



Invitation to Tender: Christian Aid Ireland ICSP - Development & Humanitarian Programmes Final Evaluation

March 2026

You are invited to submit a proposal for the final evaluation of Christian Aid Ireland's ICSP Development and Humanitarian programmes.

The following information and response templates are included in the pages that follow:

- [Document 1](#) – Terms of Reference
- [Document 2](#) – Guidance and Instructions for responding to the Invitation to Tender (ITT)
- [Document 3](#) – Code of Conduct for Suppliers
- Document 4 – Bidder Declaration Form (link [here](#))
- Document 5 – Supplier Reference Check Authorisation Form (link [here](#))
- Document 6 – CA Standard Terms & Conditions of Contract (link [here](#))

The closing date for completed responses is **5pm (BST) 31st March 2026**. It is the responsibility of the tenderer to ensure that offers are received by this time. Tenders received after this time shall not be considered.

About Christian Aid Ireland

Christian Aid Ireland (CAI) exists to create a world where everyone can live a full life, free from poverty. We are here to help end poverty, injustice, inequality and violence in some of the poorest countries across the world. We are an international development agency founded by the Protestant Churches of Britain and Ireland. We tackle both the symptoms and root causes of injustice challenging the systems and structures that perpetuate poverty and marginalisation. We work with people of all faiths and none, and work in partnership in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East.

Document 1: Terms of Reference

1. Background

Programme and institutional: 2026 is the penultimate year of CAI's 5-year programme, funded by Irish Aid under "Ireland's Civil Society Partnership (ICSP) for A Better World". The programme commenced January 2023 and will end December 2027. The ICSP is implemented by our 37 partner organisations in ten countries.

Relevant to this Terms of Reference are Streams 1 – 3 of four funding streams:

- **Stream 1:** a 5-year development programme
- **Stream 2:** a 5-year humanitarian programme
- **Stream 3:** short term humanitarian responses to acute crises
- **Stream 4:** a 5-year Global Citizenship Education programme on the island of Ireland

CAI wishes to commission two independent evaluations exploring the relevance and effectiveness of our ICSP programme, to be completed in 2026. *Specifically;*

- **Lot A:** An evaluation of our 5-year development programme (Stream 1)
- **Lot B:** An evaluation of our 5-year humanitarian programme and recurring annual short-term humanitarian fund (Streams 2 and 3)

CAI seeks proposals from qualified evaluation teams to conduct either or both lots.

Following completion of both evaluation reports, CAI will commission a final consultancy which will bring together findings from both evaluations (plus findings from an additional evaluation of Stream 4 – see above) into a single report. This Portfolio-level report deliverable, and associated budget are outside the scope of this Terms of Reference. The successful evaluation team for Lot A and/or Lot B is required to commit 1–2 days to provide inputs for the cross-stream report. These teams will also be invited to bid for the full cross-stream report, which will be managed under a separate tender, Terms of Reference, and contract.

1.1. Evaluation purpose

1. To provide an independent assessment of the delivery and contribution to change of the ICSP programme, in its different streams, with a particular focus on Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) criteria of relevance and effectiveness.
2. To evaluate the extent to which the programme prioritised women and marginalised groups
3. To identify learning and emerging good practice to inform future programming, institutional approaches and other sectoral actors.

2. Information on CAI's ICSP Programmes

2.1. Stream 1: Development Stream

Stream 1 is implemented in 6 programmes across seven countries: Burundi, Colombia, El Salvador & Guatemala, Israel occupied Palestinian territory, Sierra Leone, and Zimbabwe. The programme is largely implemented by 31 **civil society partners**. The programme goal is, *"marginalised women and men, sexual and gender minorities and communities claim their rights and hold power holders to account to address the root causes of inequality, to live in sustainable peace."* The programme has an overall theory of change and each partner organisation has their own goal and theory of change, which is informed by their organisational priorities. As such, the programme has a diversity of aims and approaches. Partners work on a wide range of context-informed issues related to at least one or more of:

- Governance and human rights,
- Gender equality and social inclusion,
- Peacebuilding and conflict prevention,
- Climate adaptation.

Partners' work spans from the individual/community level to national/ international levels of focus.

Stream 1 has a strong emphasis on civil society; one of its four objectives is *"Partner Agency: Partner organisations have increased agency; they are stronger, can do more and can relate better."* This objective is largely implemented by Christian Aid in collaboration with our partners, while the other three objectives principally describe partners' work.

The programme uses a power-informed, adaptive management approach with a strong focus on inclusion and conflict sensitivity.

Existing MEAL approaches: Since 2025 the programme has used a 'cases of change' methodology,¹ to enable it to capture and document complex changes. These cases explore the change itself, factors that enabled the change, the programme's role in bringing the change about, and how gender-inclusive the change is. When the consultancy commences there will be 21 completed cases of change. It is expected that these cases, plus the additional ones to be gathered in 2026, will form the backbone of the evaluation. In 2025 CAI commissioned an external consultancy to develop guidance materials for cases of change, and document how they can fit with an evaluation, including linkages to OECD DAC criteria. Separately, each country-programme has a results framework which enables annual consolidation of results for donor accountability.

2.2. Stream 2: Chronic Crisis Stream

Stream 2 is implemented across three countries, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Myanmar and South Sudan, by six civil society partner organisations. The programme goal is: *"Vulnerable communities affected by protracted humanitarian crises are protected, empowered and*

¹ Adapted from the methodology described in '[No Royal Road](#) Finding and following the natural pathways in advocacy evaluation', Jim Coe and Rhonda Schlangen.

better connected to live more resilient and peaceful lives". Each of the three country programmes have four complementary objectives, all implemented in the same locations and intended to deepen impact with their combined effect:

- Objective 1 – Responding to Humanitarian Need: The changing priority needs of the most vulnerable women, men, girls and boys in target communities are met in a way that promotes dignity and strengthens social cohesion, agency and gender equality. *Key approach: [Survivor and Community Led Response](#).*
- Objective 2a – Tackling Violence and Building Peace: Communities are engaging in transparent and inclusive peace building and conflict transformation processes and their efforts are linked to regional and national initiatives. *Key approaches: [Conflict analyses and Integrating Conflict Prevention into Humanitarian and Resilience Programming \(ICPR\)](#).*
- Objective 2b – Tackling Gender-based Violence: Women, men and duty bearers in target communities individually and collectively tackle harmful gender norms and inequalities and survivors of GBV receive appropriate care and support.
- Objective 3 – Strengthening Resilience: Target communities have strengthened capacity (including better connections) to prevent, anticipate, organise for and adapt to crises and risks related to conflict, violence and the environment in an inclusive and equitable way. *Key approach: [Participatory and Vulnerability Assessment \(PVCA\)](#).*
- Objective 4 – Adapting to Climate Change: Target communities have reduced vulnerability to current and expected impacts of climate change, including climate variability, by maintaining or increasing resilience, through increased ability to adapt to climate change stresses, shocks and variability.

Across Stream 2 there is a strong focus on gender inclusion and conflict sensitivity.

Existing MEAL approaches: In 2025 the programme conducted internal outcome level assessments of Objectives 1 and 3, rating performance against a rubric. This exercise will be repeated in 2026 for alternative objectives. Each country-programme has a results framework, which is reported on annually for donor accountability.

2.3. Stream 3: Acute Crisis Stream

Stream 3 of the ICSP is used to respond to acute humanitarian crises. It enables CAI to respond to the onset of a sudden emergency or a spike in an existing protracted crisis, and, where crises are imminent, implement early action interventions, using prepositioned funds. It seeks to save lives, alleviate human suffering and maintain human dignity.

Since the start of the ICSP (2023) CAI's Stream 3 has had an annual budget of €300,000 and has implemented rapid response interventions to acute crises in the following countries: South Sudan and Syria (2023), Lebanon, Nigeria and Ethiopia (2024), DRC and Myanmar (2025). Each project is typically three months in duration, and has narrative and results framework reporting available.

3. Lot A: Stream 1 Evaluation

3.1. Evaluation Scope

The evaluation will evaluate Stream 1 as a whole, including country-specific findings.

- **Geographic Coverage & primary data collection:** All six programmes will be represented in the evaluation through review of existing monitoring and reporting data, as well as remote engagement with the teams, and potentially partner organisations. For budgetary reasons, independent evaluation activities will be conducted in-country in a sample of three of the six programmes.²
- **Balance of primary and secondary data collection:** Country programmes will have completed 21 cases of change by the time the consultancy commences, and will gather some additional 18 cases of change in 2026. Whilst maintaining independence, the evaluation should leverage both existing cases of change, and the creation of cases in 2026 to inform the evaluation, as well as conduct additional independent validation and evidence-gathering.
- **Partner-level projects:** Given the diversity of partner focus areas it is not expected that the evaluation will sample all partners or engage on all partners work in their entirety.
- **Balance between country programme and programme (stream level):** It is not anticipated that each country programme will be evaluated in its entirety in response to each evaluation question. The evaluation is of the entire stream, although it is anticipated that all programmes will be reflected in the report.
- As a politically smart, adaptive, systems-oriented programme, it is anticipated that the evaluation will be against the Theory of Change (how change happens) with as much focus on describing and understanding what changes occurred, in the programmes contextual reality, as whether pre-defined changes did occur.
- CAI appreciates that the evaluation scope of a complex programme is significantly influenced by available budget. We anticipate working with the evaluation team to manage this balance, prioritising depth and insight over broad coverage.

3.2. Key Evaluation Questions

Relevance (25%):

1. **Micro:**³ To what extent does the programme – through its process and its results – respond to needs and priorities of programme participants? In particular, the needs and priorities of women and those furthest behind?

² CAI proposes that these would be Guatemala-El Salvador, Zimbabwe or Sierra Leone and IoPt (West Bank and Israel only) to include a diversity of geographies, but is open to discussion based on Evaluation Team's access.

³ Micro refers to the individual, family or immediate community level.

2. **Meso & Macro:**⁴ To what extent does the programme respond to contextual needs and priorities, as relevant to the programme goal, including those priorities related to women and most marginalised?
3. **Adaptation:** In what ways has the programme remained relevant to the evolving contexts and changing needs of all programme participants, in their diversity? What strategies or approaches enabled or limited this?

Effectiveness (75%):

1. The difference the programme made:
 - a) To what extent have the intended results of the programme (across micro, meso and macro levels) been achieved?
 - b) What results, unanticipated at the time of programme design, have been achieved (positive or negative)?
 - c) What has been the role of the ICSP programme in achieving these results? How does this compare with the programme Theory of Change?
 - d) Describe how the programme results relate to the ICSP thematic outcomes. Has integrating these thematic outcomes helped to achieve anticipated results?⁵
2. Gender & inclusion: Who has experienced positive change from results achieved (or in the case of meso and macro level results, who stands to benefit) and in what ways? Were these people among the most marginalised in their contexts?
3. What internal approaches and programme strategies enabled or limited achievement of results? Are there particular approaches or programme strategies that enabled or limited results for women and the most marginalised?
4. Locally-led development:
 - a) What have been the results (positive and negative) of the programme's locally led objective and approaches?
 - b) What organisational and programmatic processes/ strategies enabled or limited locally led development? *The response should include examples of where the ICSP grant has influenced CAI's locally led organisational approaches and strategies.*
 - c) Does the programme's assumption, that supporting locally led development will strengthen sustainability, hold true?

⁴ Macro refers to national or international levels. Meso refers to all levels between micro and macro.

⁵ The relevant ICSP thematic outcomes are: *Women and girls are empowered to participate in economic, public, political and social life; Women and girls have improved access to health, education and social services in development and humanitarian settings; Communities most at risk and vulnerable to climate change are better able to mitigate, adapt and respond to its impact; Governance institutions are strengthened to deliver effective services to communities, in particular in fragile and conflict affected contexts; Government institutions, civil society organisations, and communities have increased awareness, capacity and networks and/or have taken actions to demand, respect and protect rights and lead local development.*

5. Nexus:

- a) In what ways has the programme’s integration of a nexus approach enabled deeper results?
- b) Where is there opportunity to deepen the impact of nexus approach?
- c) Has a more holistic approach to addressing need led to stronger outcomes?

6. Strategic positioning/ Theory of Change:

- a) What significant or valuable aspects of the programme are not well reflected in the programme Theory of Change?
- b) In what ways might the programme’s strategies or results have differed had Christian Aid incorporated humanitarian funding into the same programme contexts?

3.3. Evaluation Methodology, Phases, & Key Deliverables

Evaluation methodologies must be ethical, be sensitive to the risk of harm, and align with the contextual realities of our partner organisations.

Methodologies must be responsive to gender and other inclusion factors (*such as age, disability, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, as relevant to each country programme*) and be conflict sensitive.

The evaluation methodology will be defined by the External Evaluation Team. CAI’s preference is that the methodology is revised by the Evaluation Team following selection, induction and high-level document review, for fit with our programmatic and contextual realities. It is anticipated that the methodology will be primarily qualitative, and will leverage the cases of change methodology being implemented by the programme in 2026 (whilst maintaining independence). Methodologies used will be systems-aware and appropriate for complex contexts and take into account the diverse perspectives of programme stakeholders.

Evaluation Phases & Key Deliverables

Evaluation Phase	Process/Deliverable	Responsible
Induction and Design phase <i>May 2026</i>	Induction for external evaluation team	CAI
	Initial document review and interviews with CA staff	Evaluation Team
	Deliverable: Inception report with refined methodology, drafted, and finalised based on CAI input	
Evidence gathering and interpretation <i>To be agreed</i>	Data collection, interpretation, evaluation of programme against evaluation questions, in country (sampled), remote and thorough desk review	Evaluation Team
Report <i>End October 2026</i>	Deliverable: Draft report, including recommendations, to be produced and finalised following review by CAI.	Evaluation Team

	Deliverable: Evaluation team will be asked to commit 1 – 2 days considering inputs for the cross-stream report (see below).	
<i>Cross stream report – outside of scope of this Invitation to Tender Early December 2026</i>	<i>CAI will commission a consultant to develop a single evaluation report for all four streams of ICSP.</i>	--

3.4. Budget and Resourcing

The Stream 1 evaluation has a maximum overall budget of €63,000 which will be managed by CAI. This is to include all costs associated with the evaluation team’s services, in-country travel and data gathering activities. Country programme teams have modest budgets to facilitate the collection of cases of change in 2026. CAI does not anticipate funding international travel for this evaluation.

3.5. Evaluation Team Requirements

The Lot A/Stream 1 evaluation team will have presence (or ability to connect with evaluators) in the sampled programme countries. The external evaluation team should possess the following qualities:

- Demonstrated experience and understanding in the relevant technical areas (Realising Human Rights, Peacebuilding and Conflict Prevention, Gender Equality) and an understanding of gender and inclusion as a cross-cutting issue.
- Demonstrated experience and expertise in evaluating large, multi-country programmes.
- Ability to design and use evaluation methodologies that are appropriate for complicated and complex programmes, ideally with familiarity to ToC and methodologies such as outcome harvesting or cases of change.
- Fluency in English and Spanish and clear verbal and written communication skills.
- Experience of the International NGO sector and appreciation for the principals of working in partnership.
- The team should demonstrate diversity in terms of its composition.
- Experience and understanding of at least some of the programme countries.

4. Lot B: Evaluation of Streams 2 and 3

4.1. Evaluation Scope

- **Balance between streams:** Primary emphasis should be placed on the evaluation of Stream 2. Please see evaluation questions for those which apply to Stream 3.
- **Geographic Coverage & primary data collection**
Stream 2: All three Stream 2 programmes will be represented in the evaluation through review of existing monitoring and reporting data. For access and budgetary reasons, independent evaluation activities will be conducted in-country in two of the three programmes.⁶
Stream 3: Evaluation of Stream 3 will be through document review only, focussing on a sample of the locations (CAI suggests three are sampled), with an emphasis on those in the same locations as Stream 2.
- **Balance between country programme and overall programme:** The focus of the evaluation will be on Streams 2 and 3 as a whole. All three Stream 2 programmes have the same objectives and technical approaches, enabling stream-level evaluation.
- CAI appreciates that the evaluation scope of a complex programme is significantly influenced by available budget. We anticipate working with the evaluation team to manage this balance, prioritising depth and insight over broad coverage.

4.2. Key Evaluation Questions

Note that this humanitarian evaluation focusses on two streams (see above). Brackets after each question indicate where a question is specific to a stream.

Relevance (25%):

1. To what extent does the programme – through its processes and its results – respond to the needs and priorities of crisis affected participants, in particular the needs and priorities of women and the most marginalised, in contexts of conflict, displacement, climate stress and recurring humanitarian shocks? To what extent does the programme respond to contextual needs and priorities at relevant community and local-system levels?
2. Adaptation: In what ways has the programme remained relevant to the evolving contexts and changing needs of all programme participants, in their diversity? What programme strategies or approaches enabled or limited this? (*Stream 2 only*)

⁶ CAI proposes sampling DRC and South Sudan. Programme locations in Myanmar are facing significant access challenges. In late 2025 CAI commissioned a light external evaluation of the Myanmar programme (focussed on effectiveness) which, alongside monitoring data can be used as the basis for the evaluation.

Effectiveness (75%):

1. The difference the programme made:
 - a) Achievement of intended results: To what extent have the intended results of the programme (at micro and meso levels, as relevant) been achieved?
 - b) Unintended results: What results, unanticipated at the time of programme design, have been achieved (positive or negative)?
 - c) Programme's contribution to change: To what extent, and in what ways, did the ICSP programme contribute to the achievement of these results in complex, multi-actor environments? How does this compare to 'how change was anticipated to happen' as described in the programme Theory of Change. *(Stream 2 only)*
 - d) How do the results achieved relate to the ICSP thematic outcomes? Has integrating these thematic outcomes helped to achieve anticipated results⁷
2. Gender & inclusion: Who experienced positive change from the programme, how, and in what ways? Were these people among the most marginalised in their contexts?
3. Internal process and programme strategies: What internal processes and programme strategies enabled or limited achievement of results overall, and for women and the most marginalised – and in what ways? *(Stream 2 only)*
4. Locally-led development in crisis contexts: What have been the results (positive and negative) of the programme's locally led approaches? To what extent did these approaches strengthen sustainability, legitimacy and community agency? *The response should include examples of where the ICSP grant has influenced CAI's locally led organisational approaches and strategies. (Stream 2 only)*
5. Nexus:
 - a) In what ways has the programme's integrated nexus approach enabled, or limited, deeper results? Where is there opportunity to strengthen potential impact of Nexus approaches? Has a more holistic approach to addressing need led to stronger outcomes? *(Stream 2 only)*
 - b) To what extent and in what ways, did Stream 3 responses complement Stream 2 programming (when they were implemented in the same countries)?

⁷ The relevant ICSP thematic outcomes are: *Women and girls are empowered to participate in economic, public, political and social life; Women and girls have improved access to health, education and social services in development and humanitarian settings; Communities and institutions have increased preparedness and response capacities; Communities have increased resilience to all forms of external shocks; Acute humanitarian needs of crisis affected communities are met in a timely manner; Communities most at risk and vulnerable to climate change are better able to mitigate, adapt and respond to its impact; Governance institutions are strengthened to deliver effective services to communities, in particular in fragile and conflict affected contexts; Government institutions, civil society organisations, and communities have increased awareness, capacity and networks and/or have taken actions to demand, respect and protect rights and lead local development.*

6. Strategic positioning / Theory of Change:

- a) What significant or valuable aspects of the programme’s results, partnerships or ways of working are not well reflected / captured in the programme Theory of Change? What lessons can we draw from this? *(Stream 2 only)*
- b) In what ways might the programme’s strategies or results have differed had Christian Aid incorporated development funding into the same programme contexts?

4.3. Evaluation Methodology, Phases, & Key Deliverables

Evaluation methodologies must be ethical, be sensitive to the risk of harm, and align with the contextual realities of our partner organisations.

Methodologies must be responsive to gender and other inclusion factors *(such as age, disability, ethnicity, religion, as relevant to each country programme)* and be conflict sensitive. We expect a meaningful emphasis on secondary data.

The evaluation methodology will be defined by the External Evaluation Team. CAI’s preference is that the methodology is revised by the Evaluation Team following selection, induction and high-level document review, for fit with our programmatic and contextual realities.

Evaluation Phases & Key Deliverables

Evaluation Phase	Process/Deliverable	Responsible
Induction and Design phase <i>May 2026</i>	Induction for external evaluation team	CAI
	Initial document review and interviews with CA staff	Evaluation Team
	Deliverable: Inception report with refined methodology, drafted, and finalised based on CAI input	
Evidence gathering and interpretation <i>To be agreed</i>	Data collection, interpretation, evaluation of programme against evaluation questions, in country (sampled), remote and thorough desk review	Evaluation Team
Report <i>End October 2026</i>	Deliverable: Draft report, including recommendations, to be produced and finalised following review by CAI. Deliverable: Evaluation team will be asked to commit 1 – 2 days considering inputs for the cross stream report <i>(see next row)</i> .	Evaluation Team
<i>Cross stream report – outside of scope of this Invitation to Tender</i> <i>Early December 2026</i>	<i>CAI will commission a consultant to develop a single evaluation report for all four streams of ICSP.</i>	--

4.4. Budget and Resourcing

Lot B has a maximum overall budget of €33,000. This is to include all costs associated with the evaluation team's services, in-country travel and data gathering activities. CAI does not anticipate funding international travel for this evaluation.

4.5. Evaluation Team Requirements

The Lot B evaluation team will have presence (or ability to connect with evaluators) in the sampled programme countries. The external evaluation team should possess the following qualities:

- Demonstrated experience and understanding in the relevant technical areas (*Humanitarian Response, Peacebuilding and Conflict Prevention, Resilience, Climate adaptation*) and an understanding of gender and inclusion as a cross-cutting issue.
- Demonstrated experience and expertise in evaluating large, multi-country programmes.
- Ability to design and use evaluation methodologies that are appropriate for complicated programmes.
- Fluency in English and French desirable and clear verbal and written communication skills.
- Experience of the International NGO sector and appreciation for the principals of working in partnership.
- Experience and understanding of at least some of the programme countries.
- The team should demonstrate diversity in terms of its composition.
- Experience with protection, do-no-harm and conflict-sensitive humanitarian programming desirable.

Document 2: Guidance and Instructions for responding to the Invitation to Tender

Please read and understand these instructions before responding, to ensure that your tender meets our requirements. Christian Aid Ireland reserves the right to refuse non-compliant tenders.

Only information provided as a direct response to the questionnaires will be evaluated. Potential suppliers should respond to the questionnaires on the basis that Christian Aid Ireland has no prior knowledge of their organisation. Information and detail which forms part of general company literature or promotional brochures etc. will not form part of the evaluation process.

1. Key dates

These dates are indicative only and may need to be changed during the tender process. We will inform all bidders of any changes as these are known.

Activity	Date
Issue ITT	9 th March
Deadline for submitting clarification questions	24 th March
Response to clarification questions	Within one week of receiving question, up to 24 th March
Closing date for completed tenders	5pm (BST) 31st March
Interview/Presentation	Week of the 20 th of April
Select supplier, Finalise & Agree contract	Week of the 27 th of April
Implementation	From 4 th May
Period of agreement	4 th May – 31 st October 2026

2. Communications

- i) **Completed tenders** must be returned to procurement@christian-aid.org and must include:
 - a. Your Proposal
 - b. Supplier Reference Check Authorisation Form, with two referees
 - c. Signed Bidder Declaration Form
 - d. Audited financial statements for the last three years (applicable to company only)
 - e. Two pieces of work completed by the proposed team, and the Curriculum Vitae for each team member. (These will be kept in confidence).
- ii) **Clarification questions** regarding the tender documents or process must be made in writing by email to procurement@christian-aid.org and questions will be accepted up to 24th March.

Clarification questions will be responded to within one week of them being submitted. All clarification questions and responses will be anonymised and compiled into a single file and published on our website by 25th March.

3. Proposal Requirements

The proposal document should include:

- Statement of whether applying for Lot A, Lot B or both
- Confirmation of availability to work within the required timeframe.
- An outline of a proposed methodology to produce the identified deliverables. This should include a brief rationale for key design choices made, and identify some of the further information required for evaluation design decisions.
- A profile of the proposed evaluation team, including key roles and responsibilities. This should include confirmation whether the team members are within programme countries, or whether the consultancy team plans to engage in-country consultants at a later date.
- Costed proposal in Euro, with breakdowns by key deliverables and estimated number of days, and include fees and VAT. The budget must cover all costs associated with the evaluation, including any insurance, VAT or travel costs, as determined by the Evaluation Team. The currency of the contract will be euros (€).

4. Format

Proposals should be submitted in PDF format. Additional offers which go beyond the scope of the Terms of Reference must be in the same format, but these must be in addition to the completed templates.

No promotional information to be sent.

Documents requiring signature should be signed with eSignature software or by hand and scanned as PDF.

5. CA Standard Terms & Conditions of Contract

The resulting contract will be on the Christian Aid standard Terms & Conditions included within this pack (see 'Document 6 – CA Standard Terms & Conditions of Contract; link [here](#)). As part of your submission, please review and identify if there are any clauses that you would need to amend, and share the rationale why.

6. Evaluation Panel

Compliant bids will be evaluated by a cross-functional panel comprising key people from Christian Aid Ireland's International Programme Development Team.

Following the evaluation, the highest scoring bidders will be shortlisted for interview, in which bidders should demonstrate why they are the best option for this evaluation, and CAI will question elements of the proposal in order to further substantiate the bid, as well as meeting the proposed core team.

Shortlisted bidders will be contacted as soon as possible to agree a date and time for the interview.



7. Evaluation Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of best value for CAI as a combination of quality, technical capability and value. Specifically, the evaluation criteria will include but not limited to the following:

- Quality of the proposal in responding to the evaluation requirements
- Evaluation Team's capability – areas of expertise (technical and geographic coverage), relevant experience and resources
- Clarity of communication
- Feasibility within the proposed budget

8. Selection

Christian Aid Ireland intends to select either a single provider for both Lot A and B (combined), or separate providers for each of Lot A and Lot B (as described within the 'Request for Proposal'). The decision will be made dependent on the proposals received.

The successful bidder shall be contracted for a maximum of 7 months.

Please note these are indicative time and may be subject to change as we progress through the procurement process.

CAI reserves the right not to award the services as a result of this process.

Document 3: Code of Conduct for Suppliers

ETHICAL STANDARDS

We strive to purchase and source goods, services and works which are produced and delivered under conditions that do not involve the abuse or exploitation of any persons.

We look to work in partnership with suppliers to ensure that:

- Employment is freely chosen
- Freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining are respected
- Working conditions are safe and hygienic
- No exploitation of children
- Living wages are paid
- Working hours are not excessive
- No discrimination is practised
- Regular employment is provided
- No harsh or inhumane treatment is allowed
- Safeguards are in place to protect against human trafficking

Specifically, we will not enter any procurement relationship with companies that have:

- Significant Involvement in the arms trade
- Extracted harsh and inequitable payments from developing countries for debts (Debt Relief (Developing Countries) Act 2010)
- Inhibiting access to affordable medicine according to the WHO Model Lists of Essential Medicines
- Tobacco marketing in developing countries
- Significant involvement in the alcohol industry
- Significant involvement in gambling
- Significant involvement in pornography
- Insufficient safeguards to end the use of conflict minerals where applicable (Kimberley Process/EU Regulation)
- Involvement in terrorism

ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS

We strive to purchase and source goods, services and work, which have the least negative impact on the environment.

We make procurement decisions and look to work in partnership with suppliers to ensure that:

- Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) issues are at the forefront of good corporate governance.
- Purchasing decisions are based on whole life principles to purchase more durable products with a longer life-span and maximising environmental sustainability
- Undue and unnecessary use of materials is avoided, and recycled materials used whenever possible. Effective controls of waste in respect of ground, air and water pollution are adopted. In the case of hazardous materials emergency response plans are in place.
- Processes and activities are monitored and modified as necessary to ensure the conservation of scarce
- resources, including water, flora and fauna and productive land.
- All production and delivery processes, including the use of heating, ventilation, lighting, IT systems and transportation, are based on the need to maximise efficient energy use and to minimize harmful emissions.



We expect our suppliers to comply with all statutory and other legal requirements relating to the environmental impacts of their business. We encourage our suppliers to be accredited to the relevant ISO standards.

If we work in partnership with a supplier in good faith but subsequently discover unacceptable practices either at the supplier or within the supplier's supply chain we will engage with the supplier constructively to address identified weaknesses.