

INVITATION TO TENDER

Uganda

Tender/SCI/SC/CO/03/2026

05th March 2026

**TENDER FOR THE PROVISION OF CONSULTANCY SERVICES TO UNDERTAKE AN
ENDLINE EVALUATION FOR THE CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEM STRENGTHENING
PROJECT (CPSSP) IN ARUA DISTRICT – UGANDA**

SUBMISSION DEADLINE: 12:00 PM ON 11th March 2026

PRE-SUBMISSION CLARIFICATION MEETING: N/A

QUESTIONS / CLARIFICATIONS: uganda.coprocurement@savethechildren.org

FORMAT FOR SUBMISSION: [BIDDER RESPONSE DOCUMENT](#)

PART 1 : INVITATION TO TENDER

- o Introduction to SCI
- o Project Overview and Requirements
 - o Award Criteria
- o Instructions & Key Information

PART 2 : CORE REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATION

Detailed description of SCI's specific requirements (e.g. volumes, delivery dates / locations, product specifications etc).

PART 3 : BIDDER RESPONSE DOCUMENT

Template to be used to submit response to this Invitation to Tender.

PART 1 – INVITATION TO TENDER

1. INTRODUCTION TO SAVE THE CHILDREN

SCI is the world's leading independent organisation for children. We save children's lives; we fight for their rights; we help them fulfil their potential. We work together, with our partners, to inspire breakthroughs in the way the world treats children and to achieve immediate and lasting change in their lives.

Our Vision – a world in which every child attains the right to survival, protection, development and participation.

Our Mission – to inspire breakthroughs in the way the world treats children and to achieve immediate and lasting change in their lives.

We do this through a range of initiatives and programmes, to:

- ❑ Provide lifesaving supplies & emotional support for children caught up in disasters (e.g. floods, famine & wars).
- ❑ Campaign for long term change to improve children's lives.
- ❑ Improve children's access to the food and healthcare they need to survive.
- ❑ Secure a good quality education for the children who need it most.
- ❑ Protect the world's most vulnerable children, including those separated from their families because of war, natural disasters, extreme poverty or exploitation.
- ❑ Work with families to help them out of the poverty cycle so they can feed and support their children.

For more information on the work we undertake and recent achievements, visit our [website](#).

2. PROJECT OVERVIEW

Item	Description
Description of Goods / Services	TENDER FOR THE PROVISION OF CONSULTANCY SERVICES TO UNDERTAKE AN ENDLINE EVALUATION FOR THE CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEM STRENGTHENING PROJECT (CPSSP) IN ARUA DISTRICT – UGANDA

Outcome of Tender	<i>Contract – the successful supplier(s) will be awarded a ‘Contract’. Within the terms & conditions of supply e.g. specifications, lead times, indemnities, liabilities, warranties etc.</i>
Duration of Award	90 days

Further detail on the specific requirements of the project (e.g. volumes, dates, specifications etc.) can be found in [Part 2 \(Core Requirements & Specifications\)](#) of this Tender Pack.

3. AWARD CRITERIA

SCI is committed to running a fair and transparent tender process and ensuring that all bidders are treated and assessed equally during this tender process. Bidder responses will be evaluated against four weighted categories of criteria: Essential Criteria, Sustainability Criteria, Capability Criteria, and Commercial Criteria.

3.1 ESSENTIAL CRITERIA

Criteria which bidders **must** meet in order to progress to the next round of evaluation. If a bidder does not meet any of the Essential Criteria, they will be excluded from the tender process immediately. These criteria are scored as ‘Pass’ / ‘Fail’.

3.2 CAPABILITY CRITERIA (40%)

Criteria used to evaluate the bidder’s ability, skill and experience in relation to the requirements. Bids will be evaluated against the same pre-agreed Criteria.

3.3 SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA (10%)

Criteria used to evaluate the impact a supplier has on the environment, local economy and community. Bids will be evaluated against the same pre-agreed Criteria.

3.4 COMMERCIAL CRITERIA (50%)

Criteria used to evaluate the commercial competitiveness of a bid. Bids will be evaluated against the same pre-agreed Criteria.

4. VETTING

Successful bidders must be successfully vetted. This involves checking bidders and key personnel against Global Watch Lists, Enhanced Due Diligence Lists and Politically Exposed Persons Lists.

The vetting of bidders will be completed after the award decision and prior to any contract being signed, or orders placed. If any information provided by the Bidder throughout the

tender process is proved to be incorrect during the vetting process (or at any other point), SCI may withdraw their award decision.

5. BIDDER INSTRUCTIONS

6.1 TIMESCALES

Activity	Date
Issue Invitation to Tender	05 th March, 2026
Pre-Submission Clarification Meeting	N/A
Deadline for questions from Bidders	06 th March 2026 at 12:00pm
Deadline for Bid Submission	11 th March 2026, 12:00PM
Award Contract	16 th March, 2026

Above dates are for indicative purposes only and are subject to change.

6.2 SUBMISSION FORMAT & BIDDER RESPONSE DOCUMENT

Bidders wishing to submit a bid **must use the Bidder Response Document template in [Part 3 of this Tender Pack](#)**. Any bids received using different formats, or incomplete bids, will not be accepted.

This document allows bidders to submit all the required information and be evaluated fairly and equally against the Essential, Capability and Commercial Criteria. Bidders may also be required to submit supporting documentation. Further instructions can be found within the document in Part 3 of this pack.

Soft copy Bids shall be submitted to:

Email: uganda.coprocurement@savethechildren.org

OR

Paper Submission

- ☐ One paper copy submitted on headed paper to
Save the Children International
First Floor Grand Luthuli House
Plot 15 Luthuli Avenue, Bugolobi
P.O Box 12018, Kampala - Uganda
Tel: 0393 264520.
- ☐ Bids should be submitted in a single sealed envelope addressed to “The Procurement Committee-Save the Children International”.

The envelope should clearly indicate the Invitation to “**Tender for the provision of consultancy services to undertake an endline evaluation for the Child Protection system strengthening Project in Arua District – Uganda.**”

but contain no other details relating to the bid or the bidder’s name.

- ☐ All supporting documentation should be labelled and grouped together (individual envelopes, stapled etc) and then included in a single sealed envelope as per the above.

6.4 CLOSING DATE FOR BID SUBMISSION

Your bid must be received, no later than **12:00 pm on 11th March, 2026.**

Bids must remain valid and open for consideration for a period of no less than **60 Working days.**

6.5 KEY CONTACTS

All questions relating to the tender should be sent via email to:

Name	Email Address
Mitchell Mugerwa (HoSC)	mitchell.mugerwa@savethechildren.org

Please be advised local working hours are 8:00 am to 5:00 pm. Please allow up to 2 days for a response.

Where the enquiry may have an impact on other bidders within the process, Save the Children will notify all other Bidders to maintain a fair and transparent process.

PART 2 – CORE REQUIREMENTS & SPECIFICATIONS

1. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS / CATEGORY OF GOODS / SERVICES

The Terms Of Reference (TORs) below represent the minimum requirements for this assignment, and consultants are advised to suggest any additional cost-effective approaches that will ensure more value addition to the exercise.

1.1 IMPLEMENTATION LOCATIONS:

Location: Uganda

Estimated duration of the assignment: **90 Days**

1.2. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE ASSIGNMENT

Project summary

	Details
Type of Study	Endline Evaluation Study
Name of the Project	Child Protection System Strengthening Project (CPSSP) in Arua, Uganda
Project Start and End Dates	March 31, 2023-June 2, 2026 (Year 1,2 and 3)
Project Duration	39 months (Year 1, 2 and 3)
Project Locations	Arua District (4 sub-counties) and Arua City (2 divisions)
Thematic Areas	Child Protection, Family Strengthening, Advocacy, Community Engagement
Donor	Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs (JMoFA) Save the Children Japan (SCJ)
Target Beneficiaries	Direct: 32,726 children/youth; 119,165 adults Indirect: 233,000 children/youth; 210,000 adults
Overall Objective	Strengthen child protection systems to ensure meaningful coordination, enhance social service delivery, and provide comprehensive support to children, parents, and caregivers through advocacy and community-driven initiatives, fostering local ownership and sustainability.

1.2.1 Introduction

These Terms of Reference (ToR) outline the framework for the Endline Assessment for three years Child Protection System Strengthening Project (CPSSP) implemented by Save the Children in Arua District and Arua City, West Nile region, Uganda, with funding from the Government of Japan through the Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs (JMoFA) and Save the Children Japan (SCJ).

The ToR defines the scope, objectives, methodology, roles, responsibilities, and deliverables of the endline evaluation to be conducted by an external consultant. The document serves as a formal agreement between Save the Children International (SCI) and the selected evaluation team, ensuring a shared understanding of expectations and standards.

Specifically, the ToR aims to:

- *Clarify the purpose, scope, and expected outputs of the evaluation.*
- *Define roles and responsibilities of all parties involved.*
- *Ensure methodological rigor and ethical compliance.*
- *Promote transparency and accountability to stakeholders*

1.2.2 Background and context

Project background

The Child Protection System Strengthening Project (CPSSP) focuses on six interconnected system-strengthening components that collectively aim to improve the prevention of and response to violence against children in Arua. These include:

- *strengthening the social workforce through enhanced capacity, performance, and institutionalisation of Social Welfare Officers and Para-Social Workers;*
- *improving prevention and response services to ensure early identification, timely referral, and quality support for children at risk;*
- *strengthening coordination and governance mechanisms such as Child Wellbeing Committees and Alternative Care Panels to enable effective multi-sectoral collaboration;*
- *enhancing information and case management systems, including digital platforms, to support accountability, case tracking, and evidence-based decision-making;*
- *promoting meaningful child participation and social accountability so that children's voices inform planning, budgeting, and service delivery;*
- *strengthening child justice mechanisms to ensure child-friendly, coordinated, and timely responses for children in contact with the law.*

To complement CPSSP, Save the Children Japan (SC Japan) funded a parallel project titled “Family strengthening, Child participation and Child justice initiatives as prevention and response mechanisms to strengthen the child protection system in Arua, Uganda” in the same implementation area from July 2024 to June 2026, adding three components: safefamilies(SCI evidence-based global common approach for positive parenting), child participation and social accountability (SCI evidence-based global common approach for

child participation/child-centred advocacy), and child justice. These components are intended to reinforce prevention and accountability mechanisms and to strengthen pathways between families, communities, and formal child protection and justice actors.

As the two projects approach their final closure period, Save the Children seeks to commission a comprehensive endline evaluation to assess overall impact, effectiveness, sustainability, and the extent to which strengthened systems and family- and community-based prevention approaches are likely to continue beyond project support. Safe Families is implemented in the same geographical area as a complementary family-strengthening approach; however, it is being assessed through a separate Safe Families Impact Assessment. To avoid duplication and to maintain clarity of evaluative scope, this CPSSP Endline Evaluation will not collect primary data to assess Safe Families outcomes or implementation performance, nor draw evaluative conclusions on Safe Families. Safe Families will be referenced only as part of the broader intervention context where relevant for interpretation of CPSSP system-level findings.

1.2.3 Geographic description and context

The project is implemented in Arua District and Arua City in the West Nile region of Uganda, an area characterised by historical conflict, high poverty levels, and pressure on social services due to urbanisation and population mobility. These contextual factors increase risks of violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation of children and place sustained demands on both formal child protection systems and family- and community-level prevention mechanisms.

In this context, children and families may face heightened risks of violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation, and the demand for both formal child protection services and community-based prevention mechanisms can be significant. The operating environment, therefore, requires strong coordination and functional referral pathways across government and community structures.

Implementation is led by Save the Children in partnership with the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MoGLSD), district and city local governments, Child Wellbeing Committees (CWCs), Social Welfare Officers (SWOs), and community structures such as Para-Social Workers (PSWs).

1.2.4 Project Objectives

The overall objective of the Child Protection System Strengthening Project (CPSSP) is to strengthen child protection systems to effectively prevent and respond to violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation of children.

The evaluation focuses on consolidating system functionality, sustainability, and government ownership, while strengthening family- and community-level prevention and response mechanisms.

1.2.4 Key Priority Areas

Focus Area	Description	Priority Interventions to be Assessed
1. Social Workforce Strengthening	Strengthening the professional capacity, role clarity, performance, and institutional positioning of the child protection social service workforce.	• Deployment, training, and logistical support to PSWs and SWOs to improve quality, timeliness, and effectiveness of case management and referrals. • Strengthening coordination between PSWs, SWOs, and government-led child protection structures. • Assessing contribution and performance of PSWs and SWOs in child protection service delivery. • Generating evidence to inform advocacy for institutionalization and integration of SWOs within formal government structures.
2. Prevention, Response, and Information Management	Collaborate with CP structures to change harmful and discriminatory social norms. These include physical and humiliating punishment, Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV), Child labour, among others.	• Strengthening quality, timeliness, and appropriateness of child protection case management and referral services. • Enhancing early identification, reporting, and response mechanisms at community and institutional levels. • Addressing harmful and discriminatory social norms (corporal punishment, SGBV, child labour and other forms of violence against children • Collaboration with MGLSD on development and operationalization of the Child Wellbeing Management Information System (CWMIS). • Establishment and strengthening of Alternative Care Panels (ACPs). • Assessing functionality, effectiveness, and sustainability of Alternative Care Panels (ACPs) • Strengthening functionality of referral pathways.
3. Coordination	Strengthening governance and coordination mechanisms that enable	• Strengthening functionality of Child Wellbeing Committees (CWCs) for

	effective and sustainable child protection service delivery.	prevention, case identification, referral, and follow-up. • Reconstitution of dormant CWCs and clarification of roles and responsibilities. • Improving inter-sectoral coordination among social services, justice actors, and community structures through coordination platforms and joint case reviews.
4. Child Justice	Promoting child-friendly justice systems and improving access to justice for children in contact with the law.	The programme strengthened collaboration between Social Welfare Officers (SWOs), the police (including CFPU), and justice sector actors to improve coordination in the management of child protection cases. The Key interventions included. • Strengthening collaboration between SWOs, police (CFPU), and justice sector actors. • Clarifying roles, responsibilities, and referral pathways in child justice case management. • Promoting diversion, appropriate alternative care, and child-sensitive justice procedures in line with national guidelines. • Capacity strengthening child-friendly approaches, gatekeeping, and best interests' determination. • Improving documentation, follow-up, coordination, and tracking child justice cases.
5. Child Participation	Promoting meaningful child participation in child protection decision-making, advocacy, and accountability processes.	• Formation and strengthening of Child Reference Groups (CRGs) and other child-led platforms, including Social Accountability Committees (SACs). • Capacity strengthening of children on child rights, leadership, protection issues, and safe participation. • Promoting child-led advocacy to influence planning, budgeting, and policy decisions related to child protection. • Strengthening linkages between child-led platforms and local

		<i>government planning and accountability structures.</i> • <i>Enhancing community awareness and accountability through child-led dialogues and advocacy initiatives.</i>
6. Safe Families (Context only – not assessed under this ToR)	Strengthening family-based prevention approaches to reduce risks of violence and improve child wellbeing.	• Positive Parenting Knowledge, attitudes and practices • Positive relationships (between children & adults/parents and between wives & husbands) • Children's resilience & empowerment Not assessed under this ToR. Safe Families outcome measurement and any assessment of implementation performance will be conducted through a separate Safe Families Approach Impact Assessment.

1.3 PURPOSE and Scope of the Study

Purpose of the study

The evaluation will assess the contribution and emerging effects of all core CPSSP components across the six focus areas outlined above, namely: social workforce strengthening; prevention, response, and information management; coordination; child justice; child participation; and safe families. Drawing on evidence generated through baseline and endline assessments conducted in Years 1 and 2, alongside routine monitoring data and administrative records, the evaluation will synthesise multiple data sources to support contribution analysis, interpretation of trends over time, and assessment of sustainability and institutionalisation of child protection interventions. A core purpose is also to generate and validate the data required to report against CPSSP's donor and project logframe indicators, including where indicator values are being measured for the first time, through targeted primary data collection and structured review of existing programme and administrative datasets. Where feasible, the evaluation will also generate light-touch cost-efficiency/value-for-money insights to inform planning and budgeting, including indicative unit costs and cost per key service outputs, using available financial data and implementation/service delivery records.

The evaluation will examine both system-level strengthening efforts and family- and community-based prevention and response approaches to determine their collective contribution to improved child protection outcomes. In doing so, it will assess how CPSSP interventions have strengthened the functionality and coordination of child protection systems, enhanced the capacity and performance of the social workforce, reinforced family-

and community-based prevention and response mechanisms, expanded meaningful child participation and social accountability, and supported the institutionalisation and sustainability of child protection structures and practices beyond project support.

1.3.1 Specific objectives of the study

The specific objectives of the endline evaluation are to:

1. **Social Workforce Strengthening:** Assess the extent to which CPSSP interventions have strengthened the competencies, performance, leadership, and coordination roles of Social Welfare Officers (SWOs) and Para-Social Workers (PSWs) and examine how these changes have contributed to improved quality, timeliness, and effectiveness of child protection service delivery over the project period. The evaluation will also assess progress in institutionalising and resourcing these roles, including efforts to (i) have SWO-related costs integrated into Arua District and Arua City local government budgets and plans, and (ii) contribute to national-level advocacy and policy dialogue on the regularisation of the SWO role within the government system.
2. **Prevention, Response, and Information Management:** Examine improvements in the quality, timeliness, and appropriateness of child protection case management and referral services and assess how information management practices and systems have supported prevention, response, coordination, accountability, and evidence-based decision-making throughout the project lifecycle.
3. **Coordination:** Assess the functionality, coordination, and sustainability of Child Wellbeing Committees (CWCs), Alternative Care Panels (ACPs), reception centres, and referral mechanisms, and examine their contribution to timely, coherent, and child-centred child protection responses within district and city systems.
4. **Child Participation:** Assess the extent and quality of meaningful, safe, and inclusive child participation enabled through child-led platforms and examine how child-led advocacy (Child Reference group) and Child-Centred and Social Accountability (CCSA) initiatives have influenced community awareness, planning, budgeting, accountability, and decision-making for child protection.
5. **Child Justice:** Assess the extent to which CPSSP interventions have strengthened child-friendly justice practices, including collaboration among SWOs, police, and justice sector actors; application of diversion and alternative care measures; and coordination, documentation, and follow-up of cases involving children in contact with the law.
6. **Safe Families:** Assess the extent to which Safe Families interventions have strengthened family-based prevention approaches by improving positive parenting knowledge, attitudes, and practices; promoting positive relationships between children and caregivers and within households; and enhancing children's resilience and empowerment, thereby reducing risks of violence and improving overall child wellbeing. (**Not assessed under this ToR.** Safe Families outcome measurement and any assessment of implementation performance will be conducted through a separate Safe Families Impact Assessment.)
7. **Cross-Cutting: Learning and Sustainability:** Document key lessons learned, best practices, and actionable recommendations to inform sustainability planning, institutionalisation, and

future child protection system strengthening and family-based prevention programming. Where data permit, provide light-touch cost-efficiency insights (e.g., indicative unit costs and cost per key service outputs) to support sustainability planning, institutionalisation, and local government budgeting.

1.3.2 Scope of the Study

The endline evaluation will assess the overall performance and contribution of the Child Protection System Strengthening Project (CPSSP) and the family strengthening programs through child participation and child justice initiatives across the full three-year implementation period (2023-2026).

The evaluation will examine the extent to which activities, outputs, and outcomes delivered over the project lifecycle have contributed to strengthening child protection systems, improving family- and community-based prevention and response mechanisms, and enhancing institutionalization and government ownership.

1.3.3 Geographic Scope

Geographically, the study will be conducted in the four sub-counties of Arua District (Vurra, Arivu, Logiri, and Ajia) and the two divisions of Arua City (Ayivu and Arua central) where CPSSP has been implemented. These locations encompass both urban and peri-urban settings and reflect diverse socio-economic conditions and child protection challenges.

1.3.4 Analytical Focus Areas

The endline evaluation will assess the overall project impact and performance across the three-year implementation period. The assessment will determine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the interventions implemented, measure progress against planned indicators and targets, and document lessons learned and recommendations for future programming across the following focus areas:

1. **Social workforce strengthening**, this focused on enhancing the capacity, effectiveness, coordination, and sustainability of the social service workforce to deliver quality, timely, and accountable child protection and social welfare services. This includes both formal government actors and community-based structures who play a critical role in prevention, identification, referral, and response to child protection risks. The endline evaluation will assess the effectiveness of interventions aimed at building the capacity, motivation, and performance of the social service workforce, including the para-social workers (PSWs), Community development officers (CDOs), probation officers, and social welfare workers (SWOs). The evaluation will also review opportunities for retention of the social welfare workforce particularly the SWOs, coordination, and deployment, as well as the sustainability of capacity-building measures and their integration into local government systems beyond the project lifecycle.
2. **Prevention and response**, this component aimed to reduce children's exposure to abuse, neglect, exploitation, and violence, while ensuring that children at risk or affected receive timely, appropriate, and coordinated protection services. This dual approach recognizes that sustainable child protection systems must both proactively address root causes of harm and effectively respond when violations occur. The component of child protection system strengthening focused mainly on strengthening

families, communities, and local government structures to create safe, protective environments for children, while ensuring that structured mechanisms are in place to identify, report, refer, and manage child protection cases at community level.

3. **Coordination**, key interventions here focused on establishing and reinforcing functional child protection coordination mechanisms at the sub-national level to ensure effective, well-coordinated, and accountable service delivery for vulnerable children and families within Arua district and Arua city. Key coordination structures established under the project include the Child Wellbeing Committees, Alternative Care Panels, and designated child protection and GBV focal persons at district, city, sub-county, and division levels. These mechanisms aim to improve joint planning, harmonize implementation, and multi-sectoral collaboration among local government departments, civil society actors, and community structures. This endline evaluation will assess the effectiveness of established coordination mechanisms, including Child Wellbeing Committees (CWC), Alternative Care Panels (ACP), and Child Protection & GBV Focal Persons, in strengthening a well-coordinated planning and delivery of child protection services. It will examine how these structures have facilitated resource mobilization, harmonized prevention and response interventions, and enhanced data and information sharing among stakeholders. The evaluation will also review the sustainability and institutionalization of these coordination mechanisms beyond the project lifecycle.
4. **Child justice**, this pillar focused at strengthening the child justice systems and processes to prioritize the best interests of the child, promote rehabilitation and reintegration with families and communities over punishment (sentence), and ensure that children are protected from further harm including trauma, or discrimination within legal and administrative procedures. This initiative placed particular emphasis on ensuring that children who came into contact with the law whether as victims, witnesses, or children in conflict with the law are treated in a child-friendly manner. It adopts a rights-based approach to case management while maintaining full consistency with both national and international child protection standards. This component also prioritized supporting the police in diverting minor cases, enabling resolution outside the formal justice system. This endline evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the project in strengthening child-friendly justice mechanisms, including the capacity of law enforcement, judicial actors, and probation officers to respond to child protection cases in accordance with national laws and international standards. It will examine the extent to which children in conflict with the law and children in need of care and protection have access to timely, fair, and protective procedures, and the degree to which referral pathways, case management systems, and coordination between justice actors and social services have been institutionalized and sustained at the sub-national level.
5. **Child participation**, the project emphasized recognizing children as active rights-holders and partners, ensuring their voices inform planning, service delivery, accountability, and governance at household, community, and institutional levels. Child Reference Groups (CRGs) were established as structured participation platforms for children at the sub-national level, while other children were engaged through awareness-raising, the Safe Families program, and individual case management. The CRGs enabled children to interact with duty bearers, highlight child protection and service delivery gaps, and provide recommendations to strengthen

local government responsiveness. The endline evaluation will assess the extent to which these mechanisms enhanced children's voice, influence, representation, and inclusion in local decision-making processes, and the sustainability of these platforms beyond the project lifecycle.

6. **Safe Families**, The Safe Families analytical area will assess the extent to which CPSSP family-strengthening and positive parenting interventions have contributed to reducing risks of violence against children and improving child wellbeing at household and community levels. This will include examining changes in caregivers' knowledge, attitudes, and practices related to positive parenting; the quality of relationships within families (including caregiver-child and spousal relationships); and the ability of families to identify, prevent, and respond to child protection concerns early. The analysis will also explore how Safe Families interventions have strengthened linkages between households, community structures, and formal child protection services, including referrals to PSWs, SWOs, and other service providers, and the contribution of these approaches to prevention, resilience, and sustained child protection outcomes. (*Not assessed under this ToR*)

1.3.5 Key Respondent Groups

To ensure a comprehensive understanding of project outcomes, the evaluation will prioritise engagement with the following groups:

1. **Primary system actors:** Social Welfare Officers (SWOs) and Para-Social Workers (PSWs), to assess competencies, practices, case management performance, coordination roles, and sustainability considerations.
2. **Community and child participation platforms:** Children participating in Child Reference Groups (CRGs), Social Accountability Committees (SACs), and other relevant community-based structures supported through CPSSP, to understand participation, accountability, and community-level prevention and response linkages.
3. **Stakeholders and partners:** District, city, sub-county and division authorities (CAO, City clerk, CCDO, DCDO, PSWOs, Mayor, LC5, LC3, etc.), MoGLSD, and relevant partners involved in coordination platforms (e.g., Child Wellbeing Committees, Alternative Care Panels, CP/GBV focal persons) to assess governance, institutionalisation, and alignment with planning frameworks.
4. **Special populations (as feasible):** Marginalised groups, including children with disabilities, to assess inclusivity and equity of CPSSP-supported services.

1.3.6 Key Study Questions

Focus Area	Key Study Questions.
------------	----------------------

1. Social Workforce Strengthening	To what extent have CPSSP interventions strengthened the competencies, performance, leadership, and coordination roles of Social Welfare Officers (SWOs) and Para-Social Workers (PSWs), and how have these changes affected the quality, timeliness, and effectiveness of child protection service delivery over the project period? Sub-questions • <i>To what extent does deployment of Social Welfare Officers (SWOs) at sub-county level improve the effectiveness (timeliness, quality, coordination) and efficiency (workload distribution, resource use) of case management led by PSWs, and what indicative cost-efficiency signals can be generated (e.g., unit costs and cost per case/referral outputs), where feasible?</i> • <i>To what extent have district and city authorities progressed in institutionalising and financing the SWO functions, including the inclusion of SWO-related costs in Arua District and Arua City local government plans and budgets, and what enabling or constraining factors have shaped this process?</i> • <i>What intrinsic and extrinsic factors influence the motivation and continued engagement of PSWs in community-based child protection activities?</i>
2. Prevention, Response, and Information Management (incl. CWIMS)	To what extent has CPSSP improved the quality, timeliness, and appropriateness of child protection case management and referral services, (both internal case management data (Kobo) and the broader external case management system it interfaces with) and how effectively have information management practices and systems supported prevention, response, coordination, accountability, and evidence-based decision-making throughout the project lifecycle?
3. Coordination and Governance	To what extent are Child Wellbeing Committees (CWCs), Alternative Care Panels (ACPs), reception centres, and referral mechanisms functional, coordinated, and sustainably embedded within district and city child protection systems, and how have they contributed to timely, coherent, and child-centred responses? Sub-questions: • <i>What factors predict the sustainability and continued functionality of Child Wellbeing Committees (CWCs), and how can CWCs be better integrated in district/city government systems for continuity beyond project cycles?</i>

4. Child Justice	To what extent has CPSSP contributed to strengthening child-friendly justice responses, including diversion and coordinated case handling, for children in contact with the law?
5. Child Participation and Advocacy	To what extent has CPSSP enabled meaningful child participation—including through Child-Centred Social Accountability (CCSA) mechanisms and dialogue with duty-bearers—that has influenced advocacy, planning, budgeting, and decision-making processes related to child protection at community and local government levels?
6. Safe Families and Child Wellbeing	To what extent have Safe Families and family-strengthening interventions contributed to improved parenting practices, reduced risks of violence against children, and strengthened child wellbeing at household and community levels? (<i>Not assessed under this ToR</i>)
7. Evidence, Sustainability, and Future Programming	What evidence has CPSSP generated on what works in strengthening child protection systems, and how can this evidence inform sustainability, scale-up, and future child protection programming?

1.3.7 Intended Audience and Use of the study

The findings from this endline evaluation will serve multiple purposes for a diverse group of stakeholders at community, sub-national, national, and global levels.

Save the Children will use the findings to assess the overall effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, and sustainability of the Child Protection System Strengthening Project (CPSSP) across the three-year implementation period. The evidence generated will inform organizational learning, identify best practices and gaps, and guide future child protection system strengthening and family-based prevention programming, including decisions on scale-up and replication. Additionally, the findings of the study will inform and support advocacy efforts by Save the Children, including other initiatives aimed at the formalization and regularization of the role of Social Welfare Officers (SWOs) within the mainstream government structure

At the **national and sub-national levels**, the **Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MoGLSD)** and local governments will use the findings to support evidence-based decision-making related to the institutionalization of Social Welfare Officers (SWOs), the sustainability of Para-Social Worker (PSW) initiatives, and the strengthening of coordination and governance mechanisms such as Child Wellbeing Committees (CWCs) and Alternative Care Panels (ACPs).

District, city, and sub-county authorities will apply the findings to improve the functionality of child protection systems, operationalize Child Protection Incident Preparedness Plans (CPIPPs), strengthen referral and coordination mechanisms, and enhance collaboration between government, community structures, and service providers.

For the **donor, the Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs (JMoFA)**, the evaluation will provide accountability for resources invested and demonstrate the value and contribution of CPSSP

interventions to strengthened child protection systems and improved child safety and wellbeing. The findings will also contribute to global learning on effective child protection system strengthening and Safe Families programming.

At the **community level**, actors such as SWOs, PSWs, Child Reference Groups (CRGs), caregivers, and community leaders will benefit from insights that support improved service delivery, strengthened family- and community-based prevention approaches, and more effective child participation and advocacy. **Development partners** may also use the findings to replicate and adapt successful strategies in other contexts.

Other child protection actors will utilize findings to inform their programming and pick lessons to influence advocacy.

Stakeholder Engagement

This evaluation will adopt a participatory and inclusive approach to stakeholder engagement to ensure that diverse perspectives inform the impact assessment of the Child protection system strengthening project (CPSSP) and family strengthening programs implemented in Arua district and Arua city within the 3 years. Relevant stakeholders both internally and externally will be meaningfully consulted throughout the study design, data collection, validation, and dissemination phases to enhance the credibility, ownership, and utility of the findings.

Key stakeholders will include children and adolescents (including members of Child Reference Groups, survivors/victims of abuse and violence), caregivers and families, community structures such as the Social Accountability committees (SACs), Para-social workers (PSWs), Social Welfare Officers (SWOs), Community Development Officers (CDOs), Child Protection and GBV focal persons, Alternative Care Panels members, Child Wellbeing Committees, local government technical and political leadership (CAO, City clerk, CCDO, DCDO, PSWOs, Mayor, LC5, LC3, etc.), service providers including the remand home, police (CFPU), civil society partners, and Save the Children project staff.

The study will ensure that children's participation is safe, ethical, and age-appropriate, guided by child safeguarding and do no harm principles. Child-friendly methodologies will be used to capture children's experiences, perspectives, and recommendations on service delivery, accountability, and impact of the project within the implementation periods. Engagement strategies may include key informant interviews, focus group discussions, validation workshops, and dissemination meetings to triangulate evidence and verify findings.

Consultation in Study Design

During the design phase of the evaluation, key stakeholders, including Save the Children, MoGLSD, and local government technical and political leadership (CCDO, DCDO, PSWOs, SWOs),—will be actively consulted to ensure that the evaluation design and methodology align with their priorities and expectations. This collaborative approach will enhance relevance, contextual appropriateness, and stakeholder ownership, and will support early buy-in for implementing recommendations arising from the findings.

Participation in Data Collection and Validation

Key stakeholders, including Social Welfare Officers (SWOs), Para-Social Workers (PSWs), government officials (PSWO, DCDOs, CCDO, CAO, City clerk, SAS, Police CFPU), and community representatives, will participate in data collection and validation processes to ensure that the information gathered accurately reflects the realities of child protection systems in Arua District and Arua City. Validation workshops will provide an opportunity to present preliminary findings, verify interpretations, and refine conclusions and recommendations in collaboration with stakeholders, strengthening credibility and ownership.

Feedback, Reporting, and Dissemination Mechanisms

- **Children and Communities:** Findings will be shared with communities, caregivers, and children through tailored dissemination and feedback sessions conducted in local languages and using accessible, child-friendly formats such as visual materials, infographics, and participatory tools. These sessions will encourage dialogue and feedback to ensure that findings are understood, relevant, and actionable at community level.
- **Government and Partners:** Tailored reports, policy briefs, and presentations will be developed for government stakeholders and project partners, with a focus on informing policy dialogue, advocacy efforts, sustainability planning, and integration of child protection systems and Safe Families approaches within government structures.
- **Wider Learning and Knowledge Sharing:** Results and insights from the evaluation will be documented and shared through Save the Children's learning platforms, research publications, and relevant conferences. This will contribute to broader national, regional, and global discussions on child protection system strengthening, Safe Families programming, and evidence-based prevention and response to violence against children.

1.4 Study Methodology

Study Design

The consultant will propose an appropriate and robust methodology to evaluate the overall performance and contribution of the Child Protection System Strengthening Project (CPSSP) across the three-year implementation period, with particular analytical emphasis on Year 3 as the consolidation and sustainability phase. The proposed methodology will be reviewed and approved by Save the Children prior to commissioning the evaluation.

The study design should apply appropriate sample sizes and sampling techniques for the various target respondent groups and ensure that data collection tools are child-friendly, participatory, and ethically sound. The design must sufficiently address all evaluation questions and indicators outlined in this TOR and clearly describe how each study question will be answered through the proposed methods.

The evaluation is expected to use a mixed-methods approach, integrating quantitative and qualitative methods to provide a comprehensive and triangulated assessment of project outcomes at system, community, and family levels.

1.5 Proposed Methods

The proposed methodology should include, but not be limited to, the following approaches:

- **Quantitative Methods:** Structured surveys targeting Social Welfare Officers (SWOs), Para-Social Workers (PSWs), caregivers, and children to measure changes in competencies, service delivery performance, caregiver practices, awareness, and satisfaction. Analysis of service delivery and case management records, including data from CWIMS, will be used to assess timeliness, appropriateness, and trends in responses to child protection cases. Where permissible, draw administrative indicators directly from CPIMS/CWIMS extracts to minimise primary data burden and enhance validity for example quasi-experimental comparative analysis (with/without SWOs) using routine administrative data (e.g., timeliness of response, case closure, referral completion) and matched comparison where feasible.
- **Qualitative Methods:** Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with caregivers, PSWs, community mentors, and children (where appropriate) to explore experiences, perceptions, challenges, and successes related to system strengthening and Safe Families interventions.

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with government officials, justice-sector actors, and project staff to capture strategic insights on coordination, institutionalisation, and sustainability of child protection systems.

In addition, **case studies and outcome narratives** documenting best practices and illustrative examples of change will be used to complement quantitative findings.

1.5.1 Data Sources and Data Collection Methods / Tools

The evaluation will draw on a combination of primary and secondary data sources to ensure a comprehensive assessment of the project. All primary data collected must allow for disaggregation by sex, age, disability status, geographic location, and vulnerability status to support inclusive and equity-focused analysis. Save the Children will provide guidance on tools, classifications, and standards to support data quality and disaggregation.

Existing Data Sources.

Save the Children will make available relevant project documentation and datasets, including:

- Social Welfare Officer (SWO) and Para-Social Worker (PSW) competency frameworks.
- Baseline and endline reports from earlier phases of the project.
- Routine monitoring and progress reports.
- Records related to Child Protection Incident Preparedness Plans (CPIPPs).
- Case management and service delivery records maintained by SWOs and PSWs.

- Financial and expenditure data for SWO work: programme budgets and expenditure reports, including key cost drivers (e.g., SWO salary, transport/fuel, supervision/coordination costs) to enable light-touch unit cost and cost-efficiency analysis.
- Training materials and pre- and post-training assessment results.

Where relevant, the evaluation team may also draw on external data sources, such as government administrative records or data from partner organisations, to strengthen analysis and triangulation.

Note: Any case management or service delivery data shared with the evaluation team will be provided only in aggregated and/or anonymised form, in line with Save the Children data protection and safeguarding standards. No personally identifiable or case-identifiable information will be shared.

1.5.1 Data Collection Tools and Approaches

Save the Children recommends the use of **standardised and approved data collection tools** to ensure consistency, comparability, and reliability. Existing tools and systems developed by Save the Children and the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MoGLSD)—including the **Child Protection Information Management System (CPIMS/CWIMS)** and other approved instruments—should be prioritised where applicable.

Where existing tools do not adequately capture required information, the consultant may propose adaptations or complementary tools, subject to approval by Save the Children. Any modifications must align with the objectives of the evaluation and comply with Save the Children’s **ethical, safeguarding, and data protection standards** to ensure the integrity and confidentiality of data collected. The approaches may include but are not limited to;

- *SWO contribution and cost-efficiency (light-touch VfM): extraction of case-management metrics; time-use/workload logs for SWOs/PSWOs; joint case review frequency; and supervision/home-visit transportation logs. Combine these with available cost elements to estimate indicative unit costs (e.g., cost per participant reached/completer for relevant activities where applicable) and cost per key service outputs (e.g., cost per case managed, cost per referral completed, cost per joint case review), to inform planning and budgeting.*
- *CWC sustainability: CWC functionality scorecards; review of meeting minutes, referrals, and integration into local government plans/budgets; stakeholder mapping of support flows*
- *PSW motivation & retention: standardized motivation/engagement survey; KIIs with PSWs and supervisors; FGDs; analysis of retention/attrition from program records; documentation of incentive packages (financial and non-financial).*
- *Tacit knowledge: pause & reflect sessions with implementers and government counterparts to capture adaptive learning.*

1.5.2 Expected Deliverables

Indicative Timeline (procurement and evaluation workplan)

Activity / Item	Responsible Party	Start Date	End Date
Contract signing with selected consultant	SCI / Consultant	16 March 2026	16 March 2026
Inception meeting arranged by consultant	Consultant / SCI	17 March 2026	18 March 2026
Draft inception report / evaluation plan	Consultant	24 March 2026	28 March 2026
Review inception report / evaluation plan	SCI	30 March 2026	01 April 2026
Revise inception report / evaluation plan	Consultant	02 April 2026	06 April 2026
SCI ethics review	Consultant / SCI	07 April 2026	10 April 2026
Uganda local ethics review	Consultant	10 April 2026	13 April 2026
Onboarding and training for enumerators	Consultant	13 April 2026	20 April 2026
Data collection	Consultant	27 April 2026	27 April 2026
1st draft report submission	Consultant	28 April 2026	30 April 2026
Review of 1st draft report	SCI	01 May 2026	01 May 2026
2nd draft report submission	Consultant	04 May 2026	07 May 2026
Review of 2nd draft report	SCI	08 May 2026	08 May 2026
Internal SCI Validation meeting – consultant presents findings	Consultant / SCI	11 May 2026	11 May 2026
Submission of final report and annexes including Datasets (Analysed and RAW)	Consultant	12 May 2026	12 May 2026
Final approval of report by SCI	SCI	20 May 2026	20 May 2026
External dissemination of report findings	Consultant / SCI	25 May 2026	26 May 2026

Note: Dates are indicative and may be adjusted in consultation with Save the Children.

1.6 Consultant Deliverables

Deliverable	Description / Minimum content	Format
-------------	-------------------------------	--------

Inception Report(Evaluation plan)	Final evaluation design, methodology, sampling approach, tools outline, analysis plan, ethical and safeguarding procedures, detailed fieldwork plan	MS Word + PDF
Final Evaluation Report	Final report using Save the Children report template and technical writing guidelines, including findings, conclusions, and actionable recommendations	MS Word + PDF
Evaluation Brief	2–4 page summary of key findings and recommendations (template to be provided)	MS Word + PDF
Presentation Deck	Slide deck summarising objectives, methodology, key findings, and recommendations (editable)	PPTX
Data Package	Cleaned and analysed quantitative datasets; qualitative transcripts/notes (as applicable); codebooks; analysis outputs (e.g., syntax files/tables); all delivered securely	Encrypted electronic files
Supporting Documentation	Signed consent/assent forms (securely stored and transferred), data management documentation, and any other materials required to verify data integrity and compliance	Encrypted electronic files

Data protection note: All data and supporting documentation must be handled in accordance with Save the Children’s data protection and safeguarding requirements. All electronic data transfers must be encrypted.

1.7 Study team and selection Criteria

Interested consultants are required to submit an Expression of Interest (EOI) in accordance with the provided template.

Save the Children will select the consulting firm/consultant(s) based on demonstrated technical capacity, relevant experience, and ability to deliver high-quality outputs within the proposed timeframe.

1.8 Minimum requirements (must-have)

The proposed team must demonstrate:

- *Proven experience designing and delivering evaluations and/or research using appropriate mixed methods and fit-for-purpose study designs.*
- *Strong applied experience in child protection evaluations, with demonstrated understanding of Uganda’s child protection systems, case management and referral pathways, coordination mechanisms and regulatory frameworks.*

- *Proven capacity to conduct ethical, safe, and inclusive data collection involving children and other vulnerable populations, including child participation approaches where appropriate.*
- *Demonstrated ability to manage field operations, quality assurance, and stakeholder engagement in complex multi-actor environments (government, NGOs, community structures).*
- *Strong reporting and communication skills, including production of high-quality technical reports and presentations for non-specialist audiences.*

1.9 Preferred requirements (added value)

- *Evidence that some team members have worked together previously on similar assignments.*
- *Demonstrated experience using theories of change to structure evaluation questions, analysis, and recommendations.*
- *Experience working in Uganda and/or with government child protection systems and information management tools (e.g., administrative datasets), where relevant.*

10.0 Team composition

Bidders may propose the most suitable structure; however, the team should include a designated Team Leader and demonstrate adequate capacity for: (i) field coordination and quality assurance, and (ii) quantitative and/or qualitative analysis and reporting (roles may be combined depending on the proposed approach).

11.0 Financial Proposal

Save the Children seeks value for money. This does not necessarily mean the lowest cost, but the quality of service, realism of assumptions, and the reasonableness and transparency of proposed costs. The financial proposal must be fully itemized and presented in UGX and/or USD (clearly stating the currency and exchange rate used, where applicable) to enable like-for-like comparison across bidders.

11.1 At minimum, the financial proposal must include:

1) Personnel Costs (mandatory)

Provide a personnel budget for each team member, including: role/title, key responsibilities, number of days by phase (inception/design, tool development/piloting, training, data collection, analysis, reporting, validation/dissemination), daily rate (or monthly rate with daily equivalent), subtotals, and applicable taxes/statutory charges. Clearly state whether rates are inclusive or exclusive of withholding tax, VAT, and any other applicable taxes.

2) Operational and Fieldwork Costs (mandatory)

Provide an itemized breakdown of all non-fee costs required to implement the proposed workplan (e.g., travel/transport, per diem/accommodation, training costs, data collection logistics including CAPI/data bundles/printing, translation/transcription, participant reimbursements where appropriate, and validation/dissemination costs). Key assumptions

(e.g., number of enumerators, field days, number of KIIs/FGDs, locations) must be stated and consistent with the technical proposal.

3) Cost Responsibilities and SCI In-kind Support (mandatory disclosure)

The proposal must reflect the agreed cost responsibilities and any SCI in-kind support (not to be included in the Consultant's budget unless otherwise agreed in writing). Any deviations must be clearly stated and will be considered under value-for-money.

SCI will provide / cover in-kind (subject to internal procedures and availability):

- *Access to relevant programme documents and routine monitoring/administrative data, including available extracts from information management systems (e.g., CWIMS) where permissible and in line with data protection requirements.*
- *Coordination support with district/city authorities and project-linked structures to facilitate non-coercive field access and scheduling (including support letters where applicable).*
- *SCI safeguarding orientation and referral/escalation arrangements for disclosures (approved pathways and focal points).*
- *Internal review and consolidation of feedback on key deliverables, and coordination of internal validation meeting logistics where held at SCI premises (if applicable).*
- *Enumerator sourcing support (if applicable): where SCI elects to provide enumerators already available within SCI database, the Consultant will cover their contractual arrangements and as such their costs must be budgeted for in the financial proposal.*

Costs to be budgeted by the Consultant (unless explicitly covered by SCI in writing):

- *All personnel costs and LOE as per Section 1.*
- *All operational and fieldwork costs required for the assignment as per Section 2, including enumerator recruitment/training/supervision and any CAPI devices/software subscriptions not provided by SCI.*
- *Data management, anonymisation, analysis, reporting, and production of deliverables (including editable files).*

Any deviations from the above cost responsibilities must be clearly stated in the Financial Proposal and will be assessed as part of value-for-money.

12.0 Schedule of Payment

Payments will be made against agreed deliverables on submission of satisfactory proof of progress and verification of quality. It is expected that payment will be made in 2 tranches and are subject to relevant tax deduction as per Uganda Tax Laws according to the outputs below. Payment will be processed upon receipt of a valid invoice and acceptance of the corresponding deliverable.

Deliverable	Payment
Submission of inception report	40%
Final approved report with all required annexes as specified in the TOR	60%
Total	100%

13.0 How to Apply

Submission Information:

Interested bidders are expected to provide the following documentation:

1. **Technical proposal** responding to this ToR, including proposed approach/design (cohort-based pre-post and cohort comparisons where feasible), data management and analysis plan, safeguarding approach, and a clear division of roles.
2. **Financial proposal** with a budget breakdown (role/days/daily rate/taxes) and any direct costs, clearly stating any assumptions.
3. **Workplan and timeline** aligned with the contract period and key deliverables (D1-D4, and dissemination support if feasible).
4. **Team CVs** (or consultant CV) showing relevant experience; include **at least two** recent and relevant references with contact details.
5. **One writing/analysis sample** from a comparable evaluation/research assignment (e.g., evaluation report excerpt, analysis memo, or similar).

If interested in applying for this assignment, submit your expression of interest, technical and financial proposals to uganda.coprocurement@savethechildren.org by specified dates of submission in the request for proposals.

Annex: Evaluation Matrix for JMoFA Endline (To be finalised at inception phase)



SC is an equal opportunity employer and seeks to assign the best qualified talent. Our selection process, which includes rigorous background checks, reflects our commitment to the protection of children from abuse.

Disclaimer: SC does not charge any kind of fee at any stage of the recruitment process and does not act through recruitment agents.

3. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Once/if ordered, items will need to be delivered to specified locations/districts in Uganda. In such cases delivery may be requested separately using separate quotations/orders.

PART 3 – BIDDER RESPONSE DOCUMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

This document **MUST BE USED** by Bidders wishing to submit a bid. It is linked into 5 sections detailed below:

- [Section 1 – Essential Criteria](#)
- [Section 2 – Capability & Sustainability Questions](#)
- [Section 3 – Commercial Questions](#)
- [Section 4 – Bidder Submission Checklist](#)

The Bidder is required to sign a copy of the Check list in Section 4 as part of their submission.

2. INSTRUCTIONS

Within each section there are instructions providing guidance to the bidder on what information is required. This guidance details the **MINIMUM** requirements expected by SCI. If a Bidder wishes to add further information, this is acceptable, but the additional information should be limited to only items that are relevant to the tender.

- ❓ For the avoidance of doubt, bidders are required to complete all items within the Bidder Response Document unless clear instruction is provided otherwise.
- ❓ If a Bidder does not complete the entire Bidder Response document, their submission may be declared void.
- ❓ If a Bidder is unable to complete any element of the Bidder Response Document, they should contact Save the Children through the using the contact details provided for guidance.

By submitting a response, the bidder confirms that all information provided can be relied upon for validity and accuracy.

SECTION 1 - ESSENTIAL CRITERIA

INSTRUCTIONS – Bidders are required to complete all sections of the below table.

Item	Question	Bidder Response	
		Yes / No	Comments / Attachments
1	Bidder accepts Save the Children's 'Terms and Conditions of Purchase' and that any business awarded to the bidder will be completed under the Terms and Conditions included in Section 5 of this pack.		
2	The Bidder and its staff (and any sub-contractors used) agree to comply with SCI and the IAPG's policies listed in Section 5 of this pack throughout this tender process, and during any future works should the bidder be awarded a contract.	Yes / No	Comments
3	The bidder confirms they are not a prohibited party under applicable sanctions laws or anti-terrorism laws or provide goods under sanction by the United States of America or the European Union and accepts that SCI will undertake independent checks to validate this.	Yes / No	Comments
4	The Bidder confirms it is fully qualified, licensed and registered to trade with Save the Children (including compliance with all relevant local Country legislation).	Yes / No	Comments
	This includes the Bidder submitting the following requirements (where applicable):	Requirement	Bidder Response / Attachments
		Legitimate Business Address	

	- Legitimate business address - Tax registration certificate and Tax Clearance certificate - Business registration or Incorporation certificate - Valid Trading license - Audited books of accounts for the last 3 years	Tax Registration Certificate and Clearance	
		Business Registration Certificate	
		Valid Trading License	
5	Bidder confirms that they have and are still in the in business of providing consultancy services similar in nature to the requirements in questions. (attach copies of proofs such as Letters of recommendation and Contracts from current and or previous client organizations)	Yes / No	Comments
6	Bidder confirms that their proposal confirms to the stated TORs(attach copies of documents of Gant chart, proposed methodology, team in line with the requirements)	Yes / No	Comments

SECTION 2 – CAPABILITY & SUSTAINABILITY QUESTIONS

Instructions – Bidders are required to complete all sections of the below table.

1	REFERENCES Bidder shares at least three (3) clients to attest their experience in providing services similar to those included within the scope of this tender. Clients provided must be for similar projects within a similar environment / context to that in which Save the Children operates, and within the last four (4) years.	Client Name	Contact Details (Name & Email)	Contract value and period of execution
		1)		
		2)		
		3)		

	(Note – the Bidder must ensure that for any client references shared, the nominated client is happy to be contacted / visit by Save the Children)			
2	Bidder's implementation schedule covering all deliverables and the ability to meet estimated delivery schedule	Bidder Response	Attachment(s)	
		Bidder has the capacity to deliver the entire assignment as detailed in the provided TOR - Delivery within 60 days - Delivery within 70 days - Delivery within 80 days - Delivery within 90 days - Delivery above 90 Days		
4	Proof of having qualified and experienced Personnel within the firm. These should be relevant to the assignment. Attach up to date CVs and copies of academic documents - Team leader (1) (Min 10yrs experience in Consultancy services of which 5yrs should be in the subject matter and Master's degree in relevant field. - Technical staff (Min 2) – Min. 3yrs experience in Research and Evaluation related consultancies		Comments	

	and Min Bachelors in relevant field. - Support staff (Min 2)-experience in relevant sources such as Admin, IT, quantitative methods, research. e.t.c.		
5	Proof of at least 3 current and/or previous similar assignments executed within the last 4 years. Proof shall be inform of contracts and LPOs and contract completion notes signed by the clients.		Attachments
6	Proof of any additional benefits that the service provider guarantees SCI	Bidder Response	Comments

The forms below shall be used to provide information on the consultant's experience and technical staff in relation to this assignment.

(a) Experience in previous assignments. the consultant can fill a different form for each different assignment.

Assignment Name:		Country:
Location within the Country:		Professional Staff Provided by our Firm:
Name of the Client:		No. of Staff:
Address:		
Start Date (Month /Year):	Completion Date Month/Year:	Approximate Value of the project (in Uganda Shillings):
Name of Associated Firms(s) if any:		No of months of professional staff provided by associated firm(s):

Name of Senior Staff (Project Director/Coordinator, Team Leader) involved and functions performed;
Narrative description of the Project:
Description of actual tasks accomplished by the Staff:

(b) Composition of the Team and Task Assigned to each Team Member

Core Team: Technical and Managerial		
Name	Position	Task Assignment

1.

Other Staff		
Name	Position	Task Assignment

(c) Task assignment as per proposed work plan and activity schedule.

SUSTAINABILITY CONSIDERATIONS

ren

Indicate any sustainability initiatives implemented by your organization which are in line with SCI sustainability policy													
 Save the Children Supplier Sustainabil													
Month with weekly Subdivisions													
Items of Work/Activities	1	2				3				4			

SECTION 3 – COMMERCIAL QUESTIONS

CURRENCY OF COSTS: _____

FEES				
Name and Position of Personnel	Input Quantity	Unit of Input	Rate	Total Price

TOTAL:				

REIMBURSABLE AND MISCELLANEOUS COSTS				
Description of Cost	Quantity	Unit of Measure	Unit Price	Total Price
TOTAL:				

TOTAL LUMP SUM PRICE IN CURRENCY: _____

Breakdown of Lump Sum Price Authorised By:

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Position: _____

Date: _____

(DD/MM/YY)

Authorised for and on behalf of:

Company _____

OTHER COMMERCIAL CONSIDERATIONS	
Supplier's Quote Validity Period: At least 90 working days required	
Bidder's payment terms: Required minimum 30 days after acceptance of submission and acceptance of the invoice 1- Initial payment: 40% of the contract amount on submission and acceptance of the inception report. 2- Final payment: 60% of the contract amount upon Submission, presentation and acceptance of the final report. The report shall be presented to SCI management and technical team.	
Bidder's financial capability: Bidder's proof of financial capacity to finance the requirement and deliver at least the first deliverables. Bank statement from the January 2025 to date	

SECTION 4 – BIDDER SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

We, the Bidder, hereby confirm we have completed all sections of the Bidder Response Document:		
No	Section	Please Tick
1.	Section 2 – Essential Criteria	
2.	Section 3 – Capability & Sustainability Questions	
3.	Section 4 – Commercial Questions	
We, the Bidder, confirm we have uploaded all of the required information and supporting evidence:		
Section	Required Document / Evidence	Please Tick
Essential Criteria Evidence	Proof of legitimate business address	
	Copy of tax registration & tax clearance certificate	
	Copy of business registration / incorporation certificate	
	Valid trading license	
Capability Criteria Evidence	Completed Bidder Response Document	
	Supporting documents	
Commercial Criteria Evidence	Completed Bidder Response Document	
We, the Bidder, hereby confirm we compliance with the following policies and requirements:		

Policy	Policy / Document	Signature
Terms & Conditions of Bidding	 1. Terms & Conditions of Bidding	
Child Safeguarding Policy	 Child Safeguarding Policy.pdf	
Anti-Bribery & Corruption Policy	 Anti-Bribery & Corruption Policy.pdf	
Human Trafficking & Modern Slavery Policy	 Human Trafficking & Modern Slavery Policy	
Protection from Sexual Exploitation & Abuse	 Protection from Sexual Exploitation & Abuse	
Anti-Harassment, Intimidation & Bullying Policy	 Anti-Harassment, Intimidation & Bullying Policy	
IAPG Code of Conduct	 IAPG Code of Conduct for Agencies	

We confirm that Save the Children may in its consideration of our offer, and subsequently, rely on the statements made herein.

Signature:

Name:

Title:

Company:

Date:

