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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS (ICRC)

The work of the ICRC is based on the Geneva Conventions of 1949, their Additional Protocols, its Statutes - and those of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement - and the resolutions of the International Conferences of the Red Cross and Red Crescent. The ICRC is an independent, neutral organization ensuring humanitarian protection and assistance for victims of armed conflict and other situations of violence. It takes action in response to emergencies and at the same time promotes respect for international humanitarian law and its implementation in national law.

For further information, visit the ICRC web site:
Mandate and mission - overview

1.2. NAME OF PROJECT / BACKGROUND

Humanitarian Forensic Action is the application and adaptation of forensic sciences and investigative principles to prevent and address matters of humanitarian concern, alleviate suffering, and provide assistance to victims, families, communities, and the society at large. Such matters include the search for missing persons towards the families’ right to know, and the proper treatment and identification of the deceased, including in detention settings. It also looks at preventing and addressing torture and other forms of ill treatment and sexual violence. The Forensic Unit both promotes and supports humanitarian forensics around the world and is grounded in the ICRC mandate consistently demonstrating its added value and capacity to operate where others cannot.

The ICRC seeks to commission an evaluation of its Humanitarian Forensic Action (HFA) to take stock of the developments of its set of services, its achievements and challenges, limitations, and opportunities. It will help ICRC senior management to better understand to which extent and how HFA as a service is an added value for ICRC mandate and operational impact. It will help Forensic management to steer the future of the ICRC HFA and ensure that its value chain and value proposition are aligned with the analysis of the humanitarian landscape.

The ICRC is the only organization to use forensic sciences exclusively for humanitarian purposes. Humanitarian Forensic Science is an emerging discipline recognized by international scientific bodies (e.g., IAFS, AAFS, etc.) and, while not created by the ICRC, the organization has, through its action (HFA), become the leading actor and a global reference on the topic. In a world where the number of situations resulting in high numbers of fatalities or missing cases are increasing, and as the management of the deceased is more and more seen as suboptimal in crises (i.e., conflicts, disasters, and pandemics), the ICRC has more than ever a key role to play in supporting States and parties to armed conflicts to deal with these issues with a prevention and protection perspective.

Because of its complex legal tenets, HFA supports and enables States authorities and actors of the medicolegal system (who have jurisdiction on these issues) to comply with their international obligations and to develop and implement emergency preparedness and response plans to protect the deceased, to prevent disappearance, and to solve the issue of the missing.

The medicolegal system can be defined as the set of principles, regulations, procedures, and different public or private entities, responsible for the investigation of suspicious deaths and attempts against a person’s integrity. It describes the interprofessional relationship, cooperation, collaboration, and coordination between three main sectors that necessarily interact in medicolegal investigations: the judiciary, law enforcement and forensic services or institutions. Armed Forces are also part of the system in specific circumstances (i.e., armed conflict or when granted judicial police powers). Other entities become part of the system in response to emergencies and may be mandated with tasks that are normally part of the functions of the main entities of the medicolegal system. Examples of these are the armed forces, volunteer organizations, civil defence, and in some countries the national societies of the red cross and red crescent. The main role of the medicolegal system is to support the administration of justice, while ensuring the protection of human rights and in upholding the rule of law. Medicolegal investigations are also critical for aspects related to policy making, prevention of crimes, public health and safety, evaluation of health care, in research, including surveillance, epidemiology, and prevention programs, for example in injury prevention control, prevention of suicide, violence, or substance abuse. In the case of post conflict situations, the system plays an essential role in the overall efforts of truth and justice,
including transitional justice, memory, and reparation. The strengthening of forensic systems contributes also to policy making, peace building processes and has an impact in the reconstruction of societies.

Established in 2004, the ICRC Forensic Unit focuses on the issue of Protecting the Deceased and their families and in the Search for and Identification of Missing Persons, as part of the Protection and Essential Services Department (PES) and within the Central Tracing Agency (CTA). Through its team of forensic specialists, the ICRC works globally by providing services and supporting States (and when relevant parties to armed conflict to comply with applicable IHL and IHRL obligations) towards the deceased and their families and to help ensure the deceased are protected and to uphold the right of bereaved families to know what happened to their loved ones. Today, the ICRC has experts from domains including forensic genetics, anthropology, odontology, archaeology, criminalistic and pathology working as part of their forensic team. Following the initial years of Forensic operations being understood and integrated into ICRC actions, the Forensic Unit began rapidly evolving and growing from approximately 2013. In 2017, forensic services were relocated structurally from the Assistance division, where it was located for 13 years, to become the Forensic Unit within the Protection division. With a significant growth in size, the Forensic Unit began developing its team structure to deal with this growth, for example, the establishment of the role of forensic managers in regional hubs and the establishment of its Global Management Team. The unit continued its growth in terms of workforce and diversification of actions after 2017. Subsequent structural changes saw the unit become part of the Central Tracing Agency (which has been through its own transformation).

Description of the theory of change or logic model

The work of the Forensic Unit is explained largely in its most recent strategic document: the Strategy for ICRC Forensic Services 2016-2018 (internal), which builds on two previous strategies dating back to 2008, and more importantly the 2022 Forensic Operating model (Figure 1) and actual Forensic Reference Framework. These contain elements of a theory of change for Humanitarian Forensic Action in the ICRC. The evaluation will reconstruct the theory of change during the inception phase for the purposes of the analytical frame of the evaluation. The theory of change will be refined during the process of the evaluation and the revised version will be included in the final evaluation report.

The ICRC Forensic value chain of its services has drastically changed over time. From the provision of ad hoc expertise limited to the missing file, in a few contexts, to the provision of expertise in a wide range of contexts in addition to the provision of advice to State authorities and the delivery of support to medicolegal structures in terms of infrastructure and manpower. Today, the value chain includes a comprehensive systemic approach around the strengthening of medicolegal systems as a key sustainable enabler to prevent and address the consequences of armed conflicts, other situations of violence (OSV) and emergencies, including the context of migration.

In terms of ICRC capabilities within PES and CTA, the forensic palette of services consists of the following:

- Delivering unique expertise through substitution and/or support to States authorities on management of the dead (MotD), and search for Missing Persons, including acting as a neutral intermediary.
- Delivering unique expertise in the analysis and follow up of institutional caseload of missing persons.
- Advising States authorities on HFA to comply with their legal obligations.
- Strengthening medicolegal system policies, regulations, procedures, and infrastructures
- Developing domestic expertise and know-how.

The priorities of the unit can be defined as:

- Protection of the deceased (dignified and professional management of the deceased).
- Prevention of missing persons.
- Clarification of the fate and whereabouts of missing persons.

---

2 The Central Tracing Agency: Reconnecting, reuniting, resolving - now and into the future | ICRC
Context of implementing the intervention

The ICRC’s forensic action is largely embedded within international humanitarian law (IHL), meaning the Geneva Conventions, the Additional Protocols and customary international humanitarian law which contain specific provisions and rules pertaining to the search and protection of the dead, the right to know for the families, accounting for the deceased, the treatment of human remains, their examination, burial, the maintenance of gravesites and exhumations. Other than on the matter of enforced disappearance, human rights treaties do not contain detailed provisions dealing specifically with missing persons or the treatment of the dead. However, several provisions contained in these treaties have been interpreted by United Nations treaty bodies and regional courts as giving rise to obligations relevant to missing persons, including on clarifying their fate and whereabouts, as well as requiring states to comply with certain obligations relating to the dead and the right of their relatives. Under international human rights law (IHRL), states can be held responsible for failing to uphold, the right to life, human dignity, the prohibition of torture, cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, the prohibition of enforced disappearance, the right to private and family life and the right to an effective remedy.

Domestic laws contain further guidelines for forensic activities and dead bodies’ management, while soft law instruments may address international response activities in times of catastrophes and are important to consider in practice.

Working within the above legal frameworks, the ICRC seeks coordination and cooperation, including partnerships, with external actors such as leading forensic institutions and practitioners, development actors and international organizations (See Appendix 4 for the list of external actors engaged in HFA). In practice there are some limitations to the scope of cooperation with actors that are involved in judicial or criminal investigations or that

---

3 See Advisory services legal factsheet: Humanity after life: Respecting and protecting the dead | ICRC. See also: The war dead and their gravesites; Anna Petrig; International Review of the Red Cross; Volume 91 Number 874 June 2009, available on: https://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/other/irrc-874-petrig.pdf (last visited January 2016)


5 The 2006 International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance contains specific obligations related to the location of the dead their respect and return of their human remains (Art. 24)

6 Catastrophe: is a disaster of very large and unexpected proportions. The management of human remains in other disasters (e.g. plane-crash) is normally the exclusive responsibility of forensic specialists (e.g. INTERPOL DVI), whereas in catastrophes first responders often have a leading role for this task, for which they require standards, guidelines, training, advice and tools, such as those offered by the ICRC.
are non-operational. Some formal cooperation (e.g. through MOUs) has been established with academic institutions and associations. The full range of Forensic Services consists of eight specific objectives:

Specific Objectives 1-3: Sustainable capacities:
1. Forensic Systems: Strengthening medico-legal systems, forensic services, and mechanisms
2. Forensic Competencies: Strengthening local competencies
3. Forensic Equipment: Improved working conditions (infrastructure and equipment)

Specific objectives 4-8
4. Forensic IHL/AAP: Alignment of services with IHL obligations and accountability to affected population
5. Forensic Emergencies: Forensic emergency preparedness and response
6. Forensic Caseload: ICRC caseload analysis, case management and follow up
7. Forensic Migration: Search for and identification of missing and deceased migrants
8. Forensic ill-treatment: Victims of ill-treatment, sexual violence, and death in custody

The workforce of the ICRC’s Forensic Unit has grown significantly (up to 125 in-house experts before the 2023 financial reductions for the ICRC). It includes a wide range of scientific expertise including anthropology, archaeology, pathology, genetics, odontology, and criminalistics.

There have been multiple internal changes such as the restructuring of the Central Tracing Agency (within which Forensic Unit is now situated), which is part of the recently created new department of Protection and Essential Services (PES) alongside the department of Operations (OPS). Despite being a year affected by COVID-19, Forensic activities continued to grow at the request of delegations and authorities, and a snapshot is provided for the year 2022 in Figure 2 below.
Evaluation Purpose
The purpose of the evaluation is to help the Forensic Unit to steer the future HFA as an ICRC service. The evaluation will assess ICRC's HFA positioning, set-up, performance, results to generate institutional learning with a view to improving the performance, outcome and longer-term change produced by the HFA. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation will feed into the development of the strategic orientations of the Forensic Unit and will directly serve PES and OPS in its promotion of services and in the overall institutional strategies.

Objectives
1. To understand HFA as performed by the ICRC through the lens of both internal audiences (e.g., forensic staff, other CTA staff, protection staff, management, legal) and external perspectives (e.g., key beneficiaries in delegations where we have a significant program, the forensic advisory board, the regular consultants performing missions for the ICRC, etc.)
2. To assess the effectiveness of the forensic setup at all levels to meet the aims of humanitarian forensic action, including in terms of quality and efficiency, while ensuring strong engagement with affected communities and relevant actors.
3. To identify better ways to evaluate / assess and demonstrate the impact of forensic services in humanitarian action on target populations.
4. To analyse the internal positioning of HFA in relation to achieving the best humanitarian outcomes and its contribution to the overall institutional and Movement strategies.
5. To understand the synergies between HFA and other ICRC services to target populations (i.e., in ICRC’s definition: separated, missing, deceased, civilians, actors of influence).

2. Scope and Requirements of this RFP

2.1. Scope

The temporal scope of the evaluation focuses on 2019-present day (mid-2023) due to Monitoring for Results reporting data being available for this time period. However, the historical evolution of Forensic Services will be of relevance to the context of the current Forensic Unit. Geographic scope is broad across all Forensic Services engagement however, for the purposes of data collection, the external evaluation consultants will work with the Forensic Unit to determine sampling strategies to include and exclude geographies depending on the agreed criteria.

Intended users

The primary users of the evaluation are the senior leadership of OPS, PES and LDP.

Secondary users of the evaluation are members of the Forensic Unit, CTA and PES staff, further colleagues internal to the ICRC, International Federation of the Red Cross, and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), as a membership of 191 National Societies, and the broader external network of actors working in humanitarian forensic action.

Key stakeholders

The key internal stakeholders and participants to be engaged in the evaluation include ICRC staff members from the following Units and Departments:

- Forensic Unit
- Central Tracing Agency
- Department of Protection and Essential Services
- Department of Operations
- Department of International Law, Policy, and Humanitarian Diplomacy

The list of key stakeholders and their modes of engagement in the evaluation will be developed and finalized by the evaluation manager in discussion with the external evaluation consultants. Key stakeholders and participants will be engaged in the evaluation through different methods including as part of the validation meetings with
the Evaluation Reference Group, workshops for ToC development and discussions of the findings when applicable, during inception phase consultations and key informant interviews as part of the data collection phase.

The list of external actors and partners is available in the Annex and selection of key external stakeholders for consultations and interviews will be conducted during the inception phase.

Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation will draw on the OECD DAC and ALNAP criteria of effectiveness, coherence, impact, and sustainability. These four criteria are emphasized due to the strategic positioning nature of the evaluation which seeks to inquire into humanitarian forensic action at the ICRC - how the organization currently articulates and achieves its aims and ambitions, and how it can continue to do so, and indeed do so better. Evaluation teams may propose additional criteria at the proposal or inception phases with sufficient justification.

The typical OECD criteria of efficiency is implicit in some of the evaluation questions but are not highlighted as distinct theme. Efficiency as a principle, i.e., identification of inefficiencies, will be useful but efficiency as an evaluation criterion is presumed to lack the necessary data for scientific analysis.

Coherence

1. How well does Forensic Unit fit within the wider ICRC architecture ensuring complementarity and harmonization across services for achieving humanitarian outcomes for targeted population?

Effectiveness

2. To what extent Forensic Services resources (financial, manpower and set up within the ICRC at HQ and delegation level, and their articulation) are conducive to meeting the aims of HFA?
3. To what extent and how does the Forensic Unit achieve its intended results?

Impact

4. What evidence is there to demonstrate longer-term changes produced by the Forensic Services?
5. To what extent the current monitoring and evaluation framework and tools for forensic services can capture learning, results, and impact?

Sustainability

6. Are the results and impact produced by the ICRC Forensic services likely to be sustained and in what circumstances?
   a) To what extent ICRC's Forensic action (e.g., by strengthening the medicolegal system as a key enabler) addresses long term interconnected problems
   b) To what extent Forensic Action reinforces ICRC impact (e.g., refurbishment of a morgue jointly with the WatHab unit to ensure a safe work environment)

2.2. REQUIREMENTS: EVALUATION APPROACH

Overall design, methodology

A theory-based participatory methodology is proposed for this evaluation, which will require the evaluation team to reconstruct the Theory of Change (ToC) for the ICRC’s current approach to humanitarian forensic action. Theory-based methodology is suitable for this evaluation for several reasons. Reconstruction of a Theory of Change based on the Strategy for ICRC Forensic Services (2016-2018) and more recent strategic documents in draft, along with consultation of the forensic management team will help the evaluation team to use it as a source for the evaluation design and data collection methods. During the analysis and reporting phase, the reconstructed ToC will serve as a conceptual framework for analysis. Given the second objective of this evaluation focusing on accountability through analysis of available evidence of impact the reconstructed ToC will serve as a basis to analyse the current methods and systems for M&E and propose recommendations for enhancement to demonstrate better current and future impact pathways.

Reconstruction of the ToC should take place in the inception phase, to be used for the purposes outlined above. Based on the findings and recommendations of the evaluation, the external team will present a revised ToC as part of the final report (or accompanying it).
Specific methods

The evaluation will deploy both qualitative and quantitative methods for data collection. At a minimum, qualitative data collection methods will include document review, key informant interviews, group interviews and workshops where appropriate. Quantitative methods may be primary (e.g., perception survey) and/or secondary (ICRC internal monitoring data). Analysis methods will require triangulation between multiple data sources and methods. Evaluation teams are encouraged to propose both data collection and analysis methods that are suitable for meeting the needs of the evaluation in the context of humanitarian responses.

Primary data collection is expected to generate new evidence on the effectiveness and impact of the ICRC’s forensic services, how well the current M&E system captures current results and long terms changes and what could be improved. Depending on the methods and the sources, data should be collected in a way that it can be disaggregated by individual attributes (e.g., sex, age, disability etc.) and/or contextual attributes (e.g., geography, context of conflict, intervention type etc.).

Secondary data availability

- Monitoring for Results (reporting data) 2019-2022
- Quarterly and selected EoM reports
- Prot 6 data profile and trends (individual case data is not available to external consultants)

Key documents

- Previous strategies of the Forensic Unit (2008, 2009-2014 and 2016-2018)
- Programme Reference Frameworks for Forensics
- Evaluation of the Forensic Strategy, 2014
- Report on surveys to forensic staff in 3 delegations, 2017
- Evaluation of the Integration of Thematics into ICRC Field Responses, 2023 (relevant for questions and evidence on integration and transversal working)
- Internal documents (accessible through the Forensic Wiki) and external publications (accessible through the ICRC eShop)

Risks, limitations

Known contextual risks for the ICRC include the sensitive and personal nature of the work of the Forensic services for community members whose family members are missing or deceased. Any proposed engagement with community members will require specific ethical protocols.

A further institutional context is the ICRC’s current re-organization and management of the financial situation, which necessarily places responsibilities on staff members and managers to respond thereby reducing their availability for processes such as this evaluation. The evaluation will need to be accommodating regarding the availability of staff members, and in the case of non-availability contingency plans for data collection will be needed to ensure the validity of datasets.

Evaluation teams are required to expand on these contextual risks and include methodological risks, limitations, and mitigations in their proposal and during the inception phase.

Ethical considerations and safeguarding

Evaluators are required to adhere to international best practices and standards in evaluation. It explicitly requires evaluators to abide by the Professional Standards for Protection Work; the ICRC’s Code of Conduct; the ICRC’s Code of Ethics for Procurement; and the ICRC Rules on Personal Data Protection.

The evaluation design and implementation must apply the ICRC’s guiding principles and approach on Accountability to Affected People.

Where engagement with community members is proposed and agreed, the evaluation inception report will be subject to formal Ethical Review Board approval (arranged by the ICRC). This will require specific and detailed ethical considerations for the situations and methods proposed.

Management of the evaluation

The Forensic Unit is the managing/commissioning team of this evaluation, with the Head of Forensic Unit with overall responsibility for managing the external evaluation team and convening the Evaluation Advisory Group.
The Evaluation Commissioner will work directly with the External Evaluation Team to develop a final list of stakeholders for participation, facilitate access to the necessary documentation to be reviewed, inform the relevant stakeholders about the evaluation, and facilitate initial introductions between them and the external evaluation team. The team members of the Forensic Unit will contribute to the processes of onboarding the external evaluation team accessing documentation and providing supporting information. The Evaluation Commissioner will facilitate access for the evaluation team to stakeholders (internal and external), and modes of communication for stakeholder types will be agreed in advance of them being contacted.

All evaluation deliverables will be submitted simultaneously directly to the Evaluation Commissioner and the ICRC Evaluation Office in due course for a first review. The Evaluation Commissioner will mobilize and share the inception report and final report with other key ICRC stakeholders for feedback, such as the Evaluation Advisory Group. The Evaluation Commissioner will provide consolidated feedback, including external quality assurance reviews. The key dates for deliverables and milestones will be determined during the inception phase in consultation with the Evaluation Commissioner.

The Evaluation Office at HQ will accompany the process providing technical advice and feedback to the Evaluation Commissioner at key stages, including scoping of the exercise, identifying and recruitment of the external evaluation team, providing feedback during the inception phase on the proposed methodology, methods, and data collection instruments, providing feedback on the inception and the final reports directly and through the established Evaluation Quality Assurance process and ensuring impartiality.

**Evaluation Advisory Group**

An Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG) will accompany the evaluation, providing their expert advice and feedback on key stages. The members of the EAG may be included in the initial onboarding process for the external evaluation team. The EAG will be consulted for the inception phase presentation/discussion on the plan for data collection and analysis, and for the presentation of the final report findings. The membership of the EAG is internal to the ICRC and the composition will be outlined in the relevant protocol internally.

**Indicative timeline**

The evaluation is anticipated to start in September 2023 with the outcomes expected for the beginning of QR2 of 2024. The ICRC does not mandate that working days must be consecutive. However, the ICRC envisages that the consultancy will mainly be done virtually/remotely. During the inception phase, it is recommended for the team leader to visit ICRC HQ office in Geneva during the inception phase for initial in-person consultations and potentially workshop on reconstruction of the ToC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/deliverable</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Announcement and proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and contracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft inception report &amp; QA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the inception report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final inception report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary findings presentation
Draft evaluation report
Presentation of the draft report
Quality Assurance process
Final evaluation report
Visual communication product

Evaluation Quality Assurance

The main evaluation deliverables should meet the established quality standards. The quality criteria (checklists) for evaluation products (inception reports and evaluation reports) will be provided to the external evaluation team in advance. Drafts of these key products will be quality assured through the ICRC’s QA mechanism which will provide feedback to the supplier via the Evaluation Office.

Publication of final report

The final evaluation report’s Executive Summary or the brief visual communication product will be published on the ICRC’s website in line with the ICRC’s Access to Information Policy.⁷

Dissemination of findings

The full evaluation report with findings will be disseminated through different modalities internally only to the following stakeholders:

- Protection & Essential Services (PES) at HQ, including:
  - Central Tracing Agency (i.e., Protection of Family Links, Protection Data, RCRC Center for Missing Persons)
  - Protection, Essential Services (i.e., Water and Habitat, Health, Economic Security, Water & Habitat, Weapons Contamination, Cash & Voucher)
- Executive Office of the Director General (EODG) and OPS regions at HQ
- Regional Resources Network (RRN)
- Outcome-Based Approach (OBA) unit
- Support units, Department of People and Culture (PAC), Department of International Law, Policy and Humanitarian Diplomacy (LDP), Department of Mobilization, movement and partnership (MMP), Department of Support and Digital Transformation (STD)
- IFRC

The ICRC might share selected sections of the evaluation report or executive summary with donor(s) and relevant partners.

Follow up of recommendations

In order to strengthen the use of the evaluations at the ICRC, fostering ownership over the process of change and ensuring accountability for results, the intended users of this evaluation will initiate the management response

process as a follow-up action facilitated by the Evaluation Office. The Evaluation Office will support the Innovation Facilitation Team and respective stakeholders in developing and tracking the management response actions through dedicated systems and processes.

Budget range or anticipated working days

The budget ceiling for this evaluation is 70,000 CHF, however overall cost will be taken into consideration for the selection decision. The consultants are expected to elaborate in the proposal on the number of anticipated working days for this assignment based on the budget range, proposed timeline and level of efforts required at each stage of the evaluation. The consultancy will mainly be done virtually/remotely, but the ICRC recommends for the team leader to visit the ICRC HQ in Geneva for initial consultations and/or workshop on reconstruction of the Theory of Change. The travel cost associated with visit to HQ should be included in the budget.

Required expertise and experience

The evaluation team should possess the following combined skills and qualifications:

Team Leader:

- Substantial experience (minimum 15 years) in leading teams, and designing and delivering rigorous evaluations in the international and humanitarian sectors, meeting international evaluation quality standards.
- Advanced stakeholder communication, risk analysis, and project management skills.
- Demonstrable experience of applied ethics in evaluations.
- Publications and sectoral contributions track record.
- Minimum academic qualification: post-graduate research methods in evaluation, humanitarian response, IHL, human rights, biological and medical science, disaster management or other field relevant to this evaluation.

Across the team

- Experience of conducting mixed-methods humanitarian evaluations.
- Knowledge, understanding, and/or experience of the ICRC’s institutional and operating models.
- Expertise in developing and tailoring qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis tools.
- Technical knowledge and understanding of biological and medical science, investigation and police work, disaster management would be a strong advantage.
- Ability to work in English language is essential with additional languages such as French and Spanish would be an added asset.

2.3. **DELIVERABLES**

The key outputs (deliverables) for the evaluation include the following, to be modified as required during the inception phase.

1. **A 1-page briefing** outlining the purpose, timing, and key messages to explain the evaluation process to stakeholders. This acts as a communication tool internal within the evaluation particularly during the data collection phase. It includes the contact details of the evaluators, the evaluation commissioner, and the ICRC’s integrity weblink.

2. **A draft and then final inception report with PPT** or other ways suggested by the evaluation team with articulated theory of change, detailing a proposed methodology, evaluation matrix, list of stakeholders to be consulted, workplan and timeline, and the tools for data collection to be presented to the Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG) and the commissioning unit.

3. **Workshops and/or roundtables** as appropriate for consultation with internal stakeholders on emerging issues and/or validation of findings and/or revised theory of change.

4. **A draft evaluation report.** This should be clear and simply written, free of unnecessary jargon. The main body of the report should not exceed 40 pages. The report outline will be agreed with the supplier as part of the inception report. The report will include the following sections:
   - Executive Summary - a short overview of the report
   - Context and background
   - Methodology
   - Revised theory of change with justification
   - Main findings of the evaluation, and conclusions
• Concise recommendations, with consideration of the degree of prioritization and any necessary sequencing for actions and the responsible persons

5. A final report, with feedback integrated from the EAG and other internal stakeholders as relevant.

6. A PPT presentation or other ways of presenting the key findings, recommendations, lessons learned, and best practice addressed to the Advisory Group and the commissioning unit. Any relevant complementary materials should be provided as annexes to the final report.

7. A visual communication product such as a poster, infographic or max 4 pages brief that presents the key messages and recommendations of the evaluation in an engaging manner.
3. **ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION**

Providers are invited to submit a written proposal to the ICRC for review, in a concise way, considering the instructions, scope, requirements, required answer format and timeframe defined in this RfP.

3.1. **TIMETABLE**

It is the intention of the ICRC to follow this timetable. However, the ICRC reserves the right to change any part of this timetable at any time depending on operational constraints. The ICRC will notify providers of such changes.

**Summary of key dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 July 2023</td>
<td>TOR launched with suppliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 August 2023</td>
<td>Questions to the ICRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 August 2023</td>
<td>Responses to Questions from the ICRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 August 2023 23:59 pm</td>
<td>Deadline for proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the end of August 2023</td>
<td>Interviews and confirmation of contract award</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. **ISSUING OFFICE AND POINTS OF CONTACT**

The sole points of contact for purposes of this RfP are the issuing office for the formal handling of the RfP, proposals, and contractual aspects, and the project manager regarding specifications aspects.

In order to obtain clarifications regarding this RfP, please direct all questions by email by **03/08/2023 at 23.59pm** to the attention of:

- **Name**: Hélène Richard
- **Title**: Evaluation Officer
- **Email address**: evaluation@icrc.org

3.3. **QUESTIONS FROM PROVIDERS**

All inquiries regarding the content of this RfP must be directed to the ICRC project manager in the first instance. Please submit all questions in writing by e-mail, referring to the section and page of the RfP document, if possible. Questions asked by phone or in person will not be answered.

The providers must not contact any entity within ICRC, or any of its subcontractors regarding this RfP. Any other contact with regard to this subject within the ICRC is prohibited unless with the express permission of the issuing office or the project manager. A possible consequence of providers soliciting information about this RfP either directly or indirectly from any other sources may result in disqualification of the provider from the RfP process.

Should the questions put be too numerous, the first 10 questions from each bidder will be answered. The ICRC therefore recommends that bidders prioritize their questions.

The ICRC will respond to questions promptly and will send answers to providers as a group. In doing so, the ICRC will delete the provider names from the text of questions before the answers are sent.

3.4. **QUESTIONS FROM ICRC**

The ICRC may have further questions at any time throughout the course of this RfP, for which additional written answers might be requested.
### 3.5. **Information and Document Exchange**

E-mail is the preferred mode of communication. For important documents, senders should request acknowledgement of reception. The required formats for documents are either Adobe Acrobat PDF files, or MS-Office files, e.g. MS-Word for the global document, PowerPoint or Visio for diagrams, and Excel for spreadsheets.

### 3.6. **Submission of Proposal**

Firms are requested to submit the following:

- Maximum 4-page proposal highlighting how you would approach this evaluation, plus a proposed timeline/workplan.
- CVs of consultants including descriptions of relevant assessment/evaluations or projects the consultant was involved in previously, and at least 2 referees (names and email addresses).
- At least 2 examples of previous evaluation reports for which the Team Leader was responsible for similar assignments.
- Financial proposal (including daily rates and any anticipated travel costs) - use Appendix 2 “Response Grid”

To: [evaluation@icrc.org](mailto:evaluation@icrc.org) by 11 August 2023 (23:59 hours). Please indicate “Evaluation of the ICRC’s Humanitarian Forensic Action” in the subject line.

### 3.7. **Required Format of Proposal**

Proposals must contain a version number in order to facilitate the identification of revisions.

All proposals submitted shall conform to the following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cover letter</td>
<td>The cover letter must identify the provider name and address, and the name, email and telephone number of the person authorized to represent the provider in relation to the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The letter shall be signed by a person authorized to bind the provider to all commitments made in the proposal. It shall indicate that the provider has thoroughly reviewed this document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Cover letter should indicate that requirements for the RFP are met and address any items below that are not covered elsewhere (i.e. in the Response Grid or the Proposed Approach):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overall approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Specifications of expected deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risks and concerns arising from this RFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What is needed from the ICRC to begin the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proposed workplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proposed team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proposed budget (pricing including daily rates and estimation of travel costs (note that ICRC will not pay for business class travel))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any pricing constraints on the provider part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any hidden or related costs that the ICRC may not have anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customers references in the domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Company Presentation</td>
<td>Presentation of the Company Profile. This section should at a minimum contain the following information: Use the ResponseGrid to provide information about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Official registered name, mailing address, main telephone number and web address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Official status (company or self-employed) with documentation to support this declaration (extract from commercial register for companies or social security certificate for self-employed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Proposed Approach

Maximum 4-page proposal highlighting how you would approach this evaluation, plus a proposed timeline/ workplan (use Appendix 2 Response Grid). To include:

- Understanding of the TOR and the ICRC’s context with relevance to this evaluation
- Conceptual and analytical framework to meet the needs of the evaluation
- Methodological approaches to both data collection and data analysis
- Briefly: Methodological and contextual risks, limitations and mitigations; and Ethical considerations

4. Proposed team

CVs of consultants including descriptions of relevant assessment/evaluations or projects the consultant was involved in previously, and at least 2 referees (names and email addresses).

Provide at least 2 examples of previous evaluation reports for which the Team Leader was responsible for similar assignments.

French and English will be the standard means of communication on the project.

5. Planning proposal

Provide proposed timeline/ workplan using the tab in the ResponseGrid.

6. Response Grid

The document ResponseGrid.xlsx provides a pre-defined structure to gather the information required to compare all bids. See appendices. Please fill in as much information as possible. See appendices

7. Pricing

Pricing must be established according to pricing sheet provided in the document ResponseGrid.xlsx

All prices shall be quoted in CHF without VAT. All expenses related to the project must be included. Please include any additional cost (including 3rd party software and licenses) unforeseen by ICRC. See appendices

8. Standard Terms & Conditions

ICRC Terms and Conditions shall apply (link provided below in Section 4 Appendices). Please comment the clauses/ wordings you may want to discuss. If not comment is made, this means ICRC Terms and Conditions are accepted. Deviation from the standard terms & conditions: Payment terms will be 60 days upon receipt of invoice.

9. Other

Add other documents and references deemed appropriate.

Please do not submit generic marketing materials, broadly descriptive attachments or other general literature. Providers are cautioned not to refer to a brochure as a response to a requirement. Providers are expected to write complete answers for each requirement indicated in this RfP and not to refer to previous responses.

3.8. LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS

In this RFP, the key words “may”, “must”, “must not”, “optional”, “recommended”, “should”, and “should not”, are to be interpreted as follows:

**Must**: This word, or the terms “required”, “at a minimum” or “shall”, means that the definition is an absolute requirement of the specification.

**Must not**: This phrase, or the phrase “shall not”, means that the definition is an absolute prohibition of the specification.

**Should**: This word, or the adjective “recommended”, means that there may exist valid reasons in particular circumstances to ignore a particular item, but the full implications must be understood and carefully weighted before choosing a different course.

**Should not**: This phrase, or the phrase “not recommended” means that there may exist valid reasons in particular circumstances when the particular behaviour is acceptable or even useful, but the full implications should be understood and the case carefully weighted before implementing any behaviour described with this label.
May: This word, or the adjective “optional”, means that an item is truly optional.

Providers must respond to all mandatory requirements (“must”, “shall”, “required”, “must not”, “shall not”) presented throughout this RfP. Provider’s compliance with requirements must be indicated. Failure to respond may disqualify your proposal.

3.9. PROVIDER PROPOSAL PRESENTATION

Once the ICRC has reviewed all proposals, it may decide to exclude clearly inferior proposals. Thereafter, the ICRC will send a list to the remaining bidders with additional questions and issues that require further clarification.

Shortlisted bidders may be invited to present their proposals to the ICRC project team and discuss the project further. The presentation will be limited to 0.5 hours. Approximately 0.5 hour should be reserved for the presentation of the proposal, followed by approx. 0.5 hour for questions and answers.

The provider should be prepared to present the proposal at one of the dates reserved for presentations, as stated in the timetable in chapter 3.1. The exact time and location of the presentation will be communicated at a later date.

Additional information received from the provider presentations and reference customers will contribute to ICRC’s evaluation of proposals.

3.10. PROPOSAL PREPARATION COSTS

The provider issuing a proposal will do so at its own cost. The ICRC will not consider any requests for the reimbursement of any costs associated with the preparation and issue of the proposal.

3.11. INTEGRITY OF RESPONSES

The proposal must be a bona fide response. Responding companies may be ruled out from further consideration for failure to comply with the specifications of this RfP.

3.12. VALIDITY

The proposal shall remain valid 120 days after the date of issue and shall remain binding upon the provider at any time before the expiration of that period. The ICRC reserves the right in its sole discretion to request for the extension of this period, which shall be at no cost to the ICRC, if agreed with the provider.

3.13. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES GUIDING ICRC’S RELATIONSHIPS WITH PROVIDERS

Offering any form of bribes, gifts or any other inducement to any ICRC representative, or its designated contractors, with the view to influence the outcome of the RfP will result in the rejection of the proposal and disqualification of the provider.

3.14. LEGAL DISCLAIMER

This document is a Request for Proposal (RfP) in connection with the project outlined in it. It is not intended to, nor should it be interpreted as, being an offer to contract.

Neither the ICRC nor any of its officers, employees or external consultancy make any explicit or implied representation or warranty as to, nor will have any liability or responsibility for, the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in this document or made available in connection with the project outlined in it. The ICRC and its officers, employees and external consultancy expressly disclaim any and all liability, which may
be based on such information, errors therein, or omissions there from (provided nothing in this RfP shall exclude or limit liability for fraudulent misrepresentation).

3.15. NON-DISCLOSURE

The information contained in this RfP (or accumulated through other written or verbal communication in connection with this RfP) is confidential, shall be used for proposal purposes only, and shall not be disclosed or used by providers for any other purpose. The RfP documents, including other data appended or related to them, must be returned to the ICRC or destroyed upon the ICRC’s request.

The ICRC agrees to hold information received in response to this RfP in confidence and will not disclose it to parties without express written consent from provider.

The ICRC reserves the right to publish selected information regarding the award of this contract, including the nature of the services, the name of the selected supplier, and the value of the contract.

3.16. COMMUNICATION

Providers may not refer to the ICRC for any public communication purposes, such as displaying ICRC’s logo for example. Publicity or news release pertaining to this RfP, or the award of any contract related to it, must not be made public without prior written approval of the ICRC. The contracts that the ICRC signs with its providers must clearly stipulate that no use may be made of the name, image or logo of the ICRC, or any of the Red Cross or Red Crescent emblems, without prior written approval.

3.17. OWNERSHIP OF MATERIALS

All materials submitted in response to this RfP become the property of the ICRC. Proposals and supporting material will not be returned to providers.

3.18. ACCEPTANCE

The ICRC reserves the right to reject any or all proposals received as the result of this RfP, in whole or in part, in the sole discretion of the ICRC. The ICRC reserves the right to negotiate modifications, prior to and leading up to selection of the provider(s).

3.19. PROVIDER EVALUATION AND SELECTION

The ICRC will select the provider(s) after a thorough evaluation. Any responding provider selected will be chosen on the basis of greatest benefit to the ICRC and will be considered for an eventual contract. The ICRC reserves the right, in its evaluation of the proposal, to consider all pertinent information and criteria it deems appropriate, whether or not related requirements and criteria are specified in this RfP.

Further, the ICRC might request access to the provider’s external auditor for a certification of the provider’s financial statements.

After a final selection is made, the winning provider will be invited to negotiate a contract with the ICRC; remaining providers will be notified in writing of their selection status.

Main evaluation criteria are:

- Understanding of the work to be performed
- Ability to work collaboratively with the ICRC (and its partners, where necessary) to ensure the project objectives are met
- Completeness, accuracy and consistency of the proposals
- Commitment to quality and technical expertise
- Full comment of general and technical issues
• Full comment of quality issues and control
• Experience with similar projects
• Provider viability
• Itemization of billing
• Match with ICRC: mentality, ethics, resources, processes

The principle of independence requires that the contractual relationship between the ICRC and a provider does in no way lead to believe that the ICRC may endorse a provider, its products, policies or services. The ICRC cannot grant formal “exclusivity” to any provider.

4. APPENDICES

Appendix 1: ICRC Terms and Conditions for Services, can be accessed here

Appendix 2: Response Grid (separate .xlsx document)

Appendix 3: External Actors and Partners in Humanitarian Forensic Action
Appendix 3
External Actors and Partners in Humanitarian Forensic Action

Multiple stakeholders at national, regional, and international levels carry out varying degrees with which we have interactions on various forensic-related activities and other issues of ICRC’s concern.

Other actors include:

International organizations:
- INTERPOL
- ICMP
- ICC
- WHO
- IOM
- UNODC
- OHCHR

Regional organizations:
- ICRC-sponsored networks of medico-legal services (Red Iberoamericana de IML; Asia-Pacific Network of MLIs; African Association of Legal Medicine) (case-specific cooperation e.g. disaster response).

NGOs:
- EAAF, working worldwide (general advisory services, missing, disasters, criminal investigations)
- FAFG, working worldwide (missing, HR/criminal investigations, advisory services)
- EPAF, working worldwide (missing, HR/criminal investigations, advisory services)
- EMAF, Mexico (idem above)

National institutions:
- All national medico-legal systems (criminal investigations, disasters)
- Special mechanisms (e.g., CMP in Cyprus, DPAA in the US, etc.)
- Armed and other security forces (e.g., police)
- Civil defense

Others:
- Movement actors (IFRC, National Societies)
- Academic institutions and organizations (CURML, Aix-Marseille University, Cranfield University, etc.)
- Specialized and scientific organizations (e.g., ARANZADI, AAFS, IAFS, ALAF, FASE, etc.)