



# Terms of reference – Invitation procedure – **Corrected version 12.07.21\***

**Terms of reference for the  
"External Evaluation of the Geneva Centres"  
Switzerland, November 2021 to February 2022**

## **Procedure outside the scope of international treaties**

This procedure is based on the Federal Act of 21 June 2019 on Public Procurement (PPA, SR 172.056.1) and the Ordinance of 12 February 2020 on Public Procurement (PPO; SR 172.056.11). Please refer to chapter 8.3.

⇒ **\* Change as of 12 July 2021: extension of deadline for submission of offers from 16 to 23 July 2021 (see page 12 and 15 in red). No other changes made.**

Date: 27 May 2021

# Contents

- 1 Abbreviations ..... 3**
- 2 Purpose of this document ..... 3**
- 3 Goal and content of the mandate ..... 3**
  - 3.1 Background of the evaluation ..... 3
  - 3.2 Prior involvement ..... 5
  - 3.3 Objectives ..... 5
  - 3.4 Content of the mandate ..... 5
    - 3.4.1 Task 1 – Evaluation ..... 6
    - 3.4.2 Task 2 – Provide advice ..... 10
    - 3.4.3 Deliverables ..... 10
    - 3.4.4 Methodology and Requirements ..... 10
    - 3.4.5 Institutional set-up and responsibilities ..... 11
  - 3.5 Estimated amount / volume ..... 11
  - 3.6 Timetable invitation procedure ..... 12
- 4 Eligibility criteria ..... 12**
- 5 Award criteria ..... 13**
- 6 Structure and content of the bid ..... 14**
- 7 Administrative aspects ..... 15**
  - 7.1 Official name and address of the contracting authority ..... 15
  - 7.2 Deadline and address for submitting bids ..... 15
  - 7.3 Expression of interest in submitting an offer and receiving documents ..... 15
  - 7.4 Answering questions ..... 15
  - 7.5 Type of procedure ..... 15
  - 7.6 In accordance with GATT / WTO agreement or treaty (as applicable) ..... 15
  - 7.7 Evaluation and adjustment of bids ..... 15
  - 7.8 Bidding consortia ..... 15
  - 7.9 Subcontractors ..... 16
  - 7.10 Multiple tenders by single tenderers and subcontractors ..... 16
  - 7.11 Validity of bids ..... 16
  - 7.12 Languages of invitation document ..... 16
  - 7.13 Language of the procedure ..... 16
  - 7.14 Conclusion of contract ..... 16
- 8 Further information ..... 16**
  - 8.1 Confidentiality ..... 16
  - 8.2 Integrity clause ..... 17
  - 8.3 Property rights ..... 17
- 9 Annexes ..... 17**

# 1 Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Definition
AC	Award criteria
CdP	Comité de Pilotage
DCAF	Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance
DDPS	Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport
EC	Eligibility criteria
FDFA	Federal Department of Foreign Affairs
FOPP	Federal Ordinance on Public Procurement
GCSP	Geneva Centre for Security Policy
GICHD	Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining
GTC	General Terms and Conditions of Business
ISSAT	International Security Sector Advisory Team
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
OASI (AHV)	Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance (Alters- und Hinterbliebenen-Versicherung)
OECD – DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee
PPA	Federal Act on Public Procurement
PPO	Federal Ordinance on Public Procurement
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation
StG	Steuergesetz
ToR	Terms of Reference
USP	Unique Selling Proposition
VAT	Value added tax

## 2 Purpose of this document

This document contains the requirements relating to the mandate for the project "External evaluation of the Geneva Centres". It serves as a reference for the tenderer to submit his or her offer. Contracts are awarded according to the invitation to tender procedure according to Art. 35 of the PPO.

## 3 Goal and content of the mandate

### 3.1 Background of the evaluation

Capacity building in the domain of security policies, security sector governance, as well as mine action is a major factor in making the world more peaceful and stable. In the 1990s, Switzerland founded a competence centre for each of these three fields of activity: GCSP (Geneva Centre for Security Policy, 1995), GICHD (Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining, 1998), and DCAF (Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance, 2000). Since the founding of the Geneva Centres and particularly within the past few years, the geopolitical security situation as well as the focus areas in the fields of human security, mine action and security sector governance have developed fundamentally: Both, new challenges and new opportunities have emerged, some previously pivotal aspects have lost their significance, whereas long-standing issues remain unsolved. It is therefore decisive that each of the three Geneva Centres adapts to the current environment and adjusts itself to relevant needs and demands, including the views of Switzerland and the international community.

Each Centre is constituted as an independent foundation under Swiss law. Thus, each Centre is governed by a Council of Foundation, composed of representatives of Member States (mostly Permanent Representatives residing in Geneva). As per Swiss law, the purpose of each foundation is described in its statutes and provides the core mandate of each Centre.

All three institutions are perceived as centres of excellence in their respective field of work. The Centres receive financial support from a number of countries and partners. The most important funder remains the Swiss Government with its contribution via the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA) with a

total share of contributions of between 55% (DCAF) and 75% (GCSP). The Swiss Confederation is also represented in the governing boards of each of the three Centres.

In 2018, the Swiss Confederation tasked an independent external evaluation to assess each of the three Geneva Centres with respect to its relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. This evaluation report formed the basis for the editing and submission of the federal dispatch 2020-2023. In this dispatch, the Federal Council announced that a next evaluation of each of the three Centres shall be carried out in due time.

The Swiss Federal Parliament determined in the framework credit 2020-2023 in support of the three Geneva Centres (federal dispatch 18.094, hereinafter also referred to as the "dispatch")<sup>1</sup>, that the Swiss contributions 2020-2023 will sum up to a maximum of CHF 128 million.

The dispatch also stipulates:

- a) that an evaluation shall be undertaken, focussing on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the work executed by each of the three Geneva Centres;
- b) that an internal strategy on a more comprehensive integration of the work of the three Geneva Centres into the framework of interests defined by the relevant Swiss foreign policy strategy papers for the second half of the years 2020 shall be established by the Federal Departments involved;
- c) that the Centres follow a comprehensible and coherent strategy with regard to the use and creation of synergies at the "Maison de la Paix" in Geneva;
- d) that the Centres aim towards a Results-Based Management (RMB) approach and at least indicate their underlying Theory of Change and Result Chain<sup>2</sup> (input-activities-output-outcome-impact) as the basis for a common understanding on how resources link to activities and to the desired impact (=common language of donors and recipients).

The evaluation shall be initiated by the Interdepartmental Steering Committee of the Swiss Federal Government, the so-called "Comité de Pilotage" (CdP). The CdP is in charge of implementing the Swiss interests with regard to the three Centres, in particular by managing the Swiss contributions to each of the Centres and by coordinating the positions of Swiss representatives in the governing bodies of each Centre. The CdP is also responsible for this external evaluation. The CdP has decided to assign the mandate for this independent evaluation (hereafter "the evaluation") through an "invitation to tender" process.

The CdP combines the requests by the Swiss Federal Parliament and expects the evaluation to nourish the review process for continuous improvement and provide insights into the future relevance of the cooperation for Swiss foreign policy.

The current external evaluation to be conducted in 2021/2022 will thus contribute:

1. to the drafting of the dispatch of the Federal Council to Parliament for the period from 2024 to 2027, addressing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of each of the three Geneva Centres;
2. to the work of the CdP for developing an internal strategy on a more comprehensive integration of the work of the three Geneva Centres into the framework of interests defined by the relevant Swiss foreign policy strategy papers by the second half of the 2020 years.

As a consequence, the task of the evaluators is twofold:

- a) **Evaluate** each of the three Geneva Centres with regard to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, with a particular emphasis on the capabilities and procedures linked to strategy development and implementation at the level of each Centre.

---

<sup>1</sup> See annex.

<sup>2</sup> Please note that there can be multiple Result Chains per Centre, depending on their activities. E.g. one Result Chain for courses offered and another one for investment into projects with third parties on site etc.

- b) **Provide advice** to the CdP on developing an internal strategy on a more comprehensive integration of the work of the three Geneva Centres into the framework of interests defined by the relevant Swiss foreign policy strategy papers by the second half of the 2020 years.

### 3.2 Prior involvement

No potential tenderers were involved in preparing the invitation procedure or drafting the invitation documentation. All tenderers that meet the criteria set are invited to submit a bid.

### 3.3 Objectives

In light of both the aforementioned tasks, the **overall objective** of the evaluation is threefold:

- a) **Accountability:** The evaluation shall account for the results achieved by GCSP, GICHD and DCAF between 2018 und end of 2020. It shall produce information and insights for the next dispatch on aspects of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.
- b) **Learning:** The evaluation shall contribute to the corporate development of GCSP, GICHD and DCAF, in particular with a view on the strategic positioning of each Centre and its current procedures/processes
- to analyze its strategic environment and relevant developments;
  - to assess the level of implementation of its current strategy;
  - to create synergies at the "Maison de la Paix" in Geneva.
- c) **Providing advice:** As the evaluators will gain an in-depth view of the situation of each Centre and its environment, they will be in a good position to provide advice on elements of importance that will facilitate the work of the CdP for developing an internal strategy on a more comprehensive integration of the work of the three Geneva Centres into the framework of interests defined by the relevant Swiss foreign policy strategy papers by the second half of the 2020 years.

### 3.4 Content of the mandate

The CdP decided that the evaluation shall be conducted by one evaluation team that carries out the assessment of all three Centres. This approach allows for a coherent assessment and for analysing the potential for synergies between the Centres.

The evaluation shall consist of two tasks:

- a) **Task 1 – Evaluation:** The evaluator shall assess aspects of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency** and **sustainability** of each of the three Centres, answer questions that are common to all three Centres, and then focus on issues that are specific to each Centre;  
⇒ See Section 3.4.1
- b) **Task 2 – Provide advice:** The evaluator shall provide advice to the CdP for developing an internal strategy on a more comprehensive integration of the work of the three Geneva Centres into the framework of interests defined by the relevant Swiss foreign policy strategy papers by the second half of the 2020 years.  
⇒ See section 3.4.2

### 3.4.1 Task 1 – Evaluation

One part of the evaluation shall be focused on the quality of implementation and achievements in relation to

- the tasks and priorities defined in the current dispatch (Chapter 2: *Auftrag und Schwerpunkte 2020–2023*);
- the Framework Agreement 2020-2023;
- the recommendations made in the previous evaluation.

Furthermore, governance structures, institutional mechanisms, management procedures, stakeholder perception and donor satisfaction of each of the Centres will be looked at. This review must also include an evaluation of the implementation of the approx. 20 recommendations made in the last evaluation (see 3.3 Accountability and Learning).

**Limitations:** Specific activities or projects carried out by each of the Centres are not in the focus of this evaluation. However, certain activities might be assessed in order to analyse the results monitoring mechanisms (i.e. does a results-based management exist and if so how does it work) and the quality of the services offered or to illustrate general observations.

**Special Considerations:** The below sets of questions in sections A – E are meant as general guidance for the expert. As such, they must be considered for a better understanding of the kind of information the CdP is looking for. In any case, in the Inception Report, the evaluators are expected to present a structured, consolidated and where necessary reformulated sets of questions for the purpose of the evaluation (task 1) and the provision of advice (task 2) with the Inception Report.

As a general rule, any "How?" questions for the assessment of a specific aspect must be complemented by a scale which the evaluator will use to assess that particular aspect. Where such a scale cannot be provided or is not meaningful, the question should be formulated as a "Does?" question to evaluate the existence and effectiveness of internal instruments and measures<sup>3</sup>. Possible examples are:

**Example 1: "How?" Question:** *How do the Centers assure an appropriate risk management function?*

Requirement: in the Inception Report, the evaluators need to provide a scale to assess and make a statement about the maturity and appropriateness of the existing risk management function in the context of the particular Centre.

**Example 2: "Does?" Question:** *Does the Centre have a risk management system that is effective and coherently applied?*

Requirement: The evaluators can use well-established methods to evaluate the existence and the level of effectiveness of the aspect to be analysed.

⇒ *The CdP invites the evaluators to propose "How?" questions whenever possible.*

#### A) Relevance

##### Overarching questions:

- How does each Centre assure that its activities are relevant and will remain relevant?
- What mechanisms does each Centre apply to assure the highest excellence in their respective fields of activities?

##### Strategic relevance (in general):

1. How does each Centre analyse current trends and anticipate future trends and developments in their respective areas of activities?
2. How does each Centre position itself in its rapidly changing environment?

---

<sup>3</sup> Existence in the sense of "does something exist, is it documented, coherently applied or at least commonly understood through-out a Centre". Effectiveness in the sense of "is the respective instrument suitable to meet the desired objective".

3. How does each Centre anticipate, analyse and integrate major donors' strategies, needs and trends in their relevant domains of expertise?

Excellence:

4. How is each Centre perceived in the international context, in particular by different stakeholders (donors, customers, partners), such as States, international, regional, national and non-governmental organisations?
5. How are the roles, performance, services and contributions of each Centre assessed by both international and national stakeholders, and representatives of the respective sectors / industries?
6. What is each Centre's value added compared to other organizations operating in the same area?
7. Are the profiles of the experts of each Centre adequate to meet the Centres needs? Are there any gaps?
8. Does each Centre have adequate processes in place to continuously raise its profile with key stakeholders/stakeholder groups?
9. Has each Centre actively sought to sharpen its respective profile?
10. Has each Centre established a perspective to promote synergies with other partners within the Maison de la Paix?

## **B) Effectiveness**

Overarching questions:

- Is each Centre doing the right things?
- What mechanisms are in place at each Centre to assure the achievement of the desired impact?

Implementation and continuous tracking of the strategy:

11. How does each Centre assure its effectiveness today and plans to do so in the future? Does each Centre have a formalized and transparent strategy development and strategy implementation process? Does the outcome (e.g. products and services) of each Centre meet the needs and expectations of the relevant stakeholders?
12. Is each Centre implementing a Results Based Management (RBM) approach?
13. To what extent have the current strategic objectives of each Centre been met?
14. How does each Centre communicate achievements along the implementation of its strategy?
15. How does each Centre contribute to the achievement of the SDG 2030?
16. Are the so called "additional Swiss funds" used in accordance with the activities defined in the dispatch (see annex 7, section 4.3, page 1166)?

Corporate governance and management structures:

17. Are the Governance structures operating in an independent manner? To what extent can both the Councils of Foundation and their Bureaus ensure adequate risk analysis and management?
18. Does each Centre have an adequate risk management system in place?
19. Are the governance structures of each Centre adequate in order to allow an efficient and effective implementation of their respective strategies?
20. Are the management and governance structures and procedures of each Centre adequate with regard to the size and the nature of their services?
21. Are the governance structures and procedures of each Centre adequate with regard to the working context and to the donor relations, the current funding situation and the financial risks of the respective Centre?
22. Have any adjustments of governance structures taken place since 2018, or are there any specific plans to make such adjustments in the near future?
23. Are the organisational structures dynamic and flexible enough to respond to future challenges and requirements in a timely fashion?
24. Are standardized reporting processes (management and governance), including effective corrective steering procedures in place?

## **C) Efficiency**

Overarching question: How well does each Centre manage the resources at their disposal?

25. Have the financial sources for each Centre been diversified (as stipulated in the dispatch), and has particularly the share of funds by third parties reached or surpassed the defined thresholds (GCSP: min. 25%, GICHD: min. 35%, DCAF: min. 50% of the total revenue (Swiss project funds excluded) through contributions by donors other than the Swiss Confederation)?
26. Does each Centre make optimal use of the financial and human resources to produce the expected outcomes?
27. How does each Centre assure funding with a mid-term and long-term perspective?
28. How is each Centre positioned and prepared for their work in fragile contexts? I.e. is the Centre well equipped, structured and staffed in order to work in fragile states? Are their structures flexible enough and allow for adaptive management?
29. Is the proportion of personnel expense between core experts (permanent staff) and external experts (temporarily mandated) adequate, measured in terms of outcome?
30. How does each Centre address the potential to develop a joint IT-policy or to use synergies with regard to logistics?

#### **D) Sustainability**

Overarching Question: How sustainable are the results achieved by each Centre (relating to either internal or external risk factors)?

31. How does each Centre define "Sustainability"? Based on this definition, how sustainable is each of the Centres? Are there any shortcomings?
32. Is there an overall long-term strategy in place (i.e. strategy paper)? What timespan does each Centre consider as its strategic planning cycle?<sup>4</sup> How far (in years) is the outlook for each center?
33. Are there mechanisms in place to cope with unexpected crises (crisis management other than COVID-19)?
34. How resilient has each Centre been so far in light of COVID-19? To what degree have the operations of each Centre been affected by the COVID-19 crisis?
35. How well has each Centre reacted and adapted to the challenges of the COVID-19 crisis?
36. Is the current technology platform (i.e. E-Learning, Video Teleconference Centre etc.) used in each Centre adequate for alternative content delivery formats?
37. What is the level of independent ability of a partner/government to continue the intervention after the Centre's support is discontinued?
38. Employees: Is the workforce adequate in terms of quality and quantity in order to implement the strategy, tasks and achieve the long-term goals of the Centre (quality)?
39. How high is employee satisfaction at each Centre? Are there any issues that need special attention?
40. Has each Centre implemented a formalized lessons learned (continuous improvement) process?
41. How does each Centre include gender equality, employment satisfaction and improving working environment into their corporate development?

#### **E) Specific questions addressing concrete thematic issues for each Centre:**

##### GCSP

42. Are the thematic focus and the service offered by the GCSP appropriate, dynamic and competitive? Is it in line with its statutory tasks and the ones defined in the federal dispatch 2020-2023 (particularly with regard to training, analysis and dialogue facilitation)?
43. Does the GCSP offer appropriate training methods that meet today's requests by the international civil and military clients?
44. Has the GCSP increased its competitiveness compared to other training institutions in the domain of excellence?
45. What are the concrete outcomes as a result of GCSP activities? Has the GCSP in particular extended its course programme and the circle of potential customers?
46. What is the competitive advantage (USP) compared to other leading security policy institutions?
47. Have the positions of both, the Council of Foundation and their Bureaus being strengthened in the past? And does the strengthening allow a better risk analysis and management than before?

---

<sup>4</sup> The strategic planning cycle embodied in a set of formal planning procedures, ensures that managers examine major strategic issues, faced by their [organization](#). This is necessary to overcome the natural preoccupation with short term operational problems. The formal planning cycle also provides a logical [framework](#) to enable managers to tackle their strategic issues in a systematic way, and so ensure that no major issues are left unaddressed.

48. How has the GCSP diversified its activities to better respond to the need of its community?
49. How has the GCSP improved its support to its community?
50. How has the GCSP been engaging with its audience and disseminating its knowledge and expertise?

#### GICHD

51. What are the concrete outcomes (e.g. quality and benefit in the perception of donors and customers) as a result of GICHD activities? Is there a gap between Stakeholders expectation and the actual products and services offered by the Centre?
52. Is the scope of the thematic, regional and country-specific offerings of GICHD adequate, contemporary and effective, taking into account the evolving working context (for example: new contamination, contamination in urban areas, role of new technologies, adoption of the Oslo and Lausanne Action Plans)?
53. What is the GICHD's performance regarding leveraging its expertise for integrated support to countries?
54. How does the GICHD integrate new developments in the domain of mine action (and explosive risk reduction in general), both on a global level and on a country-specific level?
55. Is the role of the GICHD in fostering new technologies in mine action (and explosive risk reduction in general) adequate and effective, taking into account the evolving working context? How could it be improved?
56. What is the GICHD's performance regarding its cooperation and coordination with other mine action actors, including governments, national authorities, UN agencies, research centres, operators, and other relevant organizations?
57. Is the hosting of the Implementation Support Unit to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention and the Implementation Support Unit to the Convention on Cluster Munitions functional? Are there unexploited synergies?
58. To what extent was the GICHD able to position itself and AMAT in the field of Ammunition Management? What is the GICHD's performance regarding its cooperation and coordination with stakeholders in Ammunition Management, including those in Geneva?
59. To what extent has the strategic shift towards risk reduction from unexploded ordnances been integrated in the overall programming? To what extent have GICHD's increased capacities in general, and in the field of gender and explosive ordnance risk education in particular, led to the desired outcomes?

#### DCAF

60. Has DCAF taken adequate measures to operate / adjust in the rapidly changing and dynamic environment of Security Sector Governance?
61. How is DCAF interacting with other relevant actors active in the field of SSR/G? Namely, has DCAF increased its collaboration with the United Nations and other multilateral partners in the domain of security sector reform and governance in terms of concrete products and services?
62. Has DCAF increased its support on police-related and other SSR/G-related activities (globally or in specific countries) in terms of concrete products and services?
63. Is the scope of core competencies (thematic areas) and activity lines (services) adequate, contemporary and effective?
64. Has ISSAT been sufficiently integrated into the overall DCAF structure? To what extent are the different departments of DCAF (including ISSAT) contributing to the overall DCAF objectives? What could be improved?
65. What is DCAF's process to measure its performance? How is the new Strategy related to the performance report of the organization?
66. To what extent have the organizational structure and internal policies been efficient and contributed to the effective delivery of DCAF's strategy over the period under review? What has changed in terms of organizational structure and internal policies since the last independent evaluation? Are these measures adequate in order to contribute in a more effective and efficient way to the overall DCAF objectives?
67. How are the donors involved in strategic and thematic discussions? Is there room for improvement? Are the structures adequate for effective donor commitment?
68. What types of immediate and intermediate outcomes can be observed as a result of DCAF's support to national and international actors in line with its corporate results framework?

### 3.4.2 Task 2 – Provide advice

While previous evaluations confirmed a high degree of relevance of the activities and achievements of all three Centres for their respective mandates, the question of the relevance for Swiss foreign policy was not systematically dealt with. This question not only relates to the ability of the Centres to adapt to a constantly changing environment. In doing so and in order to justify the continuation of the current cooperation, the Centres also need to maintain their relevance for the achievement of Swiss foreign policy objectives.

Swiss foreign policy objectives are driven by Switzerland's interests and values enshrined in the Swiss Constitution (art. 2 and 54) and relevant laws<sup>5</sup>, and described in the Swiss Foreign Policy Strategy 2020-2023. In addition, the FDFA also published a vision for its foreign policy till 2028, called AVIS 28.

As the work of the evaluators will provide them with an in-depth perspective of the positioning of each of the three Centres, of their current strategies, of their internal capabilities and procedures with regard to strategy development and implementation, they shall also provide advice to the CdP with regard to its task to develop an internal strategy on a more comprehensive integration of the work of the three Geneva Centres into the framework of interests defined by the relevant Swiss foreign policy strategy papers by the second half of the 2020 years.

At a minimum, the evaluators shall produce input:

- a) on the process, methodology and methods the CdP shall consider when developing its internal strategy;
- b) on the elements of particular importance within the structure, the environment or the work of each of the three Geneva Centres that the CdP shall take into consideration when developing its internal strategy.

### 3.4.3 Deliverables

Under the mandate assigned to the evaluation team the following deliverables are expected (all in English):

- **Inception Report (max 12 pages)** with the following information: refined methodology, refined evaluation questions etc. for both tasks 1 and 2, workplan and a proposal regarding format and structure of the deliverables for tasks 1 and 2. The Inception Report shall be addressed to the CdP (via damiano.sguaitamatti[at]eda.admin.ch) for discussion and approval.
- **Draft Report for task 1 and 2**, including key findings and recommendations, shall be addressed to the CdP (via the "Steuergruppe" StG<sup>6</sup>) and to the directors of the Centres for comments.
- **Final Evaluation Report (task 1)**: Evaluation Report of max. 20 pages for each Centre, plus a maximum 10 pages overall report on synergies and comparisons, annexes and an executive summary of max. 3 pages, including key findings and recommendations.
- **Final Report with recommendations to the CdP (task 2)** with regard to the development of an internal strategy on a more comprehensive integration of the work of the three Geneva Centres into the framework of interests defined by the relevant Swiss foreign policy strategy papers by the second half of the 2020 years

### 3.4.4 Methodology and Requirements

The evaluation shall be carried out according to the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards, including the DAC Guidelines on Evaluating Peacebuilding Activities in Settings of Conflict and Fragility (OECD 2012) as well as to the Swiss Evaluation Standards (SEVAL- Standards). For the GICHD, also the

---

<sup>5</sup> In particular the Federal Law on International Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid (SR 974.0) and the Federal Law on Civilian Peacebuilding and Human Rights (SR 193.9).

<sup>6</sup> The StG is an interdepartmental working group preparing the CdP meetings.

International Mine Action Standard 14.10 "Evaluation of Mine Action interventions" applies. For the GCSP, the EduQua standards also apply.

The methodology for the evaluation (task 1) shall include:

- Study of relevant documents (particularly on the strategic and/or political level).
- Interviews and discussions with representatives of the management and staff of the Centres, of the CdP and with the members of the Foundation Councils and Bureaus of each foundation as well as with members of the advisory boards.
- Surveys/interviews with stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries of the Centres (in the respective domains of the Centres' activities).
- Visits of partners abroad.
- Identification of issues that would require further investigation.

The evaluation team shall elaborate a specific methodology for assessing the questions under 3.4.2 and present a refined methodology for the entire evaluation in its inception report.

The recommendations should address the issues that need specific attention to strengthen the Centres' relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. The recommendations should allow for concrete improvements at strategic and operational levels. Presentation and discussion of findings, recommendations, and other issues will be discussed during a workshop with the CdP at the end of the evaluation process.

### 3.4.5 Institutional set-up and responsibilities

The following governing bodies are part of the institutional set-up for the evaluation and have the responsibilities thereafter:

**The evaluating expert(s) resp. team (hereafter: the evaluators):** The evaluators conduct the evaluation according to the mandate and Terms of References. While the evaluators are in a regular and close contact with the focal points of the evaluation, the evaluators have an independent position, meaning that the evaluators are free in their conclusions and thus recommendations.

**Committee (Comité de Pilotage, CdP):** The CdP is the awarding authority for the evaluation. The CdP is composed of representatives from the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, FDFA (State Secretariat, and Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation SDC) and of the Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport, DDPS (General Secretariat, and International Relations Defence). The CdP receives all reports and products of the evaluation and will provide a management response.

**Steuerguppe (StG):** The StG ensures the day to day management, coordination and the quality of the evaluation process, including the tender process, and serves as point of contact for the Geneva Centres and the evaluation team during the evaluation process and maintains the dialogue with them.

**GCSP, GICHD and DCAF (the three Geneva Centres or Centres)** are the subject of the evaluation. The Centres participate in the formulation of the questions for the evaluation in the Terms of Reference. Each Centre receives the inception report, the evaluation report and formulates the management response regarding its specific recommendations.

### 3.5 Estimated amount / volume

An estimated amount of 400 hours are planned for the execution of this mandate/evaluation. The rate per hour includes insurance, allowances, social costs and overheads. Additional expenses, such as travel, must be listed. All the price details must be indicated in Swiss Francs (CHF) excl. VAT.

The tenderer will not be reimbursed for any costs arising from the preparation or submission of bid.

### 3.6 Timetable invitation procedure

The following stages are completed prior to making the award decision: the awarding office reserves the right to make amendments.

Deadline	Activity
27 May 2021	Invitation of at least 3 tenderers and publication of the mandate on the <a href="#">FDFA mandates platform</a>
10 June 2021	Deadline for expression of interest and submission of questions by e-mail to damiano.sguaitamatti[at]eda.admin.ch.
25 June 2021	Sharing of answers to submitted questions to all parties having expressed interest
<b>23 July 2021</b>	<b>Deadline for submission of complete offers</b>
Before 30 September 2021	Selection of the evaluators – Written information to winning tenderer and refused tenderers
Mid October 2021	Finalisation of contract and administrative questions
November 2021	Inception Report and Inception Workshop
November 2021 – February 2022	Evaluation according to ToR / mandate
Until 28 February 2022	Submission of Preliminary Draft Report (for consultation) to both the CdP and the three Centres
Until 23 March 2022	Feedback by the CdP as well as the three Centres on the Draft Report
<b>Until 16 April 2022</b>	<b>Finalisation of the Evaluation Report, Submission of the final report to both the Swiss Federal Administration and the three Centres</b>
Until 31 May 2022	Finalisation of management responses by the CdP and the three Centres

The tenderers are requested to reserve these dates and periods.

## 4 Eligibility criteria

The tenderer must duly fulfil without limitation or modification the following eligibility criteria. The tenderer must also provide, where indicated, the necessary evidence with the submission of the bid.

Only those tenderers that fulfil all formal requirements and eligibility criteria will be evaluated on the basis of the award criteria. The other tenderers will be excluded from the further procedure.

**→ Please confirm fulfilment of Eligibility Criteria and submission of documents on Annex 00 “Confirmation EC – Eligibility Criteria”**

## 5 Award criteria

The following table shows the award criteria (AC) and the corresponding weightings, on the basis of which the tenders will be evaluated.

No.	Award criterion	Weighting
<b>AC1</b>	<b>Qualification and experience of nominated team</b>	<b>35%</b>
1.1	Composition of the proposed evaluation team: required skills and experience in relation to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the objectives of the evaluation</li> <li>- the experience of similar evaluations</li> <li>- expertise in security policy, mine action, security sector governance and reform, as well as in education;</li> <li>- knowledge of current and future trends in security policy, mine action, security sector governance and reform,</li> <li>- expertise with regards to public sector strategy assignments.</li> </ul>	(30%)
1.2	Composition of the proposed evaluation team: required skills and experience in relation to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- expertise in corporate development, strategy development and corporate governance,</li> <li>- knowledge of the languages required English, French, German.</li> </ul>	(30%)
1.3	Qualification of the <b>team leader</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Senior expert in evaluation</li> <li>- Knowledge of academic institutions</li> <li>- Confirmed experience in management of a team for evaluations and assessments comparable in size and scope</li> <li>- confirmed knowledge of the themes of security policy, mine action, security sector governance and reform</li> <li>- professional experience of "International Geneva"</li> <li>- knowledge of Swiss foreign policy</li> <li>- language skills in English, French, German</li> </ul>	(40%)
<b>AC2</b>	<b>Understanding of the mandate and general approach</b>	<b>30%</b>
2.1	Understanding of the mandate and proposed approach for the evaluation	(60%)
2.2	Measures taken for ensuring quality assurance	(20%)
2.3	Proposal for the mainstreaming of gender	(20%)
<b>AC3</b>	<b>Procedure and organisation</b>	<b>10%</b>
3.1	Agenda for the implementation of the evaluation	(50%)
3.2	Rationality of the proposed organisation/structure, coherence of the distribution of responsibilities, complementarity of the team, coverage of the thematic fields of evaluation	(50%)
<b>AC4</b>	<b>Financial Proposal</b>	<b>25%</b>
4.1	Clarity of the proposition, full character of the cost structure, realistic estimation of the costs	(20%)
4.2	The overall price is to be submitted only together with the budget form as per Annex 4 of the Terms of Reference, in accordance with section 3.5 of this document and to include the follow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Working hours related to the mandate (indicating rate per hour)</li> <li>▪ Travel expenses</li> <li>▪ Other expenses</li> <li>▪ ...</li> </ul> $\text{Score} = \left( \frac{P_{\min} \times \text{max. Points}}{P} \right)^n$ <p>P = Price of the Proposal to be assessed  P min = Price of the lowest Proposal  n = 1</p>	(80%)

Each further award criterion will be evaluated according to the following score table:

Score	Fulfilment and quality of the criteria	
0	Cannot be established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information has no significance</li> </ul>
1	Very poor fulfilment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information is incomplete</li> <li>Data quality is very poor</li> </ul>
2	Poor fulfilment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information relates inadequately to the requirements</li> <li>Data quality is poor</li> </ul>
3	Average fulfilment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information generally relates adequately to the requirements</li> <li>Data quality is adequate</li> </ul>
4	Good fulfilment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information focuses well on requirements</li> <li>Data quality is good</li> </ul>
5	Very good fulfilment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information clearly relates to the achievement of outputs</li> <li>Data quality is excellent</li> </ul>

## 6 Structure and content of the bid

The tenderer must adhere to the following structure in the interests of fairness and in order to expedite the evaluation process.

Nr.	Contents	Max. No. Pages	EC/AC
01	Cover letter with signature(s) and documents evidencing organisational capability	2	EC1
02	Self-declaration form 'Compliance with the participation conditions' (annex 3)	1	EC 2
03	'Tenderer Information' form, signed (annex 1)	--	EC 3
04	Acceptance of GTC and Code of conduct for contractual partners of FDFA (as per annexes 2a and 2b)	--	EC 4
05	Qualifications of the personnel to be deployed (CVs), of the concept, approach, understanding of the mandate, experience etc.	5	EC 10/AC 1
06	Written proof of experiences – References	6	EC 6/AC 1
07	Written confirmation of human resources for the mandate, incl. language skills	1	EC 7&9
08	<u>Financial offer</u> The offer has to be handed in duly signed, in CHF according to the budget form in annex 4.		AC 4
09	<u>Technical Offer</u> Introduction with motivation for the evaluation Appraisal of the mandate / approach Description of the refined methodology Refined workplan Competencies, roles and responsibilities of the team members. Profile of team leader.	8	AC1-AC3; SC10-SC11

## 7 Administrative aspects

### 7.1 Official name and address of the contracting authority

The Peace and Human Rights Division of the FDFA (Bundesgasse 32, 3003 Bern) manages the award procedure and is also the direct mandating party for the tenderer.

### 7.2 Deadline and address for submitting bids

The bid must be sent by e-mail to [damiano.sguaitamatti@jeda.admin.ch](mailto:damiano.sguaitamatti@jeda.admin.ch) by **23 July 2021 23h00** (date and time of e-mail submission) at the latest, with the following reference: "Offer External Evaluation Geneva Centres"

- Please submit the financial proposal in CHF (Swiss Francs).
- The bid can be submitted in Italian, German, French, or English.
- Bids received late cannot be taken into consideration. They will be returned to the tenderer.

In all cases the tenderer must retain proof of the timely submission of the bid.

### 7.3 Expression of interest in submitting an offer and receiving documents

Interested tenderers can express their interest in submitting an offer by e-mail to

[damiano.sguaitamatti@jeda.admin.ch](mailto:damiano.sguaitamatti@jeda.admin.ch) until 10 June 2021 (close of business) and will receive these terms of reference and additional documents by e-mail in return.

### 7.4 Answering questions

Questions concerning the awarding of the mandate can be sent by 10 June 2021 (close of business). Please send in questions in writing by e-mail ([damiano.sguaitamatti@jeda.admin.ch](mailto:damiano.sguaitamatti@jeda.admin.ch)).

PLEASE NOTE: The answers will be made available by e-mail by 25 June 2021 to all tenderers who have expressed an interest in submitting an offer.

### 7.5 Type of procedure

Procurement is carried out by invitation o tender in accordance with the Federal Act on Public Procurement of 21 June 2019, PPA, SR 172.056.1.

It is **not** possible to appeal the award.

### 7.6 In accordance with GATT / WTO agreement or treaty (as applicable)

This is a public contract under Annex 5 no. 1 let. d PPA. There is no right of appeal.

### 7.7 Evaluation and adjustment of bids

Tenders are evaluated in accordance with Art. 38 PPA. Tenders may only be adjusted at the contracting authority's specific request. Adjustments must be undertaken in accordance with Art. 39 PPA and subject to the conditions set out therein.

### 7.8 Bidding consortia

Consortia of tenderers are permitted. If the CdP concludes the contract with several contractors (consortium), all parties must sign, having first designated a person to represent the consortium vis-à-vis the CdP. The representative is expressly authorised to act for and on behalf of the consortium members. The consortium members shall be jointly and severally liable. The tenderer lists all members and their roles.

## **7.9 Subcontractors**

Subcontractors are permitted, subject to the prior approval of the CdP. If the tenderer engages subcontractors in order to carry out the work, the tenderer will assume overall responsibility. It must list all the subcontractors involved, together with the roles allocated to them, in Annex 1 "Tenderer information".

Any contractual delegation by the contractor of performance of all or part of the present contract to subcontractors shall be subject to the prior written consent of the contracting authority. Subcontractors and their personnel must satisfy all conditions stipulated in the present contract and the appendices thereto. The contracting authority shall be liable solely to the contractor. In the event that the contractor delegates performance of all or part of the contract, the contractor shall bear sole liability for the acts of any subcontractors. As a general rule the tenderer is required to make the characteristic supply.

## **7.10 Multiple tenders by single tenderers and subcontractors**

Consortia members are allowed to participate exclusively in one bid. The tenderer lists all members and their roles. Single tenderers are allowed to participate exclusively in one bid. Subcontractors are allowed to participate in different bids.

## **7.11 Validity of bids**

180 days after the deadline for receipt of bids.

## **7.12 Languages of invitation document**

The invitation document is available in English.

## **7.13 Language of the procedure**

The present procurement procedure is conducted in English. This means that all statements on the part of the contracting authority are made at least in this language.

## **7.14 Conclusion of contract**

The contract is concluded subject to the prior approval of credits by the FDFA.

# **8 Further information**

## **8.1 Confidentiality**

The parties shall keep confidential any facts and information that are not generally known or in the public domain. In case of doubt, all facts and information shall be treated as strictly confidential. The parties shall take all measures, to the extent that they are commercially reasonable and practicable in technical and organisational terms, to ensure that confidential facts and information are properly protected against access by, or disclosure to, unauthorised third parties.

Any transfer of confidential information by the contracting authority within its own organisation (or within the Federal Administration), or to any third parties appointed, is not deemed to constitute a breach of the obligation of confidentiality. The foregoing also applies to tenderers to the extent that the disclosure of confidential information is required for the performance of the contract, or provisions of the contract are disclosed within the organisation.

The tenderer may not, without the contracting authority's written consent, publicise the fact that a cooperation arrangement with the contracting authority is or was in effect or cite the contracting authority as a reference.

The parties shall ensure that their employees, subcontractors, suppliers and any other third parties appointed comply with the foregoing obligations of confidentiality.

## 8.2 Integrity clause

Tenderers undertake to take all necessary measures to avoid corruption and, in particular, agree not to offer or accept payments or other advantages.

Tenderers who breach this integrity clause are required to pay a contractual penalty to the contracting authority amounting to 10% of the value of the contract or at least CHF 3,000 for each instance of breach.

The tenderer notes that any breach of the integrity clause will generally result in cancellation of the award or early termination of the contract for good cause by the contracting authority.

The parties shall inform each other of any well-founded suspicions of corruption.

## 8.3 Property rights

All industrial property rights which arise in the course of the performance of the mandate shall pass to the contracting authority.

# 9 Annexes

No.	Annex
00	Catalogue of Eligibility Criteria
01	'Tenderer Information' form
02a	General Terms and Conditions (GTC) of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA) for mandates (type A and B)
02b	Code of Conduct for Contractual Partners of the FDFA
03	Self-declaration form 'Compliance with the participation conditions'
04	Budget form type B (for legal entities, organisations and self-employed persons)
07	Federal Dispatch on the framework credit 2020-2023 in support of the three Geneva Centres (online, available in German, French and Italian)
08	External Evaluation of the Geneva Centres, GCSP, GICHD and DCAF (2014-2017), Final Report (incl. final recommendations)
09	Swiss Foreign Policy Strategy 2020-2023
10	AVIS 28

**The bidders will receive the annexes 1-10 upon expression of interest, see point 7.3. above.**