

**DEMANDE D'OFFRE DE PRIX POUR DES SERVICES
APPEL A CONSULTATION**

SERVICES DE

*Final external evaluation of phase II and mid-term evaluation of phase III of the project
"FOSTERING HEALTH AND PROTECTION TO VULNERABLE MIGRANTS TRANSITING
THROUGH MOROCCO, TUNISIA, EGYPT, LIBYA, YEMEN AND SUDAN »*

**DEMANDE D'OFFRE DE PRIX/APPEL A CONSULTATION
N° : OIM/RBT/RFQ/2021/034**

Mission : *Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Yemen and Sudan*

Nom du Projet : *«Fostering health and protection to vulnerable migrants transiting
through Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Yemen and Sudan»*

Titre des Services : *Final external evaluation of Phase II and Mid-Term evaluation
of Phase III*



IOM International Organization for Migration
OIM Organisation Internationale pour les Migrations
OIM Organización Internacional para las Migraciones

Demande d'offre de Prix

L'Organisation internationale pour les migrations (ci-après dénommée **I' OIM**) souhaite engager un.e consultant.e pour l'évaluation finale de la phase II et une évaluation de mi-parcours de la phase III du projet « Promotion de la Santé et Protection des migrants en situation de vulnérabilité transitant par le Maroc, la Tunisie, l'Egypte, le Yémen et le Soudan », pour laquelle cette demande d'offre de prix est publiée. L'OIM invite les prestataires de service/consultant.e.s à fournir leur Proposition technique et financière répondant à cette demande.

Des informations complémentaires sur les services sont fournies dans les Termes de Références (TDR) ci-joints.

Les Prestataires de services/consultant.e.s seront sélectionné.e.s sur la base des procédures de Sélection Qualité-Coût décrites dans cette Demande d'offre de prix.

La Demande d'offre de prix est constituée des documents suivants :

Section I. Instructions aux Prestataires de services ;

Section II. Termes de références ;

Les Propositions doivent être soumises par courriel à l'adresse moroccoprocurement@iom.int au plus tard le **mardi 30 novembre 2021**. Les propositions reçues tardivement ne seront pas acceptées.

Table des Matières

Section I - Instructions aux Prestataires de Services / Personnes physiques.....3

Section II. Termes de référenceErreur ! Signet non défini.

Section I - Instructions aux Prestataires de services / Personnes physiques

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Seuls les Prestataires de services peuvent soumettre leurs Propositions technique et financière pour les services requis. Les Propositions constituent la base des négociations contractuelles devant aboutir à un contrat signé avec le cabinet-conseil sélectionné.
- 1.2 Les Prestataires de services ne doivent pas être engagés à une mission quelconque qui serait en conflit avec leurs obligations présentes ou passées vis-à-vis d'autres entités adjudicatrices, ou qui les placerait dans une position qui les empêche d'être en mesure de mener à bien la mission au mieux des intérêts de l'OIM.
- 1.3 L'OIM n'est pas tenue d'accepter toute proposition et se réserve le droit d'annuler le processus de sélection à tout moment avant l'attribution du contrat, et ce, sans encourir de responsabilité vis-à-vis des Prestataires de services

2. Manœuvres collusoires, frauduleuses et coercitives

- 2.1 Le Règlement intérieur de l'OIM exige que le Personnel de l'OIM dans son ensemble, les soumissionnaires, fabricants, fournisseurs ou distributeurs se conforment aux normes les plus strictes en matière de déontologie pendant le processus de passation et d'exécution de tous contrats. L'OIM rejette toute proposition des soumissionnaires et peut, le cas échéant, mettre fin à leur contrat s'il est établi qu'ils se sont livrés à des manœuvres collusoires, frauduleuses ou coercitives. En vertu de ce règlement, l'OIM définit aux fins du présent paragraphe, les termes énoncés ci-dessous comme suit :

3. Clarifications et amendements des documents de Demande d'offre de prix

- 3.1 **À tout moment avant la soumission des propositions, l'OIM peut, pour quelque raison que ce soit, sur sa propre initiative ou en réponse à une clarification, modifier la Demande d'offre de prix.**
- 3.2. **Les Prestataires de services peuvent demander des clarifications sur toutes parties de la Demande d'offre de prix. La demande doit être adressée par écrit et soumis à l'OIM à l'adresse indiquée plus haut.**

4. Préparation des Propositions

- 4.1 L'Offre du Prestataire de services doit comprendre les éléments suivants :
 - a) la Proposition technique, et
 - b) la Proposition financière.
- 4.2 La Proposition, ainsi que toutes correspondances y relatives partagées par les Prestataires de services et l'OIM doivent être en *anglais*. Tous les rapports préparés par le Prestataire de services doivent être en *anglais*.
- 4.3 Les Prestataires de services sont appelés à fournir le prix de leur service en MAD
- 4.4 Les termes et la méthode de paiement doivent être clairement spécifiés.

5. Proposition technique

- 5.1 La Proposition technique doit fournir les informations suivantes :
 - a) Une brève description du profil du Prestataire de Services et un résumé de l'expérience récente de chaque partenaire sur des missions similaires / CV détaillé accompagné d'une lettre de motivation.
 - b) Une description de la méthodologie de travail pour exécuter la mission
 - c) Un calendrier qui indique le temps proposé pour entreprendre les activités indiquées dans le plan de travail
 - d) Un exemplaire d'un rapport d'évaluation
 - e) Deux personnes de références (nom, adresse mail et numéro téléphone à contacter en cas de besoin)

6. Proposition financière

- 6.1 La Proposition financière doit comprendre tous les coûts afférents à la mission, ces coûts doivent être ventilés par activité, incluant a) rémunération du staff (honoraires journaliers et nombres d'hommes-jours) b) les dépenses tels transports, équipement, licences c) toutes les taxes applicables,

7. Évaluation

- 7.1 les Propositions seront évaluées sur la base de leur conformité aux Termes de référence, aux exigences de la Demande d'offre de prix et sur application d'un critère d'évaluation,
- 7.2 Une proposition est rejetée à ce stade si elle ne répond pas aux aspects importants des Termes de référence

8. Attribution du Marché

Le contrat sera attribué par voie d'un avis d'attribution.

Le Prestataire de services est censé commencer sa mission à la date du **7 décembre 2021**.



TERMS OF REFERENCE

FINAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF PHASE II AND MID-TERM EVALUATION OF PHASE III OF THE PROJECT “FOSTERING HEALTH AND PROTECTION TO VULNERABLE MIGRANTS TRANSITING THROUGH MOROCCO, TUNISIA, EGYPT, LIBYA YEMEN AND SUDAN”

COMMISSIONED BY IOM MOROCCO

1. Evaluation Context

Established in 1951 and part of the United Nations System since 2016, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) is the leading inter-governmental organization on migration, promoting humane and orderly migration for the benefit of all. IOM has 174 member states and is present in over 100 countries.

IOM plays a key role to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals through different areas of intervention that connect both humanitarian assistance and sustainable development. Health is one of those areas.

IOM promotes access to health services for migrants – irrespective of their status – by supporting governments and conducting operational research to promote evidence-based migration health policies as well as responding to the health needs of migrants through direct assistance.

The project “Fostering health and protection to vulnerable migrants transiting through Morocco, Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, Yemen and Sudan”, funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland, is being implemented by IOM missions in the targeted countries since 2015 and coordinated by IOM Morocco. The project has gone through three phases of implementation: Phase I from May 2015 to January 2018; phase II from February 2018 to August 2020 and the current phase III from August 2020 to May 2023, in which Sudan was included.

The project aims at contributing to improve the health and wellbeing of migrants in vulnerable situations and to advance towards Universal Health Coverage (UHC) in Morocco, Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, Yemen and Sudan. This is achieved through the following outcomes:

- 1. National policies and strategies make provisions for the health needs and rights of migrants and their communities in line with international, regional and national commitments.**
- 2. Increased accessibility and use of health and protection services by vulnerable migrants.**
- 3. Strengthened multi-sectoral partnership alliances towards a harmonized and sustainable response to the health needs of vulnerable migrants and their host communities.**

2. Evaluation purpose

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to conduct an independent twofold project evaluation to assess the regional project overall design, management and implementation. It was agreed with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland that a joint evaluation was going to be conducted: The final evaluation of phase II – that was postponed in July 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic – and the mid-term evaluation of phase III. The evaluation will also check and assess whether findings from the Mid-term external evaluation of phase II (August 2019) were incorporated in the third phase of the project.

The objective of the final evaluation of phase II is to assess the performance of the project and achievement of results, and more specifically to evaluate:

- The extent to which the project has achieved the objectives of phase II and if the effects are sustainable
- The effectiveness of the strategy of intervention
- The efficiency of project management and implementation
- The impact of COVID-19 on project implementation and the mitigation strategies
- The perception and value of the project by beneficiaries and partners
- The lessons learned, good practices and recommendations for improvement.

The objective of the mid-term evaluation of phase III is to assess whether this new phase is on track to achieve its intended results, and more specifically to assess:

- The relevance and coherence of the project design by testing the theory of change that was reviewed between phase II and phase III
- The perception of the phase III of the project by beneficiaries and partners
- The extent of achievement of outcomes
- The unexpected results and factors affecting the project implementation (positively and negatively), including the impact of COVID-19 on project implementation and the mitigation strategies put in place
- The institutional set-up, capacity for project implementation and coordination mechanisms
- The lessons learned, good practices and recommendations for improvement.

The findings of this twofold evaluation will enable the management teams and stakeholders to have a better understanding of the project implementation and assess whether the project needs to revise its implementation strategy to achieve the specific objectives and contribute to the main three outcomes. The evaluation is also expected to document lessons and good practices to ensure those are built upon in the remaining implementation time.

3. Evaluation scope

The evaluation is expected to cover the entire phase II (1st February 2018 – 1st August 2020) and mid-term phase III (1st August 2020 – 15 October 2021). It is expected to cover the five implementing missions for phase II (Morocco, Tunisia, Libya, Egypt and Yemen), and to include Sudan for phase III. Due to the COVID-19 epidemiological situation and the travel restrictions in the targeted countries, the evaluation will mostly be conducted remotely with potential field visits to some of the field areas, particularly in Morocco which is the coordination country.

4. Evaluation criteria

The evaluation will assess the performance of the project against the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The evaluation is also expected to assess the extent to which the project integrated cross-cutting issues of gender and human rights and the environment.

5. Evaluation questions

The below questions are indicative questions to be addressed in the evaluation under each evaluation criterion:

5.1. Relevance

- Did the project intervention and delivery strategies meet the needs of beneficiaries?
- Was the strategy of the project relevant to the needs of its target population and institutional beneficiaries?
- Were the project activities and outputs consistent with the intended outcomes and objective?
- Was the project aligned with and supportive of IOM national, regional, and/or global strategies and the Migration Governance Framework?
- Was the project aligned with and supportive of national strategies?
- Was the project in line with donor priorities?
- What factors have contributed in achievements or hindrances of the output or outcome?
- Were the strategies adopted, applied tools, and inputs identified realistic, appropriate, and adequate for achievements of results?

5.2. Effectiveness

- Have the project outputs and outcomes been achieved in accordance with the stated plans?
- What observed changes in attitudes, capacities and institutions can be causally linked to the project's interventions?
- To what extent have there been any unplanned positive or negative effects in relation to anticipated results of the project interventions?
- Have there been any factors and/or obstacles that prevented beneficiaries and project partners from accessing the results/services/products? If yes, has the project been successful in addressing them, and how did they affect the overall effectiveness of the project?
- How effectively were the project results monitored?
- To what extent has the project adapted to contextual challenges and/or changing external conditions (e.g. Covid-19 pandemic) in order to ensure project outcomes?
- How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources for guaranteeing sustainability of project results, including but not limited to other IOM projects in the five countries?
- What could have been done differently (design and implementation approaches) to make sure short and long terms target results are reached?
- What were the key barriers/ challenges and lesson learnt from the project for future interventions?

5.3. Efficiency

- Was the project implemented in the most cost-efficient way compared to alternative means of implementation? Specifically did the actual results (output/outcome) justify the cost incurred.

- How well have resources (funds, expertise, time) been converted into results in the current context of the project without compromising the quality of the resultant output and outcome?
- Could cheaper alternative implementation strategies/ packages have reached similar result or more? Could a different approach have produced better results?
- To what degree were inputs provided or available in time to implement activities from all parties involved?
- Was a regional/national workplan and resource schedule available and used by the project management and other relevant parties?
- To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled?
- Are there were any specific enablers/ challenges that affect the successful implementation of the project? How was it managed?

5.4. Impact

- What impact did the project have on the beneficiaries and what are the key project intervention and delivery strategies that contributed to the observed impact if any?
- Which positive/negative and intended/unintended effects have been produced by the project?
- Did the impact come from the project activities, from external factors or from both?
- Did the project take timely measures for mitigating any unplanned, negative and/or unintended impacts?
- How successful was he project in terms of supporting beneficiaries?

5.5. Sustainability

- Are structures, resources and processes in place to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue once external support ceases?
- To what extent are the project results likely to be sustained in the long-term?
- Was the project supported by local institutions and well-integrated into local social, cultural and political structures in the 5 countries?
- Do the project partners have the financial capacity and are they committed to maintaining the benefits of the project in the long run?
- Are there signs that the project results and activities will be scaled up, replicated or continued by project partners/stakeholders?
- To what extent have target groups and possibly other relevant interest groups/stakeholders been involved in the planning/implementation process?
- What should/could have been done differently to better guarantee sustainability, if applicable?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of project outcome and the potential for replication of the approach?

5.6. Cross-cutting issues

- To what extent have cross-cutting issues such as gender, non-discrimination and human rights been integrated in the project design and implementation?
- To what extent were gender mainstreaming issues considered in design and implementation?

- Were any barriers to equal gender participation identified in design or implementation, and was anything done to address these barriers?
- To what extent were the rights and dignity of beneficiaries upheld by the projects and their partners throughout the implementation?
- Have the communication and visibility actions been implemented in an appropriate manner and based on IOM's internal guidelines? Are there any project success stories generated from the communication / visibility actions?

The evaluator may identify additional questions during the process to better respond to the evaluation purpose. The evaluation will also identify the most important results, lessons learned, or best practices to inform the consolidation of the programme and implementation strategies to ensure that set performance targets are met at the end of the implementation.

6. Evaluation methodology

A mixed method approach will be used with qualitative and quantitative evaluation techniques. These will be comprised of:

- A documentation review: Project proposal for phase II and project proposal for phase III as well as documentation provided by IOM Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt, Yemen, Libya and Sudan, including activity reports, M&E tools, financial data, correspondence, specific agreements and/or sub-agreements, technical documentation reports, together with any other documentation that IOM (in each implementing country) considers important for the evaluation exercise.
- A series of interviews (online and in-person when applicable) with beneficiaries, representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland, implementing partners, affected, and interested stakeholders as well as project management team in all implementing missions and other key staff in the implementation of the project.
- Therefore, it is expected that a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection will be used including document review, key informant interviews, surveys, and other data collection methods as necessary to satisfactorily respond to the above set of evaluation questions.

The Evaluator will be expected to develop a more detailed evaluation methodology to meet expectations in line with the overall purpose of this evaluation.

Finally, the evaluator must follow the IOM Data Protection Principles, UNEG norms and standards for evaluation, and relevant ethical guidelines.

7. Evaluation deliverables

The outputs of the evaluation will be:

- An **inception report** that clearly outlines the evaluation approach and tools to be used. The inception report must also include an **evaluation matrix** which includes the methodology used, indicators, evaluation questions and detailed work plan.
- A maximum of 40-page long **draft evaluation report** in English and without annexes (including an executive summary and outlining the progress of the project indicators, data sources and findings of the evaluation, good practices, lessons learned, missed opportunities, strengths and weaknesses, gaps and challenges on the design, management and implementation of the project). The draft of the report will be presented to IOM for comments and inputs, after which the evaluator will finalize the report and submit the final evaluation report to IOM.

- A **final evaluation** report that reflects comments/feedback from IOM. The final report should be structured according to IOM evaluation report template that include the following key sections:
 - a. Executive summary
 - b. Introduction
 - c. Context and purpose of evaluation
 - d. Evaluation framework and methodology
 - e. Evaluation findings
 - f. Conclusion and recommendations
 - g. Annexes (tools, list of respondents, questions guides etc.)

- A **two-page evaluation brief** in English, French and Arabic.

The evaluator is required to submit draft documents in English to IOM for comments. IOM will cover all the expenses related to the evaluation.

8. Workplan

The provisional timetable for the evaluation is as follows:

Deliverables	Timeframe	Activity
Start of the consultancy	7 December 2021	
Inception report	7 December - 21 December 2021	Document review, desk research, development of methodology and evaluation matrix.
	21 December – 4 January 2022	Interviews with beneficiaries, stakeholders, partners and the project management team.
Draft evaluation report	4 – 18 January 2022	Drafting and submission to IOM for feedback IOM feedback
Final evaluation report	25 January 2022	Submission of the final report with the inclusion of IOM’s feedback

9. Payment and disbursement schedule

The evaluator’s fee is all-inclusive. The fee may include all cost related to hotel accommodation, evaluation field trips to project implementation sites when applicable, data analysis and report drafting, and any other cost associated with the completion of the evaluation. Disbursement of the evaluation consultancy fees will be paid upon satisfactory submission and approval by IOM of agreed upon deliverable, according to the following disbursement schedule:

- Inception evaluation report – 25%
- Draft evaluation report – 25%
- Final evaluation report according to IOM evaluation template with relevant annexes – 50%

10. Application procedure

The interested candidates are expected to submit a technical and financial proposal (not exceeding 10 pages) with all-inclusive itemized budget and their CVs, cover letter as well as a

recent evaluation report example. The proposal must provide details on the methodology and approach to the assignment. The submission should include the following documents:

- The CVs of the principal evaluator and key team members.
- The proposal outlining the proposed methodology for the evaluation and timeline.
- Availability of the evaluation team.
- The detailed budget proposal
- A sample of previous work

The proposal shall be submitted to IOM by email to morocco procurement@iom.int no later than 30 November 2021 by midnight.

11. Required Qualifications and Experience

The lead evaluator is expected to have the following minimum qualifications and experience:

- Minimum master's degree in social research and/or evaluation methods, social science, Development studies, Public Health or Epidemiology
- Minimum of 7 years of experience in managing and/or evaluating development projects/programmes/initiatives
- Proven experience evaluating project addressing public health issues is an advantage
- Demonstrated experience and familiarity with migration dynamics and demonstrated knowledge of Middle East and North Africa (MENA) context
- Fluency in English and French is required, working knowledge of Arabic is an advantage.

