



Annex A: Terms of Reference
Evaluation of UNHCR's Global Fleet Management

20 September 2017
Reference: RFP/2017/1011

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	3
1.1	Background.....	3
1.2	Statement of Purpose, Rationale and Objectives.....	5
2	Requirements.....	7
2.1	Evaluation Scope.....	7
2.2	Key evaluation questions and sub-questions	7
2.3	Methodology, data and information sources	8
2.4	Evaluation work-plan and organization and conduct of the evaluation	9
2.5	UNHCR's Responsibilities	11
3	Content of the Technical Offer.....	12
3.1	Company Qualifications.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2	Proposed Services	12
3.3	Personnel Qualifications.....	13
3.4	Vendor Registration Form	13
3.5	Applicable General Conditions	13
4	Evaluation	12
4.1	Technical Evaluation	14

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Key information at glance about the evaluation	
Title of the exercise:	Evaluation of UNHCR's Global Fleet Management
Type of exercise:	Strategy and policy evaluation
Evaluation commissioned by:	UNHCR Evaluation Service

This evaluation is commissioned by the UNHCR Evaluation Service (ES). The focus will be on the achievements of the UNHCR Global Fleet Management project which was officially launched on 1 January 2014.

1. Subject of the evaluation and its context

Transport of personnel, relief supplies and people of concern are mission-critical activities for UNHCR to enable it to fulfill its role of providing protection, assistance and solutions to refugees and other persons of concern in over 100 countries world-wide.

Given that refugees and other persons of concern are often located in remote field locations with rugged terrains and poor, non-tarmac roads, UNHCR needs a fleet of highly functional four-wheel, all-terrain light vehicles. In 2014 it was estimated that UNHCR owned and operated a fleet of more than six thousand vehicles at an annual cost of tens of millions of dollars¹.

The UNHCR vehicle fleet is made up of two categories: 1) the Administration fleet, i.e. vehicles used by UNHCR staff and affiliated workforce for routine activities in field operations, and 2) the Programme fleet, owned by UNHCR, but loaned to and operated by its partners under the "Right of Use" agreements (RoUs). It is estimated that 60% of the UNHCR Global Fleet is constituted by the "Programme Fleet".

In March 2013 the High Commissioner issued a Memorandum² announcing the launch of the Global Fleet Management (GFM) project in 2014 to reduce inefficiencies such as high operating costs (including fuel and maintenance) and poor asset control. The aim of the forthcoming strategy was "to provide operations with appropriate cost-effective, safe and fully equipped vehicles to meet operational requirements; ensure reduced vehicle costs and simpler budgeting; and improve vehicle management and staff safety". The GFM is made up by the following components:

- The Asset and Fleet Management Section, placed in the Supply Management Logistics Service (currently located in Budapest) with the Division of Emergency, Security and Supply (DESS), is in charge of all global activities concerning vehicle acquisition and disposal, internal rental schemes, insurance, fleet management software and vehicles tracking.³
- A Global Fleet funding mechanism for procurement of new vehicles receiving the proceeds from the sales of disposed vehicles and the monthly reimbursement of vehicle charges from operations.

¹ UNHCR 2015 Fleet Handbook, p. 28

² IOM-FOM 019/2013

³ While field operations continue to determine their vehicle needs, order vehicles from GFM, maintain and repair those vehicles and cooperate with the Assets Management Unit (AMU) on their timely disposal, they are further responsible for physical verification and safeguarding of those assets.

- The UNHCR Global Vehicle Insurance including the Self-Insurance Fund to cover loss and accidental damage to all UNHCR vehicles, the compulsory local 3rd party liability insurance and the excess 3rd party liability insurance.
- Centralization of vehicle procurement which allows to achieve significant economies of scale and is one of the main drivers in reducing the total cost of ownership of vehicles.
- Systematic sale of vehicles after the end of their useful lives (5 years) leading to significantly lower average age of the fleet with improved safety for staff and partners, reduced expenditures for maintenance and repair and optimized sales proceeds.
- A Vehicle Tracking System which allows visibility over assets equipped with tracking devices provides insight into utilization of the tracked vehicles, if data is used properly and can enhance safety and security of drivers and passengers.

In August 2013 the High Commissioner issued another Memorandum⁴ on the “Implementation of the Global Fleet Management”. The Memorandum, noting that UNHCR operates an aging fleet of light vehicles with some being older than 15 years, stated that the GFM’s aims are:

- Cost-effective vehicle acquisition;
- Timely replacement of vehicles;
- Realizing optimal disposal revenue from all vehicles;
- Enhanced safety

It added that “GFM will, over the next two years (2014-15), replace all light vehicles that are older than five years in a planned and coordinated manner.” One of the main innovations of the GFM, applicable to “all light vehicles”, is that the Global Fleet will purchase and “rent” the vehicles to field offices through an internal rental scheme and will therefore *not* “own” the vehicles unlike in the past when “ownership” (real or perceived) was with the field operations.

The Memorandum also contained provisions for ordering/renting new vehicles and for the disposal of old light vehicles (proceeds of sales would go to UNHCR HQs/GFM). In case a field office would like to donate a rented vehicle to a partner (e.g. governmental counterpart or NGO) through a “Transfer of Ownership” agreement, it would have to cover the difference between the rental fees paid to-date and the acquisition costs (rental base amount). In case, it would wish to donate a new vehicle not yet included in the rental scheme (i.e. direct Transfer of Ownership/ToO), the ToO will be recorded in the GFM/AMU data-bases.

Light vehicles from years prior GFM, for which ToO was intended, required prior authorization from the Asset and Fleet Management Section (AFMS).

Finally the Memorandum stipulated that for the year 2014 the rental charges for all “new light vehicles” was fixed at 2.82% of acquisition cost (rental base amount) on a monthly basis or 33.84% on a yearly basis. In addition “all vehicles” (presumably including heavy vehicles such as trucks, buses and earth-moving equipment) will also be subject to additional charges for “start-up contributions”, for insurance premium (Self-Insurance and Supplementary Third Party)⁵. “Tracking Charges” will be applicable to all vehicles equipped with the tracking system.

In December 2013, the UNHCR Division of Financial Management (DFAM) also issued a “Policy on the Use of Vehicles in UNHCR” covering issues such as financial responsibility for vehicle usage, insurance coverage, liability and authorization to drive which does not appear to introduce substantial changes.

In 2014 UNHCR issued the 2014-18 “Fleet Strategy” articulated as follows:

- Year 1 (2014-15): Global Fleet Rental and Insurance;
- Year 2 (2015-16) Maintenance and Repair;

⁴ IOM-FOM 054/2013

⁵ Information correct for 2014 only, since 2015, the start-up contribution no longer applies, while in year 3 the rental factor was in 2016 25 % and in 2017 it is 20 %.

- Year 3 (2016-17) Power Generating Equipment;
- Year 4 (2017-18) Fuel Management.

The GFM strategy is being revised with completion scheduled for the 1st quarter of 2018.

The Strategy summarizes the main features of the GFM and the benefits that it was going to achieve with the following goals (with associated objectives and outputs):

- ✓ Improve the efficiency of the UNHCR vehicle fleet;
- ✓ Enhance management and oversight of UNHCR's fleet
- ✓ Improve road safety awareness for UNHCR staff and other users;
- ✓ Minimize the environmental impact of UNHCR vehicle operations.

In May 2015 UNHCR launched another policy related to the GFM, namely on the "Policy on Global Fleet Management Vehicle Tracking Equipment Installation and Usage", prescribing that that all UNHCR vehicles (including those operated by partners under the RoU) on rent be fitted with Vehicle Tracking Systems (VTS), except where local regulations forbid it.

The purpose of the VTS is two-fold:

- a. To capture operational data on vehicles fitted with the VTS on utilization, time, distance travelled to capture accurate fleet performance information;
- b. To provide information on vehicles venturing outside permissible areas and send specific alerts for the purpose of security risk management (although with certain caveats depending on the local situation).

Key performance indicators would include distance travelled, estimated fuel consumption and running cost per kilometer. Estimated fuel data is provided by VTS (Vehicle Tracking system) while data for performance monitoring is captured by Fleet Wave (FMS- Fleet Management system).

Another feature of the GFM highlighted in the 2015 "Operational Guidelines for the Management and use of UNHCR Vehicles" also known as the "Fleet Handbook", is the move towards greater vehicle standardization (mainly focusing on Toyota Land Cruiser models 76 and 78) which is intended to bring-about the following benefits⁶:

- Increased buying power;
- More effective supply chain;
- Simplified ordering
- Increased operational efficiency and safety;
- Streamlining maintenance and repair.

The Handbook explains in greater detail the elements of the overall GFM policy, namely the vehicle rental programme including the use by UNHCR's partners, day-to-day fleet management, insurance, the vehicle tracking system and monitoring.

In 2015 the GFM contracted a research institute to carry out a "Year One Baseline Report" and a "Field Office Survey" which concluded that after one year of operation the GFM already had a positive impact, quoting *inter alia* that the fleet size decreased by 11%, the fleet age dropped by 21% (from 5.85 to 4.63 years) and procurement cost also dropped by 21%. The results of the Field Office Survey suggested that staff is satisfied with the information availability, the reliability and the simplicity that the GFM brought about, but had doubts on the improvements in timeliness, technical support, disposal policy and the cost to field operations.

1.2 Statement of Purpose, Rationale and Objectives

This evaluation is commissioned by the UNHCR Evaluation Service (ES) with support of the Supply Management Logistics Service/DESS. While the Operational Guidelines/Handbook which entered into

⁶ UNHCR 2015 Fleet Handbook, p. 17

force in July 2015 call for a review in December 2018, the 2015 “Policy on Global Fleet Management Vehicle Tracking Equipment Installation and Usage” calls for a review in 2016 and the main elements of the GFM policy were already launched in January 2014, which will be over three years before the actual implementation of this evaluation.

There have also been repeated calls from the Board of Auditors that UNHCR commissions an independent (“extensive”) evaluation of the GFM. The annual independent assessments of the implementation of the GFM strategy, commissioned by DESS, provide implementation monitoring reports, which the planned independent evaluation could take into consideration as one of the sources of information.

In addition Global recommendation #15 of the 2017 UNHCR Annual Programme Review (APR) requested that:

“DESS, in consultation with DFAM and other relevant Divisions and Bureaux, conduct by 31 December 2016 an evidence-based cost-benefit analysis of renting vs. ownership in ten locations with significant rental costs – and with assessment of practices pursued by other organisations – in order to update UNHCR’s corporate guidance”.

Furthermore the UNHCR Budget Committee also recommended that:

“a review of the Global Fleet Management be undertaken to validate the assumptions included in the original business case. This review should refer to the replacement policy for vehicle, level of procurement of new vehicles, the stock level of vehicles, the level of vehicle rental charges, the number of staff originally estimated to be required versus current levels and an overall cost-benefit analysis of GFM based on actual results from the inception of the programme. This review should be completed by 31 December 2016.”

The purpose of this evaluation will include a combination of accountability and learning. The overall objective will be to assess the extent to which the purported benefit of the GFM “to provide UNHCR Field Offices and operations with appropriate, cost-effective and safe vehicles and professional fleet management services to support optimum programme delivery”⁷ has been realized. The implementation of all the GFM strategic elements will allow informed judgement about the overall results while the evaluation may demonstrate the progress made towards achieving the set goals.

The primary users of this evaluation will be senior managers within the UNHCR Division of Emergency Security and Supply particularly the Head of SMLs, the Chief of AFMS and their teams so that the GFM strategy, policies, guidelines and practices can be adjusted to ensure optimum programme delivery. Secondary users will be in particular the Division of Finance and Administration Management (DFAM), the AHC (Operations), the Deputy High Commissioner, Regional Bureaux as well as country operations. This evaluation will also be of interest to donors who fund UNHCR operations, including the GFM.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 41

2 Requirements

2.1 Evaluation Scope

The scope of this evaluation will focus on UNHCR light vehicles (including both the so-called "Programme" and "Administration" fleets) and will not include trucks buses, Armored Vehicles or heavy-duty machinery. It will cover the following aspects of the GFM policy/strategy:

- Global Fleet Project including the rental scheme, fleet management
- Insurance (self-insurance and 3rd party insurance);
- Vehicle Tracking System.

The evaluation will not cover power generating equipment or fuel management, as it is too early to evaluate these aspects of the strategy.

In chronological terms the evaluation will need to compare data and information relating to at least three years before the introduction of the policy (January 2011- January 2014) with three years after the introduction of the policy (January 2014 – January 2017). It should be noted that this information is scattered within the UNHCR financial software (MSRP) and might be difficult to be extracted. The selected vendor will be provided with the available MSRP data.

The evaluation shall focus on three years of implementation of the five-year Fleet Management Strategy (2014-2018), which is revised in the 2017, in order to reflect the latest developments. The focus of this study is therefore a comparison of the situation before GFM (as far as this information is available) and GFM's impact of the last four years. It does not include a review of the (2015-16) Maintenance and Repair project, the (2016-17) Power Generating Equipment project and the (2017-18) Fuel Management project, which were postponed, or have not yet started for various reasons. It should be noted, that some of the benefits and cost savings of the Fleet Management strategy will only be fully achieved, once the strategy is fully implemented.

In geographical terms the evaluation will be global in scope although field visits will be in a limited number of country operations (tentatively six, see below).

The scope of the evaluation will also respond to the UNHCR Annual Programme Review conclusion # 15 and the Budget Committee recommendation to validate the assumptions, made in the original business case.

2.2 Key evaluation questions and sub-questions

[Note: sub-questions may be modified during the Inception phase].

- To what extent did the introduction of the GFM increase the cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit⁸ of the purchase, maintenance and disposal of the UNHCR light vehicle fleet?
 - Did it result in cost-savings or cost avoidance at the HQs level through increased buying power?

⁸ "Cost-effectiveness is the extent to which the program has achieved or is expected to achieve its results at a lower cost compared with alternatives. Shortcomings in cost-effectiveness occur when the program is not the least-cost alternative or approach to achieving the same or similar outputs and outcomes"; *Ibid*. See also *Better Evaluation*, "Evaluation methods for assessing Value for Money", 2013 which defines cost-effectiveness analysis as "the evaluation of two or more alternatives, based on the relative costs and outcomes (effects) in reaching a particular goal. This method can be used when comparing programmes that aim to achieve the same goal". Contrary to "cost-benefit", the concept of "cost-effectiveness" recognizes that a project or programme may result not only in monetary "benefits", but also in non-monetary ones.

- Did it result in cost savings or cost avoidance at the field level compared to when field operations had to buy instead of renting light vehicles?
 - What were the cost-benefits for field operations of the new insurance package?
 - Did the standardization of Land Cruiser (LC) models meet operational needs, particularly with partners?
- To what extent did the introduction of the GFM result in increased efficiency⁹ of the management of UNHCR's light vehicle fleet?
- Did it result in simplified ordering?
 - Did it result in simplified procedures for the disposal of old vehicles?
 - Did it improve the management of vehicles?
 - Did it allow field operations to replace more quickly aging vehicles?
 - Did it result in an increase or decrease in the level of staffing needed to manage the vehicles fleet at the field level?
 - To what extent was the VTS installed on all new light vehicles?
 - Did it capture operational data and information on utilization, time and distance travelled so that the performance could be optimized both for Administration and Programme fleets?
- To what extent did the introduction of the GFM result in improved road safety awareness and minimize the environmental impact?
- How far was the VTS used also for Security Risk Management purposes?
 - To what extent are radio rooms in field operations or other means of telecommunication in a position to monitor and respond to VTS-induced emergency alerts?
 - Is it possible to determine whether the GFM reduced carbon emissions?
 - To what extent did field operations have the capacity to implement related activities?
- Where there any unintended impact, results, either positive or negative, stemming from the GFM's introduction?
- As there was no real vehicle stock management before GFM, how did it impact on the stock levels of light vehicles?
 - What were the other benefits/drawbacks not envisioned?

2.3 Methodology, data and information sources

The evaluation will employ a mixed-method approach including qualitative and quantitative methods.

Phase 1 (Inception) will be office/home-based and will last approximately two months. It will involve an extensive literature/document review, including an analysis of the existing data from the indicators achievement report, the annual assessment report(s), the design of a survey/questionnaire to be sent to the main Country Offices in the selected operations, and structured interviews with key stakeholders at UNHCR HQs. The tentative evaluation questions as well as the evaluation methodology and scope will be refined in preparation for Phase 2. Data from different sources will be triangulated.

⁹ "Efficiency is the extent to which the program has converted or is expected to convert its resources/ inputs (such as funds, expertise, time, etc.) economically into results in order to achieve the maximum possible outputs, outcomes, and impacts with the minimum possible inputs"; *World Bank: "Indicative Principles and Standards Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs", 2007.*
http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTGLOREGPARPROG/Resources/grpp_sourcebook_chap11.pdf

It should be noted that UNHCR's Results Framework captures only very limited data regarding the utilization of UNHCR's vehicles, as follows:

Objective: Logistics and supply optimized to serve operational needs

Impact Indicator	Extent logistics management mechanisms working effectively Performance indicators
Maintenance of vehicle fleet in adequate condition	# of days when vehicles were unavailable
	% of vehicles insured

However, the AFMS of the UNHCR Division of Emergency Security and Supply is the custodian of a wealth of data through the VTS and software called "Fleet Wave".

The main product of the Inception phase, an Inception Report together with an evaluation matrix, should not only try to examine the interventions' logic and theories of change, but also clarify, refine or change the tentative evaluation questions listed above as well as the scope and methodology.

After the completion of Phase 1 (Inception) and taking into account to the results of the evaluability assessment, Phase 2 will involve fieldwork in the six countries (tentatively two in sub-Saharan Africa, three in North Africa / Middle East and one in Latin America or Europe) and the implementation of the survey targeting selected UNHCR Country Offices. The fieldwork will involve semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders from UNHCR, UN, and NGO and governmental partners. Data will be further verified and triangulated in preparation for the final report.

2.4 Evaluation work-plan and organization and conduct of the evaluation

Activity	Indicative Time Frame	Deliverable	Location
Beginning of consultancy and of desk/literature study and 4 day trip to Budapest/ Geneva for consultations with the Evaluation Service, interviews with key UNHCR stakeholders, and in particular discussions with DESS/SMSL (based in Budapest) and DFAM	End of Month 1 /Consultancy Inception Phase (Phase 1)	Summary notes where relevant	Home / Office based with the exception of one 4 day trip (indicatively 3 consultants including the Team Leader) for consecutive visits to UNHCR Geneva and UNHCR Budapest for 2 days each.
Finalization of the Inception Report, and evaluation matrix	End of Month 2 / Consultancy Inception Phase (Phase 1)	Inception report and evaluation matrix	Home / Office based
In-depth data analysis, additional interviews (phone/skype) etc.	Month 3-4 / Consultancy Main Phase (Phase 2)	Summary notes where relevant	The team of consultants will be split up in two groups of three for country visits. Each group will consecutively visit 3 locations for 6 working days per country

First draft of the evaluation report and HQs debrief on key findings, draft conclusions and recommendations	End of Month 5 / Consultancy Phase (Phase 2)	First draft of the evaluation report	Home Office based with the exception one trip to Geneva of two consultants for 1 working day
Second and last draft of final report (incorporating – as appropriate – comments from stakeholders).	End of Month 6-7 (phase 2) End of the Consultancy (Note: this will involve approximately one week of work after receiving comments)	Final draft of the evaluation report	Home Office based

The overall timeline to complete the project is 7 to 8 months. The vendor is asked to propose a timeline of no less than 7 months and no more than 8 months.

The main deliverable of the inception phase which will last up to two months will be an Inception Report (indicatively 20 pages plus Annexes) together with an evaluation matrix.

In the main evaluation phase (Phase 2) the evaluation team will be reinforced and tentatively split in two teams of 3 persons covering 3 country operations each. The fieldwork in each country should last approximately between five and seven working days and should be concluded with an informal debriefing session for the Country Office. Besides answering the evaluation questions, this phase should also develop an overall Theory of Change for UNHCR's introduction of the GFM. Phase 2 should last 4 to 5 months including the preparation of the final report. Prior to the finalization of the report a formal debriefing will be held at HQs.

The main deliverable of Phase 2 will be a Final Report (indicatively 50 pages, plus Annexes and Executive Summary) including a data collection toolkit (as Annex) showing the evidence base, a fully-fledged Theory of Change, key findings and recommendations. Furthermore the evaluators will have to ensure that the recommendations are based on evidence, well-crafted, realistic and implementable with an emphasis on quality rather than quantity. After the first draft of the evaluation report is accepted by the E.S., an evaluation brief and a PowerPoint presentation of the findings may also be requested. The structure of the Final Report will be agreed during the inception phase.

After acceptance of the draft report by the ES and the HQs presentation, the report will be circulated for comments by the Advisory Group and other key internal stakeholders. The time-frame for comments is approximately three weeks. During this period the evaluation team will not have to work and this time should not be charged to the contract. This 3 week period is included in the overall time to complete the project (7 to 8 months). It is estimated that the work of considering the comments, incorporating them in the report as appropriate and documenting in a matrix why certain comments were retained or not, will last one week.

The Evaluation will be undertaken by a team of qualified independent consultants of up to seven persons including a Team Leader with a strong expertise/background in evaluations, a Deputy Team Leader (also with expertise in evaluations), two economists or accountants (ideally with expertise in cost-effectiveness/costing data analysis), two persons with expertise in logistics/fleet management¹⁰. They will work closely with a staff member from ES who will be the Evaluation Manager. The exercise will be carried out in close cooperation with the Supply Management Logistics Service with the UNHCR Division of Emergency Security and Supply who may appoint an evaluation co-manager or a focal point who will be consulted at every step in the process.

Norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group will be applied. The guidelines and methods set by the *Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action* (ALNAP) which will be made available, should also be followed.

¹⁰ This indicative team composition should apply to the main evaluation phase which will involve field-work. During the inception phase team members could be fewer as long as the Team Leader remains the same.

An Advisory Group will be convened to guide the process, including providing substantive and technical feedback on drafts of the Inception and Final reports. The group will include primarily staff from DESS/SMLS, the Division of Financial and Administrative Management (DFAM), two officers from the Regionals Bureaux, one or two officials from sister agencies (e.g. WFP and/or IFRC) and possibly one or two from donors representations.

Members of the Advisory Group will be asked to:

- a) Provide suggestions to identify potential materials and resources to be reviewed and key contacts to be considered for key informant interviews
- b) Review and comment on the draft Phase 1 Report.
- c) Review and comment on the data collection and data analysis instruments that will be developed by the external evaluation team
- d) Review and comment on the draft evaluation report and validate emerging findings and conclusions (evaluation finalisation stage).
- e) Advise on the focus of the evaluation recommendations that will form the basis of the Management Response to the review (final stage).

Briefings and discussions with the Advisory Group are expected to take place at least twice during the evaluation process (ideally just before the finalization of the Inception Report and of the Final Report).

An ES Evaluation Manager, supported by an SMLS co-manager or focal point, will be at the disposal of the evaluation team and assume responsibility for providing available indicators, monitoring and financial data, arranging interviews at HQ levels, arranging field visits, liaising with the Advisory Group and focal points at Field Representations, and consolidating comments on the inception and final reports. The Evaluation Manager will remain in close contact with designated focal points in the field to ensure smooth mission arrangements to all the designated locations. UNHCR Country offices will designate focal points that will assist the ES Evaluation Manager and the evaluation teams with logistical and administrative arrangements. The Evaluation Manager will also share with the evaluation team a Quality Assurance/Guidance package for evaluations that is piloted by ES.

Upon completion of the final evaluation report, it will be shared with UNHCR's Senior Executive Committee with the request to formulate the formal management response, which will also be in the public domain.

2.5 UNHCR's Responsibilities

Though it is normally the responsibility of the consulting company to obtain visas, UNHCR can facilitate by providing letters of invitation for visas when needed. UNHCR will provide working space and utilities during visits to Geneva, Budapest and the field locations as needed. UNHCR will reimburse the travel expenses according to UNHCR travel rules. UNHCR will provide daily subsistence allowance (DSA) during days that consultants are away from their place of origin according to the official UN rates. Hence, DSA and travel costs should *not* be included in the all-inclusive price. The place of origin that should be provided by the vendor in the financial offer form will be used to calculate a travel cost estimate according to UNHCR travel rules. You must indicate one single place of origin for all the consultants. Should you fail to declare a place of origin, Geneva will be assumed to be the default place of origin to calculate the reimbursement of the cost of the trips. UNHCR will confirm the exact locations of the field visits at a later stage.

3 Content of the Technical Offer

Your Technical proposal should be concisely presented and structured in the following order to include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following information:

3.1 *Company qualifications and references*

1.1. **Capacity to undertake contract**

A description of your company and the company's qualifications with evidence of your company's capacity to perform the services required, including:

- Company profile, registration certificate, year founded, and last audit reports, if any;
- If a multi-location company, specification of the location of the company's headquarters, and the branches that will be involved in the project work with founding dates;
- Any information that will facilitate our evaluation of your company's substantive reliability, financial and managerial capacity to provide the services;
- You are requested to keep this part of your bid concise and to the point. If you wish, you could provide more details in an annex.

1.2. **Professional References for Evaluations and evaluation services**

- Three or more successfully descriptions of successfully completed projects, with reference contact information;

1.3. **Proven track record of providing evaluations and evaluation services on complex humanitarian and development issues**

- Proof of track record of the provision of evaluations and research on complex development and humanitarian issues. A link to at least two previous relevant evaluation reports in English should be provided. Alternatively the full reports (min. 2) can be attached;
- Number and description of similar successfully completed projects;
- Number and description of similar projects underway.

3.2 *Proposed Services*

Understanding of the requirements for services, proposed approach, solutions, methodology and outputs. Any comments or suggestions on the TOR, as well as your detailed description of the manner in which your company would respond to the TOR:

- A detailed work plan and timeline for the Fleet Management Review that demonstrates extensive understanding, knowledge and expertise of UNHCR Fleet Management.
- Convincing evidence in terms of timelines for delivery, maximum flexibility and prioritization, including risk assessment proving you company's capacity to provide the service in the given time frame (7-8 months).
- Please note that the vendor is asked to provide the service in no less than 7 months and no more than 8 months. Do not propose a timeline that is shorter than 7 months or longer than 8 months.
- A detailed description of the proposed methodologies to be used and specific research tools and software's you will use;
- A description of your organization's experience in providing these services
- Description of previous experience working with the United Nations, international organizations or large non-profit organizations, particularly with those having a large field presence outside HQ including very remote locations
- Describe the minimum standards and quality control mechanism you apply;
- Describe the administration of the whole evaluation process.

- **Quality Assurance**

The bidders have to demonstrate and describe internal quality assurance plan and mechanism they have in place to ensure consistently high quality evaluation process and products.

- Communicating results and findings in an accessible way for non-technical readers will be important. The 2 submitted reports should be of excellent quality and easy to understand even for non-technical readers

3.3 Personnel Qualifications

- The composition of the team you propose to provide;
- Summary of their specific experience and expertise relevant for this evaluation;
- Curriculum vitae of core staff (max 5 pages per CV).
- The proposed personnel will be evaluated along the following criteria:
Skills, experience, diversity and experience in data collection in the context of emergencies

3.4 Vendor Registration Form

Please complete, sign, and submit with your Technical Proposal the Vendor Registration Form (Annex C).

3.5 Applicable General Conditions

Please indicate your acknowledgement of the UNHCR General Conditions of Contract for the Provision of Services by signing this document (Annex D) and including it in your submitted Technical Proposal.

4 Evaluation

4.1 Technical Evaluation

The **Technical offer** will be evaluated using inter alia the following criteria and percentage distribution: **70%** from the total score.

Evaluation Criteria		Max. points obtainable
1. Company Qualification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity to undertake contract References Proven track record of providing evaluations and evaluation services on complex humanitarian and if applicable development issues and experience in designing and implementation of evaluations. 	14
2. Proposed Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed evaluation methodology and tools to be used Organization of work indicates the ability to comply with the required timeframe for the evaluation General Strategy and Approach indicates knowledge of subject. Internal mechanisms in place to guarantee quality of the evaluation i.e. how the quality will be guaranteed in addition to the EQA provided by UNHCR Communicating results and findings in an accessible way for non-technical readers 	28
3. Personnel qualification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experience, qualifications and proven positive track record of proposed Team Leader Diversity of team, complementarity of skills, relevant expertise and experience of members of the evaluation team, including in relation to the specific topic of the evaluation Experience in designing and implementation of evaluations, data collection and analysis methods including in the context of emergencies 	28
Total Points		70

The total minimum score to be considered technically compliant is 42 out of 70 points. If a bid does not meet this minimum it will be deemed technically non-compliant and will not proceed to the financial evaluation.