Section II: Schedule of Requirements

eSourcing reference: RFQ/2026/65265

Terms of reference (TOR)

Provision of Evaluation Services to conduct the Mid-Term Evaluation of the Sustainable Urban Integration of Displacement Affected Communities (SUIDAC) Programme

Programme Title: Sustainable Urban Integration of Displacement Affected Communities (SUIDAC)
Countries: Uganda, Ethiopia, DRC, Somalia and Sudan
Programme Duration: June 2024 to May 2028
UNOPS Programme Number: 11934-026
Name of Organisation: Cities Alliance (UNOPS)

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction to SUIDAC

The Sustainable Urban Integration of Displacement-Affected Communities (SUIDAC) Action is a four-year regional programme funded by the European Union and implemented by Cities Alliance through UNOPS from June 2024 to May 2028. The programme operates across nine secondary cities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan, and Uganda: Kananga and Tshikapa (DRC), Assosa and Jigjiga (Ethiopia), Borama and Gabiley (Somalia), Atbara (Sudan), and Koboko and Arua (Uganda).

These cities face common challenges linked to rapid urbanisation, displacement pressures, service delivery constraints, infrastructure deficits, governance capacity limitations, and social cohesion dynamics associated with hosting displacement-affected populations. SUIDAC was designed in response to the growing concentration of displacement in urban areas and the increasing pressures this places on municipal systems, services, infrastructure, and local governance.

Building on the earlier CRRF: Inclusive Urban Development and Mobility Action and aligned with the Cities Alliance Global Programme on Cities and Migration, SUIDAC combines city-led planning, direct municipal engagement, technical assistance, infrastructure and service investments, regional dialogue, and policy engagement to support the sustainable integration of displacement-affected communities (DACs). The programme commenced with a six-month feasibility and analytical phase during 2024–2025, including city-level diagnostics, perception surveys, and participatory feasibility studies, before transitioning into implementation and delivery across the nine partner cities through 2028.

The programme targets displacement-affected communities (DACs) - which includes migrants, returnees, IDPs, asylum seekers, refugees, as well as host communities - through area-based interventions designed to support both displaced and host communities within shared urban systems and neighbourhoods.

The overall objective of SUIDAC is to contribute to the sustainable local integration of DACs in the targeted Sub-Saharan hosting cities.

- Specific Objective 1: Improve the self-reliance and social cohesion of DACs (women and men, girls and boys) living in the targeted urban and peri-urban areas of the DRC, Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan, and Uganda (Component 1).
- Specific Objective 2: Strengthen local city administrations' integrated forced displacement response, urban planning, and development capacities, with particular attention to DACs and vulnerable groups (Component 2).

1.2 Programme Delivery, Grant Modalities, and Governance Structure

Cities Alliance is responsible for overall programme management and coordination of SUIDAC, including strategic oversight, grant management, monitoring, evaluation, reporting, learning, knowledge generation, and regional policy engagement. Programme implementation is delivered through a dual-grant modality supporting both Technical Implementing Partners (TIPs) and participating municipalities. The Municipalities, grant recipients of the SUIDAC Programmes are Arua and Koboko in Uganda, Assosa and Jigjiga in Ethiopia, Gabiley and Borama in Somalia, and Tshikapa and Kananga in DRC. (Note: Atbara in Sudan is part of the programme but not a direct recipient). The TIPs are responsible for day-to-day operational delivery, local coordination, stakeholder engagement, and technical support within each country context, while municipalities lead or co-lead city-level planning, governance, and implementation processes. TIP partners include the International Organization for Migration (Sudan), AVSI Foundation (DRC), the International Rescue Committee and the Organisation for Welfare and Development in Action (Ethiopia), Associazione Centro Aiuti Volontari (Uganda), and TAAKULO (Somalia).

In addition to implementation grants, SUIDAC includes a research, learning, and evidence-generation component intended to strengthen the evidence base on urban displacement and integration, support adaptive programme management, inform city-level planning and investment decisions, and contribute to policy dialogue at municipal, national, regional, and global levels. This is implemented by the Danish Refugee Council. The programme also supports regional dialogue and exchange mechanisms directly implemented by Cities Alliance and designed to strengthen peer learning, multi-level governance, coordination, and policy engagement among municipalities, national governments, regional actors including IGAD, development partners, and displacement-focused stakeholders across Sub-Saharan Africa.

The partnership model is designed to combine Cities Alliance's global convening role and urban policy expertise, grant oversight, and regional engagement capacity with the contextual knowledge, operational presence, and implementation experience of regional, national and local actors, while strengthening municipal ownership, locally led delivery, institutional capacity, and long-term sustainability.

1.3 Introduction to the Evaluation

The evaluation covers the SUIDAC programme from its inception in June 2024 through the mid-point of implementation, including both the feasibility/inception phase and the initial phase of operational delivery across participating cities in the DRC, Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan, and Uganda. The evaluation will assess implementation progress, emerging outcomes, and early institutional and systems-level changes, while generating evidence-based recommendations to strengthen programme implementation, adaptive management, partnerships, and sustainability during the remaining implementation period.

1.4 Introduction to Cities Alliance

The Cities Alliance is a global partnership dedicated to reducing urban poverty and promoting inclusive,

sustainable, and resilient cities, with a strong focus on informality, migration and displacement, climate resilience, gender equality, and equitable economic development. Established in 1999 and hosted by UNOPS, the partnership brings together local and national governments, multilateral organisations, civil society networks, and development partners to support city-led approaches to urban development. The Cities Alliance Secretariat operates through interconnected global and regional hubs in Brussels, Nairobi, and Bangkok, enabling the partnership to combine global policy engagement and knowledge generation with strong regional coordination, locally grounded programme delivery, and operational support across Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East. As per its Charter, the main objective of the Cities Alliance is to reduce urban poverty and promote the role of cities in sustainable development.

Through its Global Programme on Cities and Migration, Cities Alliance has made a long-term commitment to supporting secondary cities in low-income countries that are managing significant inflows of migrants, refugees, and other displacement-affected populations. This commitment is reaffirmed in the Cities Alliance Strategic Plan 2026–2029, which positions cities, particularly secondary cities, at the centre of responses to accelerated human mobility, forced displacement, climate vulnerability and growing urban poverty. The Strategy emphasises integrated, inclusive, climate-responsive, and locally led urban development approaches, anchored in multi-level governance, strong partnerships, community participation, and sustained long-term engagement.

SECTION 2: EVALUATION PURPOSE, AUDIENCE & SCOPE

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of this Mid-Term Evaluation is twofold:

1. Accountability: To provide an independent, evidence-based assessment of the progress of the SUIDAC programme against its stated objectives (SO1 and SO2), indicators and targets, part of the Description of Action (DOA) - including the approved logframe.
2. Learning and Adaptation: To examine the management and governance structures and generate learning and evidence-based recommendations that inform adaptive management and strategic course corrections for the remaining implementation period (Years 2–4) to improve performance, including adjustments to programme design, delivery modalities, partnership arrangements, MEAL systems, and policy engagement strategies.

2.2 Key Users and Audience

The primary users of the evaluation are the European Union, Cities Alliance Secretariat, participating municipalities, Technical Implementing Partners (TIPs) and other stakeholders involved in the implementation, governance, financing, and strategic direction of the SUIDAC programme, including IGAD.

Specifically, the targeted audiences for the evaluation will include:
i) The European Union and other development partners, supporting urban displacement, migration, and resilience programming, who require evidence on programme performance, strategic relevance, policy contribution, and future programming directions;
ii) The Cities Alliance Secretariat, including global, regional, and country teams responsible for programme oversight, technical support, monitoring, learning, policy engagement, and adaptive management of SUIDAC and the broader Cities and Migration portfolio;
iii) Participating municipalities, local authorities, and national government stakeholders engaged in urban displacement governance, urban planning, and service delivery in displacement-affected secondary cities;

iv) Technical Implementing Partners (TIPs), research and knowledge grantees, and regional actors including IGAD, who are directly involved in programme delivery, coordination, evidence generation, peer learning, and regional policy dialogue;
v) Current and prospective international, regional, national, and local partners seeking evidence and lessons on city-led approaches to the sustainable local integration of displacement-affected communities, climate-resilient urban development, and multi-level urban governance in fragile and displacement-affected contexts.

2.3 Evaluation Scope

The scope of the evaluation covers the SUIDAC programme from its inception in June 2024 through the mid-point of implementation, including both the feasibility/inception phase and the first phase of operational delivery across participating cities in the DRC, Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan, and Uganda. The evaluation shall assess progress toward achievement of the programme's overall objective and specific objectives, as set out in the approved Description of Action (DOA), including programme performance across city-level implementation, municipal systems strengthening, regional dialogue, policy engagement, research and learning components, and partnership arrangements.

Given the timing of the evaluation, the assessment will focus primarily on the inception phase (Y1) and early implementation progress (Y2), emerging outcomes, early systems-level changes, and the plausibility of longer-term contribution trajectories rather than final impact.

The evaluation should take into consideration the diverse and evolving operating environments across the nine participating cities and assess how contextual factors have influenced programme implementation, partnerships, risks, adaptation, and results. Particular attention should be given to conflict and fragility, displacement dynamics, governance constraints, climate vulnerability, urbanisation pressures, service delivery challenges, and evolving national, regional, and international migration and development policy frameworks relevant to the sustainable local integration of displacement-affected communities.

In addition to accountability functions, the evaluation is expected to generate forward-looking findings and evidence-based recommendations on programmes focusing on the integration of DACs in cities, timebound recommendations to strengthen programme implementation, sustainability, adaptive management, partnership modalities, municipal ownership, and policy influence during the remaining implementation period through June 2028.

SECTION 3: EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

1. Assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, early impact trajectory, sustainability, and equity dimensions of the SUIDAC programme, including gender responsiveness and inclusion, across participating countries and cities;
2. Assess progress toward implementation of the approved DOA, including progress against intended results through the measurement and verification of a selected subset of logframe indicators, and examine the continued validity of key programme assumptions, evolving risks and contextual factors, stakeholder feedback, and adaptive management approaches;
3. Document lessons learned and good practices relating to implementation effectiveness, adaptive management in changing and fragile operating contexts, partnership approaches, governance arrangements, and unintended outcomes to inform the remaining programme period and future Cities Alliance programming;

4. Test and assess the programme's Theory of Change and the plausibility of SUIDAC's contribution to intended outcomes and emerging institutional and systems-level changes;
5. Examine the effectiveness and efficiency of SUIDAC's delivery model, including the governance structures, the role and function of technical implementing partners, implementation architecture, and regional dialogue mechanisms;
6. Generate prioritised, evidence-based, and actionable recommendations to inform the remaining programme period;
7. Provide evidence-based and actionable recommendations for future Cities Alliance urban displacement and migration programming, including options to sustain, scale, institutionalise, or leverage the investments, partnerships and capacities established through SUIDAC, with a context specific approach.. Recommendations should take into account the evolving international financing landscape and identify potential pathways for future support, partnerships, and investment, including where relevant alignment with European Union external action priorities and financing instruments such as the Global Gateway.

SECTION 4: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Relevance

1. *To what extent is SUIDAC's area-based, city-led integration approach and package of interventions aligned with the priority needs and constraints of DACs and host municipalities, as evidenced in feasibility studies and early implementation decisions?*

Coherence

2. *How coherent is SUIDAC: a) internally across SO1, SO2, and implementation mechanisms; b) externally with other displacement and urban development initiatives operating in the same contexts; and c) with relevant EU frameworks,policy priorities and financial instruments including the Global Gateway, and IGAD programming and policies?*

Effectiveness

3. *To what extent has implementation progressed in line with the approved DOA and logframe?*
   3.1. To what extent is SUIDAC on track to improve DAC self-reliance and social cohesion in participating cities, and what early evidence exists that interventions are addressing identified barriers related to livelihoods, services, legal identity, inclusion, climate resilience and equitable access, participation, protection, and socio-economic opportunities for women, youth, and vulnerable DAC groups? Is SUIDAC aligned with EU guidelines on human rights in migration and forced displacement interventions?
   3.2. To what extent has SUIDAC strengthened the integrated forced displacement response, urban planning, and development capacities of local authorities through improved planning, governance, coordination, service delivery, and inclusive urban systems?

Efficiency

4. *To what extent is the SUIDAC delivery model (including governance structures, Technical Implementing Partners, grant modalities, technical assistance, municipal partnerships, implementation arrangements, and MEAL systems), efficient in converting resources into timely, high-quality outputs, implementation readiness, evidence generation, and locally owned results,*

including considerations relating to value-for-money, operational efficiency, and implementation quality?

Early Impact and Contribution

5. *What early contribution is SUIDAC making to broader and potentially sustainable systems-level changes in urban integration, governance, social cohesion, urban resilience, and urban development, and what intermediate changes (behaviour/practice/system shifts) are most likely to lead to longer-term impact?*
6. *What intended, unintended, positive or negative changes, emerging dynamics, or secondary effects has SUIDAC contributed to across communities, institutions, and urban systems, and what implications do these have for programme adaptation and future implementation?*

Sustainability

7. *How likely are SUIDAC-supported changes to be sustained beyond EU financing - including municipal plans, governance mechanisms, institutional arrangements, infrastructure investments, operations and maintenance systems, service delivery functions, and financing mechanisms? To what extent are these likely to be operationalised, updated, financed, maintained, and institutionally embedded beyond programme support, and what design, implementation, financing, or partnership adaptations are needed to strengthen sustainability prospects?*

SECTION 5: METHODOLOGY

5.1 Overall Approach

The bidder shall propose an initial methodology as part of the Technical Proposal - in accordance with the requirements below. The methodology will then be fully developed and detailed in the Inception Report.

The methodology is expected to demonstrate:

- A theory-based, mixed-methods performance evaluation grounded in the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, aligned with UNEG Norms and Standards, and informed by principles of utilisation-focused evaluation;
- Contribution-focused analysis of implementation progress, early outcome trajectories, and emerging changes relating to SO1 and SO2;
- Development and application of a structured evaluation matrix, linking evaluation questions, indicators, data sources, methods, sampling approaches and judgement criteria;
- Measurement and/or verification of a selected subset of logframe indicators (see Annex 1). Findings from indicator measurement and verification shall be integrated into the evaluation analysis and used to support conclusions regarding programme effectiveness, early impact, and progress toward outcomes. Where data gaps or methodological limitations are identified, the evaluation shall provide recommendations for strengthening the programme's MEAL system and results measurement framework during the remaining implementation period;
- Case-based comparative analysis across participating cities to identify contextual differences, implementation lessons, and actionable adaptation recommendations;
- The evaluation should assess not only measurable results, but also the quality, inclusiveness, effectiveness, and sustainability of the processes, partnerships, and governance dynamics generated through programme implementation;

- Gender-responsive, participatory, conflict-sensitive, climate-aware, and inclusive approaches, including consultation with women, men, girls, boys, youth, host communities, and vulnerable displacement-affected groups, with particular attention to differentiated experiences, needs, participation, and outcomes. Qualitative and quantitative data collection tools should enable sex-, age-, and vulnerability-disaggregated analysis where feasible across all evaluation criteria and questions. Where appropriate, participatory methods should include a Most Significant Change (MSC) process in a purposive sample of locations (minimum 4) to identify and validate stories of change relating to individuals, households, communities, municipal institutions, and partnership processes.

The evaluation firm must conduct in-person fieldwork in a preferred minimum of six (6) of the nine (9) SUIDAC cities. The selection of cities shall:

- Reflect geographic diversity (minimum four countries represented);
- Capture variation in displacement dynamics, implementation modalities, and intervention types to the greatest extent possible;
- Be justified in the inception report.

Where security or access constraints prevent in-person engagement in specific cities, the evaluation firm may propose alternative data collection approaches, which should be clearly justified in the inception report. However, fully remote evaluation approaches across the programme as a whole will not be considered sufficient, and the evaluation is expected to include substantial in-person field engagement in a preferred minimum of six (6) SUIDAC cities.

5.2 Desk review

Documentary review of programme information, including the DOA for SUIDAC, logframe, feasibility studies, perception surveys, dialogue reports, financial reports, and other documents as provided by Cities Alliance (and listed below), as well as other relevant documents from the funding source, IGAD and urban and displacement literature.

Key Resources:

- Approved SUIDAC Design/Description of Action (DOA), including the programme logframe and results framework;
- Feasibility studies and city diagnostics for participating cities;
- Baseline and perception survey tools, datasets, reports, and sampling methodologies;
- Programme workplans, implementation plans, and progress reports;
- Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) frameworks, indicator tracking data, and reporting tools;
- Grant agreements and relevant documentation relating to Technical Implementing Partners (TIPs), municipalities, and research/knowledge grantees;
- Reports and outputs from regional dialogues, peer-learning activities, and policy engagement processes;
- Research studies, knowledge products, communications materials, and evidence-generation outputs supported by the programme;
- Relevant governance and coordination documentation, including steering committee or partnership meeting records where appropriate;
- Lists of stakeholders and contact information relevant to the evaluation.

5.3 Primary data collection

Data collection through surveys, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions, and/or other appropriate qualitative, quantitative and participatory methods.

The evaluation shall assess progress against the programme logframe through a combination of direct measurement of a selected subset of indicators and verification of reported results for other indicators. The subset of indicators to be measured will be agreed during the inception phase and will prioritise outcome-level indicators requiring primary data collection. For the remaining indicators, the evaluation team shall verify reported results through review of monitoring data, documentation, interviews with stakeholders, and field observation where appropriate. The evaluation shall also include an assessment of the quality and reliability of the programme's results measurement system.

Primary data collection requirements:

In each of the selected fieldwork cities, where feasible, the evaluation team shall conduct:

a) Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). A sufficient number of interviews (minimum 25-30) to support stakeholder feedback inclusion, robust triangulation and analysis, including:

- Municipal leadership and technical staff;
- Technical Implementing Partners (ACAV, AVSI, IOM, OWDA, IRC, TAAKULO) and Grantees (Danish Refugee Council);
- Representatives of DAC groups (migrants, returnees, IDPs, asylum seekers, refugees, host communities) and refugee-led organisations;
- Local service providers;
- Civil society actors;
- Relevant private sector actors where applicable;
- Relevant UN organizations and NGO where applicable;
- Service users and participants in the SUIDAC programme;
- and other relevant stakeholders.

b) Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). Focus Group Discussions (minimum 4-6) should, where feasible, be stratified by:

- Gender;
- Age (>35, <35);
- Displacement status (DAC groups: migrants, returnees, IDPs, asylum seekers, refugees, host communities);
- and include vulnerable or marginalised groups.

c) Structured Household Survey. The evaluation should implement structured surveys in selected fieldwork cities, where feasible, with a sample size sufficient to support credible descriptive findings and selected indicator measurement. The proposed sample size and sampling approach shall be justified in the inception report and proportionate to the evaluation scope, resources, and security context and designed to support credible descriptive analysis rather than experimental impact attribution. The evaluation will implement structured surveys in each selected fieldwork city, where feasible, to:

- Capture perceptions relating to service access, livelihoods, inclusion, integrated urban resilience, municipal responsiveness, and social cohesion;
- Allow directional comparison with feasibility-phase perception data where possible;
- Generate credible descriptive findings and indicator measurement (see Annex 1).

The proposed sampling methodology and sample size shall be justified in the inception report and should be proportionate to the evaluation scope and resources.

5.4 Additional Required Methods

The evaluation methodology is expected to include, where feasible:

- National-level interviews with relevant line ministries, local government authorities, and EU INTPA and Delegations where appropriate;
- Regional-level interviews with Cities Alliance Secretariat staff, IGAD representatives, and other relevant regional stakeholders;
- Direct observation and documentation of selected project sites, infrastructure investments, municipal processes, and service delivery interventions, including the collection of high-resolution photographs where appropriate and feasible, and in accordance with safeguarding, informed consent, and data protection requirements. Photographs should illustrate programme implementation, infrastructure, stakeholder engagement, and examples of programme outcomes and should be accompanied by appropriate captions and metadata.
- Policy and institutional analysis, including review of municipal plans and governance, regional dialogue outputs and policy engagement processes.
- Most Significant Change (MSC): The evaluation shall apply a participatory Most Significant Change (MSC) approach in a purposive sample of participating cities to identify and document significant changes experienced by individuals, households, communities, municipal institutions, or other programme stakeholders. The process should include stakeholder reflection on why these changes are considered significant and how they relate to the programme's Theory of Change. The evaluation should present a small number of validated case studies illustrating different dimensions of programme outcomes, including intended and unintended changes, and use these to complement quantitative findings and strengthen learning.

5.5 Values and Ethics

The delivery of the SUIDAC Mid-Merm Evaluation will be consistent with the Cities Alliance approach to local ownership through respectful engagement and respect of the “do no harm principle” with all partners, including local beneficiaries and stakeholders. Free and informed consent procedures and forms, for all participants in the evaluation, must be approved by Cities Alliance prior to data collection, and adhered to during the entire evaluation process. The bidder must reference informed consent procedures to be followed and illustrate what safeguarding procedures they have in place.

5.6 Data Analysis and Quality Assurance

The evaluation must:

- Apply triangulation across qualitative, quantitative, and stakeholder feedback data;
- Explicitly address methodological limitations and potential biases, including selection bias, recall bias, and incomplete baseline data;
- Include comparative analysis across countries and cities where feasible;
- Provide clear links between findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations;
- Include an internal quality assurance process including tool piloting procedures, enumerator training and data verification;
- Ensure adherence to ethical standards, informed consent, confidentiality, safeguarding, and “do no harm” principles throughout the evaluation process;

- Apply clear procedures for digital data management, storage, protection, verification, and confidentiality throughout the assignment.

SECTION 6: CONTRACT PHASES & TIMELINE

The evaluation will consist of the following phases:

- **Contract and Kick-off meeting:** The contract is signed, and an initial discussion of the assignment takes place. Programme documents, including available data, reports, the survey tools, and sampling frame used for the perception survey, are provided to the evaluation team.
- **Inception-Phase and Desk Study:** The evaluation team will study all necessary project/programme documents, analyse the intervention logic, its design and assumptions, and results achieved to date. The inception report should include an assessment of existing/external data and a data protection plan.
- **Field-phase:** Data needs to be gathered, analysed, and interpreted. The field phase is expected to include both quantitative and qualitative data collection, including required logframe disaggregations where applicable
  The field phase of the evaluation will only take place upon official approval of the inception report and methodology by the Cities Alliance.
- **Preliminary Findings Presentation and Validation Workshop**. Online presentation, validation and discussion of key findings with stakeholders.
- **Draft Report:** Submission and presentation of draft report, addressing factual clarifications from partners and Cities Alliance.
- **Final Report:** Submission of final reports (one in English and one in French).
- **Final Results Presentation and Learning Workshop:** Online presentation and discussion of key findings, learning and recommendations with stakeholders.

The total duration of the assignment is expected to be 20 weeks from the date of contract signature. The estimated Level of Effort (LOE) for the evaluation is approximately 150 professional days, distributed across the evaluation team. The table below presents the indicative schedule, key milestones, deliverables, and expected allocation of professional effort by activity. Bidders may propose refinements to the allocation of effort, provided that all requirements of these Terms of Reference are met and the overall assignment is completed within the contractual timeframe.

Deliverable	Action	Responsible	Timeline	Indicative LOE[1]
Signing of contract and kick-off meeting	Award of contract	Cities Alliance	Upon signing of contract	2
Deliverable 1: Inception Report	Submission of Inception Report	Contractor	4 weeks from signature of contract	30
Deliverable 2: Preliminary Findings Presentation and Validation Workshop (English and French)	Online presentation and facilitated discussion, 2-3 hours	Contractor	13 weeks from signature of contract	70

[1] The estimated Level of Effort (LOE) for the evaluation is indicative and approximately 150 professional days across the evaluation team.

Deliverable 3: Draft Evaluation Report	Submission of Draft Evaluation Report	Contractor	15 weeks from signature of contract	30
Deliverable 4: Final Evaluation Reports (English and French)	Submission of Final Evaluation Report and final digital data sets	Contractor	18 weeks from signature of contract	15
Deliverable 5: Final Results Presentation and Learning Workshop (English and French)	Online presentation and facilitated discussion, 2-3 hours	Contractor	20 weeks from signature of contract	3

SECTION 7: DELIVERABLES

The evaluation firm shall submit all deliverables in English, and the final deliverable in both English and French. As part of the technical proposal, bidders may propose refinements to the reporting structure, methodology, sequencing, and timeline, provided these remain aligned with the objectives and scope of the assignment.

7.1 Deliverable 1: Inception Report

Due within four weeks of contract signature.
The inception report shall include:

- Refined understanding of the assignment and TOR;
- Refined and evaluable Theory of Change framework;
- Detailed evaluation matrix;
- City selection rationale;
- Detailed methodology and analytical framework;
- Data collection tools and instruments, including survey and questionnaires tools, focus group discussion guidelines, interview protocols, and the process for facilitating the participatory learning-focused approaches (i.e. Most Significant Change) for approval before field phase. The use of a data collection planning worksheet or a similar tool is required. Procedures for data triangulation and quality control need to be included in the inception report.
- The inception report should outline how participatory and learning-focused approaches will be integrated into stakeholder engagement, validation, and reflection processes during the evaluation.
- Quality assurance, ethics, safeguarding, data safeguarding, and risk management approaches;
- Workplan and detailed timeline;
- Proposed structure for the draft and final reports.

The inception report must be approved by Cities Alliance prior to commencement of fieldwork.

7.2 Deliverable 2: Preliminary Findings Presentation and Validation Workshop (online - 2-3 hours)

Due approximately 13 weeks after contract signature.
The evaluation team shall facilitate a stakeholder validation and learning workshop involving Cities Alliance, participating municipalities, TIPs, the European Union, and other relevant stakeholders.
The session shall:

- Present preliminary findings and emerging conclusions;
- Identify evidence gaps or inconsistencies;
- Gather stakeholder feedback;

- Test preliminary recommendations;
- Support refinement of the final analysis.

7.3 Deliverable 3: Draft Evaluation Report

Due approximately 15 weeks after contract signature.
The draft evaluation report shall:

- Not exceed 60 pages excluding annexes;
- Include a standalone executive summary of no more than 10 pages.

The report shall include:

- Introduction and programme context;
- Evaluation purpose, scope, and methodology;
- Limitations and mitigation measures;
- Findings structured according to the agreed evaluation questions and OECD/DAC criteria;
- Analysis of cross-cutting themes;
- Conclusions;
- Lessons learned;
- Prioritised recommendations for the remainder of the implementation period;
- Advice and recommendations on sustaining, scaling, and institutionalising SUIDAC results, including potential future programming and financing pathways.
- Illustrative quotations, photographs and case examples integrated throughout to provide qualitative evidence supporting key findings.
- Annexes including i) Evaluation TOR; ii) Evaluation Matrix; iii) city-level case studies outlining implementation progress, key findings, contextual factors, stakeholder perspectives, emerging outcomes, implementation challenges and recommendations, lessons learned; iv) Measurement and/or verification of assigned logframe indicators; v) a summary of the Most Significant Change process and a selection of 10-15 validated stories of change illustrating programme outcomes and lessons, with appropriate consent permissions; vi) a selection of high-resolution, captioned photographs documenting programme interventions, infrastructure, stakeholder engagement, and field activities, with appropriate consent and usage permissions for future Cities Alliance reporting, communications, and knowledge products; vii) others as deemed appropriate.

In addition, the Draft Report should be submitted with all digital data collected during the field work stage to Cities Alliance. Digital data to be submitted to Cities Alliance includes the following:

- cleaned and anonymised datasets;
- coded qualitative analysis or interview matrix;
- final data-collection tools;
- consent records;
- presentation files.

The draft report may also be circulated by Cities Alliance to selected external stakeholders for review and comment.

7.4 Deliverable 4: Final Evaluation Report

Due within fifteen (15) calendar days of receipt of consolidated comments on the draft report.
The final report shall:

- Incorporate agreed revisions and clarifications to the Draft Final Report;

- Provide both programme-wide and country/city-specific recommendations where relevant;
- Clearly identify responsibility and potential follow-up actions for recommendations where feasible;
- Include all agreed annexes and supporting materials.
- Meet all criteria for evaluation reports outlined above.

The final submission shall include:

- Clean and tracked-changes versions of the report;
- Presentation materials;
- Final data collection tools;
- Cleaned datasets where applicable;
- A digital library of high-resolution photographs (JPEG or PNG format), with captions identifying the location, activity, date (where appropriate), and photographer, together with confirmation that appropriate consent has been obtained for their use by Cities Alliance.

7.5 Deliverable 5: Final Results Presentation and Learning Workshop (online - 2-3 hours)

At completion of the assignment, the evaluation team shall facilitate a final presentation and learning workshop with Cities Alliance, participating municipalities, TIPs, the European Union, and other relevant stakeholders. The session shall:

- Present final findings and recommendations;
- Support reflection and learning;
- Identify implications for the remaining implementation period;
- Support discussion of strategic, operational, partnership, policy, and sustainability considerations moving forward.

Note: All information, datasets, photographs, interview records, quotations, and other materials collected or produced during the evaluation shall remain the property of Cities Alliance. The evaluation firm shall maintain appropriate confidentiality throughout the assignment and shall not publish or use any evaluation materials without the prior written approval of Cities Alliance.

7.6 Criteria for Evaluation Reports (Draft and Final)

The Evaluation Reports (Draft and Final) must meet the following:

- Distinguish clearly between findings, stakeholder perceptions, and evaluative interpretations;
- Adequately address *all* evaluation questions; explain the methodology used in detail and identify all sources of information;
- Where feasible, include a transparent approach for assessing confidence in findings and evidence;
- Provide recommendations categorised by short-, medium-, and longer-term actions where feasible;
- Describe limitations to the evaluation, with attention to the limitations associated with the evaluation methodology (selection bias, recall bias, unobservable differences between comparator groups, etc.);
- Present evaluation findings as analysed facts, evidence, and data.
- Produce specific and concise findings and conclusions, supported by strong quantitative or qualitative evidence;
- Provide required data disaggregations (City, DAC, age and gender where required) for evaluation findings relating to individual-level indicators, outputs or outcomes;
- Recommendations should be supported by a specific set of findings and should be action-oriented, practical and specific to the stakeholder addressed;
- The Executive Summary should present a concise and accurate statement of the most critical elements of the report. The summary should summarise key findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations and needs to be submitted as part of the final draft report;

- The findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the draft final report and final report must be structured according to the evaluation questions and make clear reference to the evidence-base for findings, conclusions and learning identified;
- The report should include a representative selection of stakeholder quotations throughout the report to illustrate key findings, perceptions, experiences, and lessons identified through the evaluation. Quotations should reflect the perspectives of a diverse range of stakeholders, including women, men, youth, displacement-affected communities, host communities, municipal authorities, Technical Implementing Partners, and other relevant actors, and should be clearly linked to the evaluation findings and conclusions. Stakeholder quotations should be anonymised unless informed consent has been obtained for attribution.
- The recommended structure for evaluation reports: Acronyms; Acknowledgement; Table of Contents; List of Figures and Tables; Executive Summary; Introduction; Methodology including limitations; Findings, structured by evaluation question; Conclusions and Lessons Learned; Recommendations, for SUIDAC, different partners, and per city; Annexes.

7.7 Confidentiality, Ownership and Use of Information

All information, datasets, interview notes, transcripts, photographs, recordings, quotations, and other materials collected or produced during the evaluation shall be treated as confidential and used solely for the purposes of this assignment. The evaluation team shall ensure that all personal data are collected, stored, processed, and shared in accordance with applicable data protection requirements and the informed consent procedures agreed with Cities Alliance.

Unless participants have provided explicit informed consent for attribution, all quotations, case studies, photographs, and other identifiable information included in evaluation outputs shall be anonymised or presented in a manner that protects confidentiality and does not expose participants to unnecessary risk.

All reports, datasets, photographs, data collection tools, interview records, and other materials produced under this assignment shall become the property of Cities Alliance. The evaluation firm shall not publish, reproduce, distribute, or otherwise use any evaluation materials or findings without the prior written approval of Cities Alliance.

SECTION 8: QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF TEAM COMPOSITION

Whilst team composition is to be proposed by bidders, the evaluation team must collectively demonstrate the technical expertise, evaluation experience, regional knowledge, language capacity and operational capability required to deliver a complex, multi-country evaluation across the SUIDAC programme. The proposed team should combine strong international evaluation expertise with relevant regional, national and local knowledge.

The proposed team must collectively cover the following minimum six key roles and areas of expertise:

1. Team Leader / Senior Evaluation Specialist
2. Urban Development, Municipal Governance and Displacement Specialist
3. Quantitative Research and MEAL Specialist
4. Qualitative Research, Participatory Methods and Gender and Social Inclusion Specialist
5. Country-Level Evaluation Experts / Coordinators
6. Quality Assurance Specialist

Bidders are required to submit a minimum of four (4) CVs that collectively cover all six mandatory areas of expertise specified above. These minimum six functions represent mandatory areas of team coverage, rather

than six separate mandatory positions. Bidders may propose individual experts fulfilling more than one role, provided they demonstrate the relevant qualifications and experience, and allocate sufficient professional time to discharge each responsibility effectively: Individual experts may fulfil multiple functions where their qualifications, experience and proposed level of effort demonstrate sufficient capacity to discharge each responsibility effectively. Bidders retain flexibility to determine the overall size and structure of the team, which should be proportionate to the proposed methodology, geographic coverage and level of effort. The technical proposal must clearly identify how each of the six functions will be covered, the personnel responsible, and their respective roles and allocation of professional days. With the exception of country-level evaluation experts, all personnel responsible for fulfilling these functions must be named in the technical proposal, with their respective roles and allocation of professional days clearly specified. For country-level evaluation experts who are not yet identified, bidders must provide a credible plan for securing appropriately qualified personnel, including the required country knowledge, technical expertise and language capabilities.

1. Team Leader / Senior Evaluation Specialist

The Team Leader must demonstrate:

- A master's degree in a relevant discipline, such as urban planning and development, economics, migration, development studies, public policy or a related field.
- A minimum of 10 years of experience leading complex evaluations or applied research assignments.
- Proven experience in theory-based evaluation approaches, including contribution analysis or systems-oriented evaluation.
- Strong analytical, synthesis and report-writing skills, including experience producing high-quality evaluation reports and actionable recommendations.
- Demonstrated experience managing multi-country evaluation teams and coordinating complex stakeholder processes.
- Fluency in English.
- Experience evaluating programmes in fragile or displacement-affected contexts, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, is highly desirable.

The Team Leader will have overall responsibility for methodological rigour, evaluation management, oversight of quality assurance, comparative analysis and delivery of the evaluation outputs and is expected to provide substantive technical leadership throughout the assignment, including evaluation design, oversight of primary data collection, interpretation and synthesis of evidence, stakeholder engagement, and preparation of evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

2. Urban Development, Municipal Governance and Displacement Specialist

The proposed expert(s) must demonstrate:

- An advanced university degree in urban planning, urban development, public policy, migration studies, development studies or a related discipline.
- A minimum of 5 years of relevant professional experience in urban development, municipal governance, local service delivery or inclusive urban planning, preferably in secondary cities.
- Demonstrated understanding of forced displacement and the challenges of integrating displaced populations and host communities into urban systems and services.
- Experience assessing institutional capacity, local governance arrangements, urban infrastructure or municipal service delivery.
- Experience working in fragile or displacement-affected contexts, preferably in Sub-Saharan Africa is desirable.

The expert(s) will provide thematic expertise to assess SUIDAC's urban integration approach, municipal capacity strengthening, infrastructure investments and the sustainability of programme-supported changes.

3. Quantitative Research and MEAL Specialist
The proposed expert(s) must demonstrate:

- A university degree in economics, social sciences, development studies, statistics or a related discipline, with relevant quantitative research or MEAL expertise.
- A minimum of 5 years of proven experience designing and implementing quantitative research, including household surveys, sampling approaches and data analysis.
- Experience with results frameworks, indicator measurement and verification, baseline and follow-up data, and assessment of data quality.
- Knowledge of descriptive statistical analysis, data disaggregation, and the interpretation and presentation of quantitative findings, including recognition of data quality issues and methodological limitations.
- Experience managing data collection quality assurance, including supervision, validation and verification procedures.

The expert(s) will be responsible for ensuring the methodological quality of quantitative data collection and analysis, including the assessment and verification of SUIDAC results framework indicators.

4. Qualitative Research, Participatory Methods and Gender and Social Inclusion Specialist
The proposed expert(s) must demonstrate:

- A university degree in social sciences, development studies, gender studies, anthropology or a related discipline.
- A minimum of 5 years experience designing and implementing qualitative research, including key informant interviews, focus group discussions and participatory evaluation methods.
- Experience applying gender equality and social inclusion perspectives in evaluations.
- Familiarity with participatory approaches such as Most Significant Change, and methods for analysing and triangulating qualitative evidence.
- Understanding of conflict sensitivity, research ethics, safeguarding and appropriate approaches to engaging vulnerable populations.

The expert(s) will ensure robust qualitative and participatory analysis, including the integration of gender equality, social inclusion and differentiated experiences of programme beneficiaries throughout the evaluation.

5. Country-Level Evaluation Experts / Coordinators
The proposed country-level experts must collectively demonstrate:

- Relevant qualifications or equivalent professional experience in evaluation, applied research, development studies, social sciences or related fields.
- Experience supporting or conducting evaluations, research or field-based assessments in the relevant country contexts.
- Strong understanding of local governance, displacement dynamics, institutional arrangements and socio-economic conditions relevant to the selected SUIDAC cities.
- Experience coordinating fieldwork, engaging local stakeholders, supervising data collection and supporting quality assurance.
- Appropriate local language capacity and familiarity with the operational, security and access considerations of the relevant locations.

Country-level experts will support fieldwork planning and implementation, stakeholder engagement, contextual analysis, validation of findings and coordination with the core evaluation team. Their role should extend beyond logistical support and primary data collection to contribute to the interpretation of evidence and development of contextually relevant findings and recommendations.

6. Quality Assurance Specialist
The proposed expert(s) must demonstrate:

- Relevant qualifications and professional experience in evaluation, applied research or a related discipline.
- Proven experience providing methodological oversight, technical review or quality assurance for complex evaluations.
- Familiarity with international evaluation standards, including OECD/DAC criteria and UNEG norms and standards.
- Experience reviewing evaluation methodologies, data collection tools, analytical approaches and evaluation reports for methodological rigour, consistency and evidence-based conclusions.

The Quality Assurance Specialist will provide technical review and quality assurance at key stages of the evaluation, including the inception report, methodological design, analysis and draft evaluation report. This function may be fulfilled by a senior expert within the proposed team or through an independent technical reviewer, provided that the arrangements allow for effective and sufficiently objective quality assurance.

Flexibility in team composition: Where a function is covered by more than one expert, the relevant qualifications and experience may be demonstrated collectively, provided that responsibilities are clearly allocated and all required competencies are adequately covered. Similarly, individual experts may fulfil multiple functions where their qualifications, experience and proposed level of effort demonstrate sufficient capacity to discharge each responsibility effectively.

The proposed evaluation team should collectively provide sufficient professional input to deliver the assignment within the estimated Level of Effort indicated in these Terms of Reference. Bidders are expected to justify the allocation of responsibilities and professional days across team members in their technical proposal and if applicable in their financial proposal.

In addition, Cities Alliance encourages partnership approaches that incorporate regional, national, and local evaluation expertise and contextual knowledge.

The evaluation team must also provide:

- A clear independence and conflict-of-interest declaration;
- At least two recent examples of comparable evaluation assignments.

Languages:
The evaluation team must collectively demonstrate fluency in the relevant working languages of the programme contexts, including English, French, and Arabic, either through team composition, local partners, or qualified interpreters.

SECTION 9: COORDINATION & RESPONSIBILITIES

Cities Alliance will be responsible for:

- Providing data and reports for the desk review;
- Providing a list of stakeholders and contact details to the consultant;
- Reviewing and approving all data collection methodologies, tools and reports.

The contractor will be responsible for

- Management and coordination of the evaluation process, including regular updating of the Cities Alliance team;
- Data collection and management, including informed consent procedures;
- Ensuring accurate data is collected and analysed and quality assured;
- Safeguarding procedures to ensure the evaluation process is ethical, legal and respectful;
- Report writing and timely submission to Cities Alliance;
- Organising, presenting, facilitating and documenting feedback workshops;
- Efficiently responding to feedback on deliverables and ensuring the completion of all deliverables, to the required standard, by the end of the assignment.

SECTION 10: REPORTING & PAYMENTS

Payment will be paid based on milestone deliverables as described in section 7, upon submission of invoice and upon certification and approval by Cities Alliance of the services completed.

Deliverable	Payment	Due date
Signing of contract and kick-off meeting	0%	N.A
Inception Report	40%	Within 30 days from the receipt of invoice and approval of the inception report by Cities Alliance Contract Manager
Draft Evaluation Report	30%	Within 30 days from the receipt of invoice and approval of draft report and receipt of digital data collected during the evaluation, by Cities Alliance Contract Manager
Final Evaluation report (French and English)	30%	Within 30 days from the receipt of invoice and approval of final reports by Cities Alliance Contract Manager

SECTION 11: SELECTION CRITERIA

- The firm must have been legally registered and operational for a minimum of seven (7) continuous years;
- The firm and proposed key personnel must demonstrate substantial experience conducting complex, evidence-based and learning-oriented evaluations, including theory-based, mixed-methods, and performance evaluations of multi-country development programmes;
- The firm must demonstrate at least seven (7) years of relevant experience conducting evaluations, performance assessments, strategic reviews, or applied research assignments relating to urban

development, forced displacement, migration, municipal governance, resilience, or international development programming;

- The firm and proposed key personnel must demonstrate strong expertise in urban development, municipal systems, urban planning, displacement-affected contexts, and/or city-level governance and service delivery;
- The proposed team must collectively demonstrate expertise in quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, participatory approaches, data analysis, evaluation quality assurance, and the design and implementation of robust mixed-methods evaluation methodologies;
- Demonstrated experience conducting evaluations in fragile, displacement-affected, or complex operating environments, particularly in Africa, and in SUIDAC countries is highly desirable;
- Experience managing EU-funded evaluations or assignments involving donor reporting and accountability frameworks is considered an asset;
- The quality, relevance, feasibility, and methodological rigor of the proposed technical approach and evaluation methodology will form a key component of the assessment of bids. Technical proposals should demonstrate a clear understanding of the assignment, a credible and context-appropriate mixed-methods methodology, robust approaches to data collection and triangulation, and realistic plans for fieldwork (to preferably cover 6 SUIDAC cities in 4 countries), stakeholder engagement, quality assurance, ethics, and delivery within the proposed timeframe;
- The evaluation team must collectively demonstrate fluency in the relevant working languages of the programme contexts, including English, French, and Arabic, either through team composition, local partners, or qualified interpreters. The Team Leader must be fluent in English.

SECTION 12: ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: Indicative Logframe Indicators for Measurement and Verification

	Results chain	Indicator	Means of Verification (MOVs)	Assumptions
Impact level (Overall Objective)	To enhance the sustainable integration of DACs in the targeted hosting cities in Ethiopia, DRC, Somalia, Sudan, and Uganda	OO1: Countries with migration policies to facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, by policy domain. (1 = Requires further progress; 2 = Partially meets; 3 = Meets; 4 = Fully meets) SG_CPA_MIGRS, all domains *(GERF 1.18 SDG 10.7.2)*	UNSDG Indicators Database https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/dataportal/database	*Not applicable*
		OO2: Proportion of the population who are refugees, by country of origin (GERF 1.17)	UNHCR data https://data.unhcr.org/en/countries/	
		OO3: Extent to which the promotion of local integration as a preferred durable solution for displaced people in urban settings improves the situation (material, legal, economic, social, societal, psychosocial) of women and men living in the cities targeted by the Action. Maturity scale:	Mid and Final Independent Evaluations. Qualitative and quantitative sources	

		1 = Chronically vulnerable, 2 = Poorly resilient and integrated, 3= Moderately, 4= Sufficiently adaptive, 5= Strongly adaptive and transformative		
		OO4: Extent to which the (legal, material, economic, social, societal, and psychosocial) situation of women and men living in urban areas targeted by the Action is satisfactorily improving. Maturity scale: 1 = Chronically vulnerable, 2 = Poorly resilient and integrated, 3= Moderately, 4= Sufficiently adaptive, 5= Strongly adaptive and transformative	Mid and Final Independent Evaluations. Qualitative and quantitative sources	
Specific Objectives	SO1: Improved self-reliance and social cohesion of DACs (women and men) living in the targeted urban and peri-urban areas of Ethiopia, DRC, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda	SO1.1: Proportion of targeted individuals who report improved wellbeing (understood as reduced level of distress, access to protection and essential services)	Baseline and endline surveys conducted by the EU-funded intervention (TIPs)	*Cities manage to deliver urban responses to forced displacement in a timely and efficient manner to meet the increasing demands and needs of DACs living within their boundaries*
		SO1.2: Proportion of targeted individuals with access to livelihood opportunities as well as finance and savings	Baseline and endline surveys conducted by the EU-funded intervention (TIPs)	
		SO1.3: Number of new or improved in-country registration mechanisms for DAC access to documentation and protection	Project monitoring/ grant monitoring database / verification by Independent Evaluation	
Output level	OP1.1 Improved DAC access to urban services including health (physical and mental), nutrition, WASH, education, GBV support, energy, and Housing, Land and Property	OP1.1.1: Number of DAC members with improved access to basic services provided with support of the EU	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	*Cities manage to deliver urban responses to forced displacement in a timely and efficient manner to meet the increasing demands and needs of DACs living within their boundaries – especially for this output involving service delivery aspects.* *Local partners and DAC members are effectively engaged in project activities.* *The security situation allows for local activity implementation.*
		OP1.1.2: Number of people with access to improved drinking water source and/or sanitation facility with EU support (GERF 2.38)	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP1.1.3: Proportion of EU-funded intervention assisted individuals reporting satisfaction or high satisfaction with services provided	Post activity surveys; EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP1.1.4 Number of migrants, refugees, and internally displaced people or individuals from host communities protected or assisted with EU support (GERF 2.20)	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP1.1.5: Number of vulnerable youth (not in formal education, training or employment) receiving	EU intervention monitoring and reporting	

		vocational and/or life skills training with the support of the EU (GERF 2.14)	systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
Output level	OP1.2: Increased DACs' access to diversified livelihood opportunities and finance with specific attention to tackling vulnerabilities of informal economy workers	OP1.2.1: Number of DAC members with access to income-generating opportunities provided with support of the EU	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	*Cities manage to deliver urban responses to forced displacement in a timely and efficient manner to meet the increasing demands and needs of DACs living within their boundaries – especially for this output involving livelihood and financial self-reliance aspects* *Local partners and DAC members are effectively engaged in project activities* *The security situation allows for local activity implementation*
		OP1.2.2: Number of DACs members with access to finance and loans and savings structures provided with support of the EU (GERF 2.17)	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP1.2.3: Number of DAC-led savings and loan associations supported by the EU (GERF 2.28)	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP1.2.4: Number of individuals receiving job matching services through one stop shops with the support of the EU	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP1.2.5: Number of individuals receiving financial literacy and/or business training with the support of the EU	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
Output level	OP1.3: Enhanced DACs' access to legal assistance and justice systems, under national and international customary and refugee law, protocols and policies	OP1.3.1: Number of people with improved access to key documentation and registration with the support of the EU	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	*Cities manage to deliver urban responses to forced displacement in a timely and efficient manner to meet the increasing demands and needs of DACs living within their boundaries – especially for this output involving legal and regulatory aspects, and documentation, registration and access to justice*
		OP1.3.2: Number of urban community groups (host CBOs, SDAs, RLOs) supported by the EU with the aim of improving social cohesion and peaceful coexistence	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP1.3.3: Number of people directly benefiting from legal aid interventions supported by the EU (GERF 2.25)	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP1.3.4: Number of individuals trained in protection and human rights with the support of the EU	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP1.3.5: Number of individuals utilising EU-supported reception centre help desks	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and	

			final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP1.3.6: Number of migrants, refugees, and IDPs or individuals from host communities protected or assisted with EU support (GERF 2.20)	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
Outcome level	SO2: Strengthened readiness and effectiveness of local city administrations, national governments and regional bodies to respond to the needs of DACs in the urban areas	SO2.1.1: Number of urban development policies adopted by targeted local authorities that integrate approaches to forced displacement in urban contexts	Baseline and endline surveys conducted by TIPs / Policy documents / verification by Independent Evaluation (mid and final)	*Cities manage to deliver urban responses to forced displacement in a timely and efficient manner to meet the increasing demands and needs of DACs living within their boundaries Governmental actors at various levels across countries targeted by the Action show a common and sustained commitment to promoting the local integration of forcibly displaced people in cities whilst adopting integrated approaches to meet the needs of host populations*
		SO2.1.2 Number of key urban infrastructure projects which embed inclusive and environmentally sustainable approaches completed in target cities	Baseline and endline surveys conducted by TIPs / verification by Independent Evaluation (mid and final)	
		SO2.3: Number of local strategies facilitating the urban local integration of forcibly displaced people (GERF 2.21)	Baseline and endline surveys conducted by TIPs / Local strategy papers / verification by independent evaluations (mid and final)	
		SO2.4: Number of new or revised national strategies favouring a regionally coordinated response to urban forced displacement adopted	National strategy papers / grant monitoring database / independent evaluations (mid and final)	
Output level	OP2.1: Improved capacity of local authorities to develop and implement strategies and interventions, based on inclusive, integrated and sustainable approaches to urban development and forced displacement.	OP2.1.1: Number of local authorities representatives trained by the EU-funded intervention with increased knowledge and/or skills on urban development and good governance	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	*Governmental actors at various levels across countries targeted by the Action show a common and sustained commitment to promoting the local integration of forcibly displaced people in cities whilst adopting integrated approaches to meet the needs of host populations – especially for this output involving key inclusive urban planning and integrated urban development aspects* *Readiness of key stakeholders to cooperate*
		OP2.1.2: Number of integrative city development and expansion plans and local DAC inclusion strategies supported by the EU	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP2.1.3: Number of local DAC censuses undertaken with EU support	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP2.1.4: Number of municipal fora bringing together local authorities, DAC representatives, community leaders, local civil society operating at city level supported by the EU	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP2.1.5: Number of cities with systems or technologies to more	EU intervention	

		frequently track and monitor population data	monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
Output level	OP2.2: Strengthened multi-level (local, national, regional) policy dialogue on urban forced displacement issues concerning DAC-hosting cities/districts/regions	OP2.2.1: Number of working groups created/strengthened by the EU-funded intervention to foster policy dialogue on urban forced displacement issues among relevant actors (city administrations, local governments, civil society, line national ministries)	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	Governmental actors at various levels across countries targeted by the Action show a common and sustained commitment to promoting the local integration of forcibly displaced people in cities whilst adopting integrated approaches to meet the needs of host populations – especially for this output involving forced displacement policy aspects Readiness of key stakeholders at local, national, and regional/international level to exchange and to cooperate
		OP2.2.2: Number of regional working groups created/strengthened by the EU-funded intervention to promote regional dialogue, policy harmonisation and peer-learning on key thematic areas among relevant actors (local governments, civil society, national ministries, and organisations/agencies and key regional and international organisations)	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP2.2.3: Number of people participating in awareness raising/advocacy dialogues and peer-learning events conducted with support of the EU-funded intervention	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP2.2.4: Proportion of participants in peer-learning events who state that they will use the learning for city-level policy, planning or services	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP2.2.5: Number of practical knowledge products produced and disseminated to city stakeholders	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
		OP2.2.6: Number of cities sharing their experiences in international high-level events	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	
Output level	OP2.3: Strengthened governments' evidence-based responses to urban forced displacement issues Targets of this output will be	OP2.3.1: Number of data gathering and collection initiatives (e.g., needs assessments, intention surveys) conducted with support of the EU-funded intervention to document, measure and monitor urban forced displacement rates as well as their effects on the cities targeted by the Action	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	*Governmental actors at various levels across countries targeted by the Action show a common and sustained commitment to promoting the local integration of forcibly displaced people in cities whilst adopting integrated approaches to meet the needs of*
		OP2.3.2: Number of research initiatives (e.g., policy papers, area-based studies) conducted with	EU intervention monitoring and reporting	

	determined after contracting of a firm to lead output 2.3	support of the EU-funded intervention to advance understanding on causes and effects of urban mixed mobility and impact for people and cities	systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	*host populations – especially for this output involving key data and research aspects*
		OP2.3.3*:* Number of municipalities' representatives trained by the EU-funded intervention with increased knowledge and/or skills on methodologies and data collection for evidence-based responses	EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)	

SECTION 14: Evaluation Criteria

UNOPS's evaluation of the proposal shall take into account the following evaluation criteria.

Eligibility and Formal Criteria – evaluated on Pass/Fail basis and checked during Preliminary Examination

	Criteria	Documents to establish compliance with the criteria

1	Bidders is eligible as defined in the document Section I: Instructions to Offerors, Article 4 including each member of the Joint Venture, consortium, or association and/or Subcontractor (as applicable) (In case of a JV, EACH joint venture, consortium members must meet the Non-inclusion in UNGM ineligibility lists.)	• Form F: Joint Venture Partner Information Form • Form A: Quotation Submission Form
2	Completeness of the Quotation. All required Questionnaires (if any), and Returnable Bidding Forms and other documentation requested under the Document Checklist section have been provided and are complete	• All documentation as requested under this quotation and attach all the supporting documents in the checklist in esourcing portal
3	Bidders accept UNOPS General Conditions of Contract as specified (In case of a JV, The DESIGNATED/ LEAD ENTITY of the joint venture, consortium members must meet)	• Form A: Quotation Submission Form • Esourcing questionnaire
4	Quotation is valid for a period of 60 days from the date of submission deadline.	Form B: Price Schedule Form

Qualification criteria – evaluated on Pass/Fail basis

1	Bidders should be in **service/existence** for at least seven (7) continuous years before the date of submission deadline (For Joint Venture (JV), this is applicable for all partners)	• Valid Company Registration/certificate of incorporation from country of origin"(For Joint Venture (JV), Each joint venture member must meet it;)
2	Bidder must demonstrate at least seven (7) years of relevant experience conducting evaluations, performance assessments, strategic reviews, or applied research assignments relating to urban development, forced displacement, migration, municipal governance, resilience, or international development programming successfully completed evaluation or assessment assignments of comparable scale, complexity, or thematic relevance completed within the last seven years. (For Joint Venture (JV), all joint venture partners combined or At least one of the joint venture members must meet it)	• Form D(i):Previous Experience Form • Attach supporting document in esourcing checklist labelled "Attach supporting documentation such as copies of SIGNED contracts/SIGNED POs/SIGNED completion certificate and SIGNED Letter of recommendation"
3	The bidder must provide evidence of at least/minimum two (2) successfully completed assignments in evaluation or assessment assignments of comparable scale, complexity, or thematic relevance completed within the last five years, with a minimum overall total contract amount of USD 200,000 combined. Bidders must provide documentary evidence/supporting documentation of the completed assignments, such as signed purchase orders or signed contracts or applicable signed completion certificates or signed client references of the mentioned assignments. Documentary evidence from other assignments not indicated in FORM D will not be	• Form D(ii):Previous Experience Form • Attach supporting document in esourcing checklist labelled "Attach supporting documentation such as copies of SIGNED contracts/SIGNED POs/SIGNED completion certificate and SIGNED Letter of recommendation"

	considered. (For Joint Venture (JV), all joint venture partners combined or At least one of the joint venture members must meet it)	
4	Bidders must provide a clear independence and conflict-of-interest declaration for the evaluation team.	• Attach supporting document in esourcing checklist labelled "independence and conflict-of-interest declaration"
5	Financial capability: The bidder must demonstrate sufficient working capital to pre-finance field mobilisation and implementation until milestone payments are made. The bidder shall submit an official bank letter confirming access to funds or an unutilised credit facility of not less than USD 36,000. (For Joint Venture (JV), the leading partner must comply with this requirement)	• Attach supporting document in esourcing checklist labelled Financial Capacity Documents: Credit Line Facility from any recognised/reputable Financial/ Banking Institution
6	PSEAH: The Bidder shall detail its approach for preventing and addressing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse, and Harassment (SEAH) within its organisation and including each member of the Joint Venture, consortium, or association and/or Subcontractor (as applicable) and all related operations. This description must include an overview of relevant policies, preventative measures, reporting mechanisms, and response procedures.	• Supporting Documents for PSEAH accountability

Technical Criteria - evaluated on Pass/Fail basis

Criteria	
1. Background/Expertise	
1.1 Organisational Experience and Relevant Expertise Demonstrated experience undertaking complex multi-country evaluations and performance reviews relevant to urban development, displacement and migration, municipal governance, resilience, infrastructure, and international development programming, particularly in Africa and/or fragile contexts. The firm must at a minimum demonstrate an established track record in conducting independent evaluations or comparable evaluative assessments of complex international development programmes, including multi-country assignments, with relevant expertise in urban development, municipal governance, displacement and migration, or related sectors. Experience working in African and/or fragile or displacement-affected contexts should be demonstrated. Experience limited to programme implementation, monitoring, statistical surveys or the production of research studies, without substantive experience in independent programme evaluation is insufficient. In addition, firms who do not demonstrate a track record in evaluation	**Pass/Fail**.

in Africa covering at least 2 of the SUIDAC countries will be considered to have insufficient relevant experience.	
1.2 Relevant Assignment Experience Quality and relevance of previous evaluations, assessments, strategic reviews, or research assignments completed by the firm that demonstrate capability to deliver this assignment. The firm must at a minimum provide credible examples of completed assignments of comparable complexity, demonstrating experience in independent evaluation or evaluative research, preferably using mixed methods and involving multiple countries or implementation partners. The assignments should demonstrate relevant thematic and contextual experience, particularly in urban or municipal development and/or displacement-affected settings. Programme implementation experience or research studies alone, without evidence of relevant independent evaluation assignments, is insufficient.	Pass/Fail.
2. Technical Approach	
2.1 Understanding of the Assignment and Operating Context Demonstrated understanding of the SUIDAC programme, its objectives, delivery model, operating environment, urban displacement context, and key evaluation requirements. The proposal must at a minimum demonstrate a clear and specific understanding of SUIDAC's objectives, programme structure and delivery model, including the roles of municipalities, implementing partners and other key stakeholders. It recognises the challenges of urban displacement and service delivery in fragile and diverse operating contexts, and the implications for evaluating programme results. The proposal must demonstrate an understanding of the evaluation's purpose, scope and key requirements, including the need to assess both community-level outcomes and municipal and institutional capacity strengthening. Generic descriptions of displacement or development challenges, without clear application to SUIDAC's programme design and evaluation requirements, are insufficient.	Pass/Fail.
2.2 Proposed Methodology and Evaluation Design Quality, rigor, and feasibility of the proposed methodology, including mixed-methods design, application of OECD/DAC criteria, contribution-focused analysis, triangulation, participatory approaches (including MSC), indicator measurement and verification, comparative city analysis, and quality assurance arrangements. The proposal must at a minimum present a coherent, feasible and sufficiently detailed theory-based, mixed-methods evaluation design, clearly linked to SUIDAC's Theory of Change, evaluation questions and OECD/DAC criteria. It demonstrates how qualitative, quantitative and participatory methods, including Most Significant Change, will be integrated and triangulated to assess programme results and plausible contributions, including alternative explanations. The methodology must provide a credible approach to comparative city analysis, indicator measurement and verification, and synthesis of findings across the programme. It should demonstrate how evaluation questions will be answered, rather than simply listing methods, and be proportionate to the evaluation's purpose, timeframe and resources.	Pass/Fail.

Insufficiently developed methodologies, analytical approaches, or designs, or those dominated by statistical research without adequate evaluative analysis are insufficient.	
2.3 Fieldwork, Sampling and Data Collection Plan Quality and feasibility of the proposed fieldwork strategy, including city selection, stakeholder engagement, surveys, interviews, focus groups, inclusion approaches, language capacity, logistics, and management of access or security constraints. The proposal must at a minimum presents a credible, sufficiently detailed and feasible fieldwork and sampling plan that addresses the minimum requirements set out in Section 5 of the TOR, including: ● Geographic coverage: The proposal must demonstrate substantial in-person field engagement consistent with the TOR's preferred minimum of six cities across four countries, or provide a credible and justified alternative where security or access constraints prevent this, without compromising the overall evaluation's geographic coverage and quality. ● Key Informant Interviews: A commitment to approximately 25–30 KIIs per selected fieldwork city, where feasible, covering municipalities, implementing partners, displacement-affected and host communities, service providers and other relevant stakeholders. ● Focus Group Discussions: A commitment to 4–6 FGDs per selected fieldwork city, where feasible, ensuring appropriate representation of women, men, displaced and host communities and vulnerable groups. ● Most Significant Change: A clear approach to collecting and validating stories of change in at least four purposively selected locations. ● Household survey: A credible, proportionate city-level survey design for descriptive analysis and measurement of selected outcome indicators, including a justified sampling approach, indicative sample sizes, appropriate coverage of populations in programme intervention areas and consideration of disaggregation and methodological limitations. ● Implementation feasibility: Adequate arrangements for stakeholder engagement, language and translation, fieldwork supervision, safeguarding, data quality and management of logistical and security risks. Proposals that omit key minimum data collection commitments, provide inadequate or unjustified sampling approaches, exclude programme cities without alternative coverage, or fail to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed fieldwork are insufficient. Detailed sampling and operational arrangements may be refined during inception, but the technical proposal must demonstrate a credible commitment and approach to meeting the TOR requirements.	Pass/Fail.
2.4 Logframe Measurement, Data Quality and MEAL Approach Approach to measurement and/or verification of selected logframe indicators, assessment of data quality, analysis of MEAL systems, management of datasets, and integration of quantitative and qualitative evidence. The proposal must at a minimum demonstrate a clear and credible approach to assessing progress against the SUIDAC logframe through both direct measurement of selected indicators	Pass/Fail.

and independent verification of reported results. It must explain how indicators will be selected for measurement or verification, including the use of baseline data, primary data collection, programme monitoring records and other supporting evidence. The methodology must include appropriate procedures for assessing data quality, including accuracy, reliability, completeness, disaggregation, potential double counting and consistency of reported results. It should also demonstrate an understanding of SUIDAC's multi-partner MEAL arrangements and explain how quantitative and qualitative evidence will be triangulated to support evaluation findings. General commitments to reviewing monitoring data or verifying indicators, without a credible explanation of the methods, evidence sources and data quality checks to be applied, are insufficient.	
2.5 Workplan and Timeline Quality, realism, and sequencing of the proposed workplan, including key milestones, deliverables, and allocation of resources. Clear, comprehensive, and well-sequenced workplan demonstrating strong understanding of assignment requirements. The proposal must at a minimum provide a realistic and sufficiently detailed workplan aligned with the TOR's 20-week timeframe, key milestones and deliverables. It demonstrates logical sequencing of inception, fieldwork preparation, data collection, analysis, validation and reporting, with adequate time allocated for each stage. The workplan must demonstrate that the proposed activities are feasible within the available timeframe and resources, including a credible allocation of personnel and level of effort across key tasks, countries and deliverables. It should account for multi-country coordination, fieldwork logistics, quality assurance and potential access or security delays. Unrealistic sequencing or workplans that do not demonstrate sufficient personnel time and resources to deliver the proposed methodology are insufficient.	Pass/Fail.
3. Management Approach	
3.1 Team Structure and Management Arrangements Appropriateness of the proposed team structure, management arrangements, quality assurance systems, and ability to mobilise and manage fieldwork across multiple countries and cities. The proposal must at a minimum present a clear and credible team structure with defined roles, responsibilities and reporting arrangements, demonstrating the capacity to manage and deliver a complex multi-country evaluation. It must identify appropriate arrangements for coordinating and supervising fieldwork across the SUIDAC countries and cities, including the involvement of qualified country-level experts and substantive oversight by senior evaluation team members. The proposal must be accompanied by a minimum of 4 CVs which demonstrate coverage of the 6 required areas of expertise in Section 8: Team Composition. The proposal must demonstrate effective coordination between international and national experts, clear responsibility for data collection, analysis and reporting, and appropriate quality assurance arrangements, including technical review and verification of fieldwork and deliverables. It should also demonstrate credible arrangements for mobilising personnel and managing operational, logistical and security challenges. Where national evaluation experts or	Pass/Fail.

field partners are not yet confirmed, the proposal must demonstrate credible arrangements for their identification, mobilisation, technical supervision and integration into the evaluation team. Generic management structures, reliance on unconfirmed field teams without credible mobilisation arrangements, insufficient senior technical oversight, or unclear quality assurance responsibilities are insufficient.	
3.2 Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel Relevance of qualifications, technical expertise, evaluation experience, regional knowledge, language capacity, and experience in urban development, displacement, municipal governance, and mixed-methods evaluation. For each of the names identified above, attach his/her CV using the format in Form Labelled: Format for Resume of Proposed Key Personnel, also attach his/her Statement of Exclusivity and Availability The proposal must identify suitably qualified and experienced key personnel who collectively meet the **qualifications, professional experience and technical expertise requirements set out in Section 8 of the TOR**. The proposed team must demonstrate the required expertise across all six technical functions identified in Section 8, including senior evaluation leadership, urban development and municipal governance, displacement, quantitative and qualitative research, participatory methods, gender and social inclusion, country-level evaluation expertise, and quality assurance. The proposal must also identify suitably qualified country-level evaluation personnel or provide a clear and credible plan for securing the required expertise, including relevant country knowledge and language capabilities. Individual experts may fulfil more than one technical function, provided all required functions are adequately covered. All identified key personnel must be supported by CVs in the prescribed Form E format, demonstrating their suitability for the assigned roles. Teams lacking demonstrated senior evaluation leadership, essential urban/municipal or displacement expertise, adequate country-level and language capabilities, or credible coverage of the required technical functions are insufficient.	Pass/Fail.