Term of Reference
FINAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF UKRAINE CASH CONSORTIUM (UCC)

FUNDED BY USAID/BHA
April 2023

1. Background

The Ukraine Cash Consortium (UCC) comprises Mercy Corps, Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), and People in Need (PIN). The Consortium's programmatic work currently consists of the implementation of a $100 million, 17-month USAID/Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA) award of the same name. The program's goal is to meet emergency basic needs while enhancing the protection environment for approximately 320,000 internally-displaced people (IDPs), returnees and other conflict-affected people (CAPs) in Ukraine.

The purposes of the program are:

Purpose 1: Address Basic Needs of Households in Areas of Ukraine where markets are functioning through provision of Multipurpose Cash Assistance

From October 1, 2022, to March 31, 2023, UCC partners delivered MPCA to 135,680 unique individuals, reaching a total of 175,016 individuals since the beginning of the project. Individuals received a one-off payment of 6,660 UAH or the equivalent of about USD 180, to provide three months of assistance at UAH 2,220 (approximately USD 60) per month. Assistance was prioritized in newly liberated and highly conflict-affected locations where humanitarian needs are at their most acute. Of the 175,016 individuals reached to date, 85% are from front-line oblasts in Eastern and Southern Ukraine

Purpose 2: Address Basic Needs of Households in Areas of Ukraine where Markets are weak through Provision of Food, Water and Shelter Assistance

To date, Mercy Corps has distributed emergency household NFI kits and hygiene kits to 1,119 unique households (3,204 individuals) in Dnipro and Zaporizhia oblasts, which represents a 110% achievement against the revised target of 2,907 individuals. In specific areas where UCC is implemented, markets have remained open and continued to function , leading to minimal need for NFI distributions or food assistance. For this reason, targets have been reduced. Despite that,

if and when market functionality deteriorates, Mercy Corps stands ready to distribute NFI and food assistance.

Following the preparatory work conducted during the first quarter of the project, and per Shelter and NFI (SNFI) Cluster guidance, PIN developed the following cash assistance range for rent to be provided: 3-person HH - up to 11,000 UAH, 4-person HH – up to 12,000 UAH, and 5-person HH and above – up to 13,000 UAH per month, for a 6-month period. The amount reflected is slightly higher than the recommended cluster indicative cost considering the market and rental prices in Ivano-Frankivs'ka oblast, where PIN decided to implement this pilot activity due to its presence through other donors. In January 2023, PIN worked closely with local authorities and CSOs to conduct online registration through KoBo form, as well as in-person registration in collective centers, to identify eligible families. Currently, 79 households (316 individuals) (out of 150 HHs targeted) have already received the first out of three tranches covering two months' rent. An additional 16 families are in the process of receiving the first tranche. PIN is also working with a local partner, Metelab, to identify 15 more families who meet the eligibility criteria and shall be enrolled in the second half of April 2023. Information about the labor market was also gathered, analyzed, and shared with beneficiaries to support family members in finding employment opportunities to strengthen their capacity to pay the rent once the 6-month assistance is completed. Due to landlords' refusal to sign tenancy agreements, PIN is actively seeking alternative solutions, such as finding other rental properties, for 14 families eligible to receive cash for rent assistance in a relatively short period of time.

Additionally, in October 2022, Russian forces targeted civilian infrastructure, particularly Ukraine's power grid, and damaged or destroyed 50% of Ukraine's energy infrastructure. For months, large areas of the country were without power, resulting in intermittent access to reliable heating. Tens of thousands of families faced acute protection needs from the harsh winter. The project adapted to meet this emerging and critical humanitarian need. In November 2022 the cash top-up for winterization assistance was scaled up through an additional allocation of USD 6,829,043 from the pooled funds, of which USD 3,928,000 were allocated to Mercy Corps and USD 2,901,043 to PIN. Following SNFI Cluster guidelines, Mercy Corps and PIN identified the most vulnerable households, mainly among those who received MPCA (with the exception of 3,955 unique individuals), to receive an additional cash top-up for winterization assistance. During the reporting period, Mercy Corps and PIN provided winter assistance to 15,275 HHs (33,455 individuals), reaching 104% of the targeted households. The total transfer value per household was USD 312 for households registered in collective centers and USD 512 for households outside of collective centers. The targeting criteria, as defined by the UCC targeting model and scoring tool, included: HHs located in, or coming from, front-line conflict contact zones or heavily affected and recently liberated areas; HHs living in poor shelter conditions; HHs with a total monthly income of less than 5,400 Hryvnia; single and elderly-headed households; HHs with a large number of dependents; HHs' ability to meet their basic needs (self-declared through the reduced Coping Strategies Index (rCSI)).

Purpose 3: Provide Access for IDPs and CAPs to Critical Protection Information

Mercy Corps' support, local partners conducted supplementary protection activities to make the information services inclusive and accessible to the most marginalized community members:
- 140,931 people received general information through printed and digital information products, social media campaigns and group information sessions.
- 8,153 unique individuals accessed one-on-one information support.
- 1,683 individuals received psychosocial support (PSS) in the form of accompaniment to institutional appointments (welfare office, schools, doctors, etc.); psychological aid/counselling; mental health, and PSS provision for survivors of gender-based violence (GBV); and
- 263 people received legal aid in the form of group information sessions and individual counselling.

Mercy Corps trained team members and partner staff who are responsible for identifying, reporting, and addressing protection issues during interactions with participants according to standard protection guides for humanitarian agencies. To date, 122 unique participants (76% achievement of the target of 160 individuals) received training, which included training sessions on humanitarian principles, working with vulnerable groups, and protection in humanitarian settings; psychological first aid (PFA) training sessions; and gender equality and social inclusion (GESI).

1.1 Evaluation Purpose and Objective

The purpose of this Final evaluation is to assess UCC's overall program performance and delivery of program activities and assistance according to OECD/DAC evaluation criteria.
- The proposed objective of the evaluation is to help UCC to improve its future programming through lessons learned and best practices generated through this program.
- To identify areas of strength and weakness and provide feedback to improve future performance for consortium partners.
- To measure the effectiveness of program
- To ensure that the goals and objectives of the program have been met.
- To identify areas for improvement in processes, systems, and operations.
- To provide accountability and transparency for stakeholders.
- To assess VfM of the UCC programme primarily in terms of cost, time, quality and equity. The study will also assess the cost-efficiency of the effectiveness of the programme
- To determine the impact of interventions on target populations or communities.
- To assess the UUC complied with regulatory, legal, donor or accreditation requirements.
- Tentatively, indicator measurements verification. This will be agreed upon with the UCC MEL team and the Evaluation team and will be defined in the Analytical Framework, as agreed upon by both parties.

1.2 Evaluation Scope and Questions

The evaluation scope and framework should be organized around OECD/DAC evaluation criteria as follows, with suggested evaluation questions provided.

Relevance and design:

1. How effective has UCC been in establishing a common overall understanding of vulnerability and a common targeting approach (vulnerability criteria/scoring, overall outreach approach to identify vulnerable people)?
2. How well did UCC prioritize specific locations (Oblasts, Hromada, Raion, government controlled/non-government controlled, etc.) to provide assistance?
3. To what extent are households able to access the program's assistance? What were the barriers in accessing UCC's assistance and why?
4. To what extent the cash assistance has proven to be appropriate for the most vulnerable population including women, children, persons with disabilities/chronic illnesses, and older persons?
5. To what extent did the program consider gender equity, protection, age, physical and emotional challenges of the participants, and risks to participation in various interventions in activity design and implementation?
6. Was the response timely in assisting the most vulnerable populations with humanitarian assistance?
7. To what extent did UCC consult the community regarding the Program activities?
8. What are the cost drivers of the program? How are they affected by the program design with respect to equity? (VfM evaluation question)[1]

Efficiency:

1. Were there any human/financial resource barriers within UCC and did it affect assistance activities and delivery of program outcomes?
2. How cost efficient (i.e. MPCA and kits distribution components) was the response in terms of delivering humanitarian aid to the most vulnerable communities? What is the Cost Transfer Ratio (CTR)? How does the CTR evolve based on the location of the intervention, type of participants receiving assistance, and type of modality delivered?[2] How would the CTR change if the program was to scale up its household reach? (VfM evaluation question)
3. What are the main drivers affecting the efficiency (both cost efficiency and time efficiency) of UCC? (VfM evaluation question)
4. *How is the design of the response impacting the efficiency of UCC? (VfM evaluation question)*

---

[1] *Suggested metric: cost of a category as % of the total cost.*
[2] Suggested cost efficiency metric: CTR

Effectiveness:

1. Has UCC addressed the basic needs of affected people/households (women and men of different ages, children and persons with disabilities)? How? Was their feedback taken into consideration?
2. To what extent has the program approach effectively met the stated program objectives, outcomes, targets and delivered outputs in a timely manner?
3. Has UCC sufficiently adapted to a fluid and insecure context to deliver appropriate assistance in a timely fashion and effectively address the urgent needs of the target population?
4. Was the modality flexibility approach used effectively? What are the positive outcomes of adopting a flexible modality approach?
5. How did the cash assistance and NFIs compare to other forms of social welfare programs in terms of effectiveness and cost?
6. How effective were the three different modality approaches - self registration, in person registration, and through local partners? What were the comparative advantages?
7. How effective was the local partnership approach of UCC partners?
8. How effective was communication and information sharing with Community Members regarding the program activities? And to what extent were the community members and program participants comfortable in using the available feedback channels for suggestions, feedback or complaints, including sensitive complaints?
9. What's the contribution of output to reach outcome level results? (VfM evaluation question)
10. Has UCC been able to address the originally identified inclusion barriers, and how? (VfM evaluation question)

Impact:

1. Are there any unintended consequences (negative and positive) on program participants as a result of this program?
2. How did the UCC manage and mitigate risks over the course of the program?
3. Did the UCC Program affect the market and market systems - positively and/or negatively?
4. Have there been any differences in the implementation or impact of the cash assistance program among the different consortium members and their areas of operation? (reaching NGCA,..etc).
5. What impact did the available budget and staffing structure of AAP within UCC and within each partner have on adoption of AAP approaches through the program cycle and what lessons can be learned?

Learning:

1. How was external and/or internal evidence used to design UCC program activities?
2. To what extent have the consortium members been able to share best practices, and how has this contributed to the success of the project?

Sustainability

1. Does UCC have an adequate exit strategy in place for its programming to ensure sustainability?
2. To what extent did UCC implement measures to strengthen partners' institutions, capacities and systems to promote Accountability to Affected People.

2.1 Evaluation Project Tasks

1. Conduct data collection and analysis based on the agreed upon analytical framework
2. Refine the evaluation objectives and primary research questions in consultation with UCC management team.
3. Incorporate specific research questions regarding strategic Program areas and activities undertaken during the Program
4. Devise and test a methodology and evaluation tools to address the specific objectives and individual research questions of the evaluation and obtain sign off from UCC management team on these
5. Conduct secondary data collection and desk research, including using UCC's existing project monitoring data, to identify gaps in data coverage and knowledge
6. Collect primary data in Ukraine and through various stakeholders to address the specific research questions of the evaluation
7. Provide a draft report to UCC management that will be incorporated into ongoing Program planning and evaluation, as well as recommendations for maximising social impact
8. Facilitate an online workshop to validate the findings of the Final evaluation with UCC and partners staff and other stakeholders.
9. Incorporate UCC feedback into a draft report and prepare a final report. The final report should both describe the results of the evaluation, and provide actionable recommendations for improving UCC's Program
10. Provide an English version of the Final Evaluation report, including an English and Ukrainian versions for the Summary/External report, and a separate VfM report (no more than 15 pages)

2.2 Timeline

Activity	Provisional Deadline
Contract Signing and drafting inception report	18 July 2023
SUBMISSION: Draft Inception Report and Instruments	25 July 2023
Client Feedback on Draft	1 Aug 2023

SUBMISSION: Final Inception Report and Instruments	4 Aug 2023
Enumerators Training and data collection	9 Aug 2023
SUBMISSION: Field updates. Data Collection (multiple consultants can deploy for more efficient collection)	17 Aug 2023
Data Analysis and Report Writing	21 Aug 2023
SUBMISSION: Presentation of the Key Findings	23 Aug 2023
SUBMISSION: Draft Evaluation Report	29 Aug 2023
Client Feedback on Draft	7 Sep 2023
Final Evaluation Report (English)	14 Sep 2023
SUBMISSION: Final Evaluation Report Summary/External (English and Ukrainian Versions)	20 Sep 2023

This consultancy will take place between (18th of July - 20h of September 2023).

3. Methodology

UCC recommends a mixed method approach that can quantify impact and define programs' achievement against the goals and objectives of the program. The final methodology and tools to be used will be adapted by the evaluation team.

For any quantitative data collection, household surveys isthe preferred technique. In discussions with the Evaluator, UCC will aim for the sampling outlined below:
- The sample methodology will be constructed using the two-stage stratified methodology with probability proportional to size at the first stage of sampling from the list of targeted communities within the AoO and partners.
- Households are then selected randomly from the relevant beneficiary list for that cluster using random sampling.
- The sampling, for either approach, is based on a 95% confidence level, 5% margin of error and a 50% prevalence with a design effect of 1.25.

For Qualitative data collection,the tools are

- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs): Conduct KIIs with program staff and support (M&E, finance, operations), Cash Working Group members, donor representatives, representatives of the affected population, and civil society/local actor to explore their perceptions of the program's strengths and weaknesses. The KIIs could explore their views on the program's targeting process, coordination mechanisms, and feedback mechanisms. The KIIs could also explore stakeholders perceptions of the program's impact on the targeted populations and any challenges they faced during implementation.

- Desk review: Review program documents, including program reports, monitoring and evaluation reports, CARM, and other relevant documents to gain a better understanding of the program's implementation, management, and monitoring processes. The document review could also provide insights into the program's design, implementation challenges, and lessons learned. Existing Program Information Sources includes:
  - Proposal
  - Logframe and M&E plan
  - Situation Reports, market research conducted at various periods of the crisis
  - Contingency Plans/Workplans
  - Post Distribution Monitoring Data/Reports
  - Aggregated (non-sensitive) CARM Data
  Financial data and revised budgets
  - Learning Documents/lessons learnt workshops
  - Risk and Issues Register
  - Minutes of meetings
  - Donor communication

- Case studies: Conduct case studies with selected program participants to explore their experiences with the program in more depth. The case studies could explore their perceptions of the program's impact on their well-being, livelihoods, and protection needs. The case studies could also explore any challenges they faced during the program implementation and their feedback on the program's targeting process..

Afterwards the evaluation team will;

- Data analysis: Analyze the qualitative data collected from FGDs, KIIs, document review, case studies, and participatory approaches using thematic analysis. This analysis could identify key themes related to the program's implementation, targeting process, impact, and sustainability.

- Triangulation: Triangulate the qualitative data with other sources of data, including quantitative data and program monitoring data, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the program's performance.

The evaluation team will decide in coordination with UCC MEL team whether the presentation of findings will be as follows:

- After Action Review (AAR): Initial key informant interviews will inform the structure and content of a remote AAR. The AAR format, including the use of Zoom breakout groups to develop a program timeline, facilitate deep conversation, data capture, and learning, will allow the evaluation team to understand perspectives on key questions from a variety of staff across partners, roles, and geographies. In case the team of evaluators does not speak English, live captioning/translation will be utilized to facilitate full engagement for all participants. The team will annex the agenda, guides, and tools in the draft and final reports.

Overall, the above qualitative research methods can provide valuable insights into the experiences and perceptions of program participants and stakeholders, and help to identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement for the Ukraine Cash Consortium program.

3.1 INCEPTION

Before the start of data collection, the evaluation team will do the following:

1. Hold a short planning meeting with all members of the evaluation team including the UCC MEL Director and relevant Program teams who will provide a brief about the Program and agree on the documents to be included in the desk review.
2. Review key internal and external documents. reports will be made available to the evaluator(s) along with other relevant project documentation.
3. In partnership with the UCC MEL Director, refine and finalise the specific evaluation questions to be explored from the scope described above.
4. Propose to the UCC MEL Director and Program team the appropriate methodology to be developed for the Ukrainian context to evaluate the BHA Program and address the OECD evaluation criteria.
5. Prepare an outline of the data collection methods that are required and the relevant survey templates and participatory data collection guides to be used for data collection.
6. Develop a work plan consisting of key milestones required for data collection.
7. The inception report and the data collection tools will be reviewed by UCC, and feedback provided to the evaluator.
8. Finalize the inception report and data collection tools.

3.2 PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION

The qualitative approach, feeding into the findings around the objectives outlined above, will aim to assess the effectiveness of the project management, systems, and processes established by the projects, including strategies to improve gender equity both at the participant and project management level, protection issues, and its implementation, performance monitoring, and conflict sensitivity. The qualitative evaluation will also capture lessons learned and best practices. Data collection through interviews in UCC areas of operation in Ukraine shall be carried out using mobile data collection and maybe collected through remote surveys depending on the security situation and access.

3.3 DATA ANALYSIS

Qualitative data should also be analyzed and should primarily focus on developing a deeper understanding about the relevance of the Program, and providing recommendations for improving or strengthening the effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the results of the Program.

UCC may request the evaluation team to statistically compare the endline data with the baseline data. A statistical package (i.e SPSS, STATA, SAS, CSPro, or other statistical application) will be expected to be used for this and a test of difference for all key variables to detect change(s). In addition, UCC will also require the Evaluation team to integrate the Cost-efficiency analysis of the VfM analytical component into the software Dioptra[3].

4. PRESENTATION AND DOCUMENTATION OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the evaluation must be shared with UCC in the following formats:
- Closing workshop with UCC staff to present findings and get feedback (conducted remotely):
    - Agreed lessons learned and best practices that can be incorporated into relevant sectors' programming
    - Agreed recommendations that will inform and improve UCC's future programmatic strategy, with agreed action points and deadlines
- Draft Evaluation Report submitted to UCC MEL Director for feedback and comments after conclusion of field visit. UCC will submit feedback and the consultant will have to incorporate UCC feedback into the Final Evaluation Report.
- Final Evaluation Report- The report must be clear and concise and the following sections must be included as a minimum: Executive Summary, Literature Review of all BHA responses in Ukraine, Methodology, Analysis of Findings, Limitations and Challenges, Recommendations, Annexes: ToRs, a timeline of the response, a list of individuals interviewed, statistical outputs, templates of data collection tools used, a description of the methods employed, a summary of survey results (if appropriate) and any other relevant materials. UCC requests that a second version of the evaluation to be prepared for external use to share of key findings with other actors in the Ukrainian response.
- A Ukrainian version of the Final Evaluation report is to be submitted to UCC after the finalization of the English Final Evaluation report.
- An English version of the Value for Money report

5. DISSEMINATION OF FINDINGS

---

[3] https://www.dioptratool.org/how-does-dioptra-work

Results and recommendations will be made available externally to interested stakeholders at the discretion of UCC Ukraine's senior management. The final report and any primary data collected will be submitted to and be the property of UCC.

If particular sections of the evaluation are deemed useful or informative for the greater humanitarian community as lessons learned or opportunities to improve programming, UCC reserves the right to create a separate report with excerpts from the final evaluation report to share with the wider community. At the key findings stage, UCC may request that the consultant produce such a report along with the final evaluation report.

6. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND DATA PROTECTION

The evaluation team will make clear to all participating stakeholders that they are under no obligation to participate in the evaluation study. All participants will be assured that there will be no negative consequences if they choose not to participate. The evaluation team will obtain informed consent from the participants. The research team will ensure prior permission is received for taking and use of visual still/ moving images for specific purposes, i.e., research report and presentations. The evaluation team will assure the participants' anonymity and confidentiality and will ensure the visual data is protected and used for agreed purposes only. In particular, the evaluation team will employ robust data security measures to further ensure participants' confidentiality and anonymity. All beneficiary and community members identifying information must remain confidential. It is the responsibility of the contracted Consultant to anonymise all datasets or raw data and ensure that identifying personal information is not shared with UCC Program staff nor any external party.

The Consultant will ensure that the preservation of respondent anonymity and confidentiality is prioritized during data collection, management, storage and reporting. Respondent data will not be shared with third parties without prior consent from UCC. The Consultant is expected to have clear data protection protocols and policies that should be shared with UCC during the procurement process and inception phase.

The evaluation team must also ensure compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). The GDPR sets standards for the collection, storage, and use of personal data in the European Union (EU) and should be followed to ensure the protection of personal data.

The evaluation team is responsible for determining whether or not their proposed methodology would require Institutional Review Board (IRB) clearance and will be responsible for clearing the process and training if such approval is required.

7. ASSUMPTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

- Evaluators will have access to all documentation and can take part in relevant meetings and field trips within Ukraine.

- UCC will communicate with Local Authorities regarding the Evaluation scope and dates to facilitate access for the Evaluation team.
- Evaluators will have access to key staff in the responding UCC offices in Ukraine (and other neighboring countries as needed) as well as partner offices to obtain adequate information provided.
- The evaluation team will have access to members of the affected population for conducting interviews.
- Evaluators will take confidentiality and objectivity into consideration during the process.
- Security concerns could impact the timing and the scope of the evaluation. It is important for the team to remain flexible. They must be open to making changes to the schedule and itinerary such as visiting alternate sites, conducting remote reviews and interviews, etc.
- COVID-19 situation doesn't prevent or restrict data collection.
- All data (primary or secondary) gathered by the evaluators will be fully transferred to Mercy Corps ownership and eliminated from evaluators' possession

8. COVID-19 MITIGATION MEASURES

The spread of the novel COVID-19 virus stands to impact every facet of humanitarian and development program design and implementation. With new emergency aid and modifications of ongoing aid and development programing, adjustments and adaptations to monitoring and evaluation approaches are imperative. External Evaluators must do their part to limit human-to-human transmission of COVID-19 and ensure protection of staff and others by taking preventive measures. The evaluator is to ensure the following:

- The evaluation methodology is adapted to include evaluation approaches that correspond to the current COVID-19 pandemic.
- Detail the measures to be taken to minimize the risk of COVID-19 transmission to consultancy staff, beneficiaries and other stakeholders.
- Demonstrate the effectiveness and efficiency of proposed adapted methodology in achieving evaluation objectives.

9. Proposed Governance Structure

Final Evaluation steering committee will be established to oversee the overall implementation of the evaluation and conducted in an ethical and transparent manner, and the findings and recommendations are implemented effectively.

The Final Evaluation steering committee should consist of key stakeholders such as partners (program or M&E) leads. The committee should coordinate regularly to review progress, provide guidance, and make decisions on any issues that arise.

The Final Evaluation Steering Committee should have the following roles and responsibilities:

a. Provide overall guidance and support for the evaluation process

b. Review and approve the evaluation plan, including the methodology, data collection tools, and analysis plan

e. Review and approve the findings and recommendations

f. Formulate a management response to the Final Evaluation findings and recommendations

g. Ensure that the management response is implemented effectively

The consultant/s should report to the UCC MEL Director for all the contract related matters and aspects of the consultancy,and will report to the Final Evaluation Steering Committee on the following:
a. Conducting the evaluation according to the approved evaluation plan
c. Ensuring that the evaluation is conducted within the agreed timeframe
d. Providing regular progress reports to the Final Evaluation Steering Committee
e. Presenting the evaluation findings and recommendations to the Final Evaluation Steering Committee and other relevant stakeholders
f. Responding to feedback and comments from the Final Evaluation Steering Committee and other relevant stakeholders
g. Collaborating with the Final Evaluation Steering Committee in formulating the management response to the Final Evaluation findings and recommendations.

10. REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS

For the purposes of this evaluation, UCC welcomes international and national evaluation firms to apply. The required qualifications are:
1. Individuals or firms with minimum 5 years of experience in social research, and/or humanitarian evaluation with a background in international aid, research mixed methods, economics, development studies, or other related fields, preferably previous experience in cash/food/WASH assistance evaluation.
2. Excellent analytical and writing skills in English and ability to translate the final external report into Ukrainian
3. Individuals or firms with minimum 5 years of prior experience in at least one of the following: value for money, cost efficiency, cost effectiveness and/or cost benefitExperts assigned demonstrate qualitative and quantitative research skills: The consultancy firm/ individual consultant should assign a team and submit CVs of experts who demonstrate strong skills in both qualitative and quantitative research methods. This includes expertise in conducting surveys, focus group discussions, and key informant interviews.
4. Experts demonstrate fluent English language: The consultancy firm should assign experts who demonstrate fluency in the English language. This is necessary for effective communication with the client and for the preparation of reports in English. Also, ability to translate the final external report into Ukrainian.
5. Experts have field management skills: The consultancy firm should assign experts who have strong field management skills. This includes experience in managing data collection teams, ensuring quality control, and providing technical support to field staff.
6. Share at least 2 similar assessments: The consultancy firm should be able to provide evidence of at least two similar assessments conducted in similar settings. This demonstrates the firm's experience and capability in conducting the baseline assessment in the target areas.
7. Approach covers all details covered in the TOR.

8. Final report with all comments and feedback reflected must be submitted by the end of September.

The bidder are required to submit: (i) technical proposal annexed to it team structure, and CVs,(ii) business license, (iii) minimum 2 similar assessments and ensure that 1 of those assessments include VfM; and (iv) financial proposal.