USDA, opinion leaders and local authorities as well as focus group discussion guides to obtain qualitative information from community groups such as Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs), School Management Committees (SMC), and Savings and Internal Lending Communities (SILC). In addition, CRS will draw on observation instruments like checklists to analyze changes in classroom environment quality, kitchens, storage facilities, WASH and health practices. CRS will triangulate this observational data with surveys and focus group data.

To complement the primary data, CRS will request secondary data on student and teacher attendance from MoNE and incorporate findings from national, statistical reports. CRS will select consultants based on their country's experience and expertise in education, health and agriculture.

The evaluation teams will design the mixed-method study and plan how to collect and analyze the data. At the baseline, the evaluators will develop a comprehensive field manual, data collection instruments and a sampling strategy. They also will establish a clear data analysis plan.

### **Sampling Approach**

Please see section 4, sampling sub-section, in Annex 1.

#### 4.1. Data Processing and Analysis Procedures

To meet expectations as to how evaluation data can be useful, CRS will engage the recruited evaluation team to determine how to ensure data quality through a quality control system. Data analysis should be descriptive in that it will provide trends (central and dispersion trends, rate, percentage) in the achievement of results at each measurement period. Because these evaluations will employ representative samples, the significance of the estimators (indicators) will be verified using inferential statistical methods.

The mid-term and final evaluations should, at minimum, check for statistical differences between baseline and respective report values. This will likely be via a t-test; however, a preferred general specification would be:

$$Outcome_{its} = Midterm_t + Final_t + Female_i + Strata_s + \varepsilon_{its}$$

where

- $Outcome_{its}$  is the outcome indicator of interest for individual  $i$  at time  $t$  (baseline, midterm, or final) in strata  $s$ ;
- $Midterm_t$  is a binary variable taking the value 1 if the data was collected during the midterm evaluation, and zero otherwise;
- $Final_t$  is a binary variable taking the value 1 if the data was collected during the final evaluation, and zero otherwise (only relevant at final evaluation);
- $Female_i$  is a binary variable taking the value 1 if individual  $i$  is female, and zero otherwise;
- $Strata_s$  is a vector of binary variables for each stratum (excluding one to avoid the dummy variable trap);
- $\varepsilon_{its}$  is the error-term that should be clustered at the cluster-level during analysis.

Ideally, a table with each indicator of interest could be presented per row, with the coefficient (or marginal value when using probit/ logit models) and standard errors for the midterm, final, and female indicators in columns. It is not necessary to present marginal values per stratum. The specification can be adapted if the outcome indicator is not at the individual level, not stratified, or not clustered.

## 5. Audience and Key Stakeholders

CRS will organize sessions to disseminate findings at the local and national level. These sessions will allow the team to present conclusions and gather feedback and interpretation of the data collected from beneficiaries and other key stakeholders. These information-sharing sessions will involve learners, teachers, school administrators, community-based educational support associations (APE, COGES), local leaders, technical partners, government representatives and



USDA representatives. Online information-sharing sessions in the form of webinars will be organized to gather feedback from key stakeholders. CRS will work with implementing partners and other stakeholders to develop recommendations and an action plan related to the evaluation findings.

McGovern-Dole project managers will develop concrete next steps for each recommendation, identify responsible parties for each action, and create a timeline for responsible parties to verify completion of each element of the action plan. The action plan will be reviewed at quarterly project meetings.

## 6. Evaluation Management

CRS MEAL Technical Advisor, Head of Program, and Deputy Head of Programs (all based in Dakar, Senegal) will lead and oversee the evaluation management. They will be supported by teams from WARO and CRS HQ in Baltimore, Maryland. The CRS Operations and Human Resources departments located in CRS' Senegal office will be responsible for contracting external evaluation consultants and other service providers and will work with the **MeREECE** program team, including the Chief of Party and MEAL Manager, to coordinate logistics of data collection in the field. Project partners will participate in the ToR review, data collection supervision, review of draft reports and stakeholder workshops on evaluation design and sharing of results and recommendations.

## 7. Deliverables

The consultant shall deliver the following products in accordance with the validated timeline:

The evaluator is expected to follow American Evaluation Association's Guiding Principles for Evaluators (<http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51>). Dependent upon participants in the evaluation, the evaluator should specify steps that will be taken to ensure informed consent, confidentiality, and protection of minors. The evaluator should specify steps taken to safeguard data collected and data management procedures to be used in the evaluation. There will be a data rights clause in the signed contract, and the external evaluator should obtain permission from CRS before sharing the final evaluation report with any external party, including posting it to their organization's website.

All deliverables should be completed in English (and data collection tools must also be in Portuguese), be free of typos or grammatical errors, and be a polished document ready for submission to USDA. This means the document contains no factual errors or inaccuracies and citations are properly used.

Deliverables include the following:

- Work plan (including evaluator responsibilities for identifying, interviewing, contracting, training and overseeing enumerators).
- Sampling plan, including if the sample sizes will differ from Annex 1.
- Instruments, data collection manuals, and training materials for enumerators (i.e., focus group guides, key informant interview guide, observation checklist).
- Quality Assurance Plan (including training of enumerators and weekly check-ins during data collection).
- Conduct interview with USDA (it is expected USDA will facilitate this exercise by providing the contact person and the means of the interview)
- Data analysis as outlined in the evaluation plan, including analysis methods and tools to be used, and summary of findings.
- Summary of preliminary quantitative results for key indicators (for the final evaluation), to provide early insights prior to the full report submission in May 2028.
- Data sets with accompanying codebook/data dictionary (original paper and/or electronic as well as final, clean electronic data sets with syntax).
  - If the evaluator provides .dta, .do, .sps, or .sav files, they must also provide open source file versions (.txt, .csv, .doc, etc.)
  - If part of a longitudinal design, an identifier file that links respondent PII with ID numbers in the data file(s)
  - Deidentified transcripts of selected interviews and focus groups and/or data files of coded sections of text from interviews and focus groups
- At baseline only, a 10-page preliminary report, suitable for presentation to USDA, 6 weeks after the end of data collection. The report will only contain:
  - An IPTT for the indicators with non-zero baseline values, including relevant disaggregates.
  - Enough information about the methodology to engender confidence in the data quality. This should include a list of the data collection tools, number and gender of people interviewed, any information about stratification, and any data limitations. Whenever possible, the preliminary report should simply refer to the approved ToR and/ or Evaluation Plan, rather than incorporate the information.
  - Annex with description of team members' qualifications and their positionality.
- Draft Report with at least one round of edits from CRS and another subsequent round from USDA
- Final Report with the following sections:
  - Executive summary (including brief introduction of program evaluated, key evaluation questions, findings, and conclusions);

- Background;
- Evaluation questions
- Evaluation design including assumptions and limitations;
- Methodology;
- Findings;
- Conclusions, lessons learned and effective practices (if any), and
- Recommendations (should be clear, concise, relevant, specific and practical, following directly from findings and conclusions established in report);
- Annex with original scope of work (marked for redaction from final web version);
- Annex with final data collection instruments;
- Annex with description of team members' qualifications and their positionality;
- Annex with additional methodological discussion/ robustness checks as needed.
- Annex with updated IPTT.
- Final reports must not contain any propriety or personally identifiable information (PII). PII is any information that directly or indirectly identifies an individual. This information can be used on its own or with other information to identify, contact or locate a single person, or to identify an individual in a specific situation. This may include, for example, a name, national ID number, address, birthplace, etc. PII includes both direct and indirect identifiers that, when taken together, could allow for identification of an individual (such as a village name, gender, age, name, and/ or facial image).”
- In addition, final reports should not allow for the identification of individual schools or communities. Any list of schools or communities provided should be included as in the report annex, so that it can be easily removed before submitting it to USDA for external sharing.
- The report should address all quality criteria in Annex 3: Checklist for Evaluating USDA Evaluation Reports (CRS internal).
- Final reports must be compliant with Section 508 of the United States Access Board which requires that information and services are accessible to persons with disability. (See <https://section508.gov/create>).
- **Evaluation Summary Document:** A 2-3 page document that summarizes the evaluation methodology, key findings, conclusions, and recommendations. This document will be designed to provide stakeholders with a comprehensive understanding of the evaluation process and its outcomes, using clear language and supporting graphics to facilitate understanding.

- **Learning Brief:** A separate 2-3 page stand-alone brief that focuses on the key achievements and lessons learned from the project. This document will be aimed at informing donors, policymakers, practitioners, and project stakeholders, highlighting successes and providing insights to improve future interventions. It will be written in accessible language and include relevant graphics and tables
- Presentation of final evaluation to stakeholders.
- A webinar of key findings and lessons learned for CRS globally and USDA (if requested).

## 8. Ethical considerations

CRS maintains the highest ethical standards for MEAL policies, especially for evaluations in which some informants are children. CRS will commit to respect and enforce research and evaluation ethical requirements for service providers in accordance with current MEAL Policies and Procedures. Respect for confidentiality and the protection of informants' personal data are essential conditions for all data collection and analysis functions. Therefore, the evaluation team will collect consent from respondents to ensure data privacy protection and responsible ethical considerations in all evaluation and research activities. The evaluation team conducting assessments will maintain the integrity of the data collection and analysis while also adhering to CRS and USDA policies and procedures on evaluations.

## 9. Evaluation Resources

CRS and implementing partners will provide to consultant team preparatory, logistical assistance and the following documents.

- MEAL documents and tools such as the project's: results framework, evaluation plan, key performance indicators list, theory of change, learning agenda, existing evaluation reports and case studies (and other available documents as needed)
- Access to a database that includes all 350 schools targeted with demographic and geographical information
- Secondary data available to further understand educational context in Guinea-Bissau;
- Compilation of reference documents (project proposal, periodic reports, etc.)
- Contact details of stakeholders in the implementing zones
- Submitting protocol and compliance information to relevant local and administrative authorities (MoE, MoH, etc.) as needed
- Tablets for data collection

**Annex (attached as separate documents)**





Table 3. List of Annexes (attached as separate documents)

Annex Number	Document
1	<b>MeREECE Phase II Evaluation Plan</b>
2	<b>MeREECE Phase II Indicator Performance Tracking Table</b>
3	<b>CRS Report Review Template for USDA Evaluations</b>
4	<b>CRS Standard Tools</b>