GICHD

Request for Offer

Evaluation of GICHD's Information Management Programmes

Introduction

The [Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining](https://www.gichd.org) (GICHD) is pleased to invite qualified companies/consultants to submit an offer for the provision of the description the services described below as per requirements set out in this request for offer.
Reference number: RFO/2021/IM/EVAL
Posting date: 17 May 2021
Deadline for submission of the Request for offer form: 4 June 2021,18:00, GMT+1.
Currency: The proposal and quotation shall be presented in Swiss Francs (CHF)
Language: The proposal and quotation shall be submitted in English
Submit to: consultants@gichd.org (CC: s.hellen@gichd.org)

Background

The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) works toward reducing risks to communities stemming from explosive ordnance, with particular focus on mines, cluster munitions, other explosive remnants of war and ammunition storages. The Centre helps develop and professionalise the sector for the benefits of its partners: national and local authorities; donors; the United Nations; other international and regional organisations; non-governmental organisations; commercial companies; and academia. It does so by combining three distinct lines of service: field support and capacity development and advice; multilateral work focused on norms and standards; and research and development focused on cutting-edge solutions.

GICHD's 2019-2022 strategy defines mine action as a sector of work aimed at reducing risk to communities caused by explosive hazards. Managing and ultimately reducing risk caused by a hazard implies knowing its likelihood and severity, understanding who and what is vulnerable to it and making sound strategic and operational decisions towards removing the hazard and/or improving resilience to it. Information management (IM), the practice of turning raw data into useful and useable information for evidence-based decision-making underpins all of this. Quality information (ie: information that is sufficiently accurate, precise and timely) on the geographic extent of hazards and on the prevalence of accidents and the number of associated victims enables us to gauge the level of the risk these hazard pose. When combined with information on humanitarian, development, or peacebuilding efforts the result helps plan and prioritise mine action to maximum impact. A robust information flow from field operations to headquarters allows effective monitoring of and reporting on risk reduction progress.

One of the founding objectives of the GICHD was to provide the mine action community with solid information management systems. Over the years the GICHD has established itself as a pivotal provider of IM support to mine action. The role of its IM capacity development and technical development programmes is to ensure that mine action actors are enabled to leverage information towards evidence-based operational and strategic decision-making. This is accomplished by ensuring that the sector has an adequate pool of skilled personnel at its disposal and an up-to-date and fit-for-purpose information management system (the Information Management System for Mine Action – IMSMA) for compiling, storing and disseminating accurate, timely and relevant information on mine action. This goal has become more relevant as principles of results-based management (RBM), which rely on the availability of sound information to build indicators, are being adopted throughout the sector. IMSMA has evolved through the Centre's 20-year existence to follow technological and methodological trends. The IM division in charge of this has also evolved. It has gone from a provider of technical support and training to an advisory service with a more systems-oriented approach that includes organisational processes.

Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is twofold:

1. Review the relevance, effectiveness, quality, and sustainability of the IM division's products and services; and
2. Identify clear recommendations to help steer and improve GICHD's IM programmes.

The enabling environment and context in which IM products and services are used is a critical consideration throughout the evaluation.

This evaluation will complement the mid-term review of the centre's strategy and serve as input to planning for the next strategy period. The primary period covered for this evaluation is the first two years of the GICHD's current strategy period (2019-2022). This aligns with the launch and expansion of IMSMA Core, a significant milestone and new direction for the GICHD's IM offering. GICHD's IM sub-strategy and overall theory of change will be critical references for the evaluator.

Key questions for the evaluation

Based on the objectives of the evaluation mentioned above, this section summarizes key evaluation questions. The themes of the evaluation fall into two broad categories: How well we are doing; and How can we improve.

Throughout the evaluation, the enabling environment must be considered as it influences what methods and tools will be useful and usable in a given context. The enabling environment describes the overall context in which organizations and people function. For mine action this includes regulatory frameworks, treaty obligations, placement of mine action within government structures, social norms, and digital infrastructure, access and policies.

Current State: How Well Are We Doing?

Relevance and Effectiveness

- Are the beneficiaries/audience of IM programmes clearly identified?
- To what extent have relevant stakeholders (outside GICHD) been party to the development of the division's IM programmes?
- How useful do beneficiaries and other stakeholders find the division's programmes and offerings?
- What has been the impact of the IM division's programmes on the mine action sector's IM capabilities and practices?
- Do competing IM programmes exist in the mine action sector?
- Are the IM technical and capacity development programmes fit for purpose? Why or why not?
- What has been the uptake of GICHD IM support/products from partners and other relevant stakeholders?
- What issues and recommendations identified in the 2010 IM evaluation and applicable IM sections of the 2017 *Evaluation of GICHD Tools and Publications* are still relevant today and to what extent has the IM division addressed these?
- Among partners who are using IMSMA Core, to what extent is it meeting programmatic needs?
- Among partners who are using IMSMA Core, to what extent is its data considered accurate and authoritative?
- To what extent does dependency on a primary technology partner (Esri) help or hinder the reach and efficacy of GICHD's IM offerings?

Quality

- To what extent is the IM division delivering high quality products and services?
- How has the quality of IM services and support offered by GICHD changed over time?
- Does GICHD have and follow a repeatable process for selecting and prioritizing which partners/states receive IM support?
- Does GICHD have and follow repeatable processes for delivering IM services and support?

Sustainability

- To what degree do the IM programmes lead to a lasting change?
- Do the beneficiaries continue to benefit from the programmes after the completion of an intervention?
- What is the level of independent ability of a partner/government to continue sustaining the programmes after the Centre's support is discontinued?
- To what degree do partners/governments rely on IM tools introduced by the Centre? To what degree do they have duplicate systems or tools?
- To what degree are GICHD's IM interventions helping to build alliances and strong coordination between IM and operations functions among partners/governments being supported?

Future State: How Can We Improve?

Themes to focus on when considering areas for improvement will be significantly shaped by the outcomes of the current state evaluation. Potential (additional) areas to examine include, but are not limited to:

- Simplicity: GICHD's IM portfolio is comprised of several versions of IMSMA as well as a number of ancillary tools. What steps can be taken to rationalize the portfolio while minimizing disruption to those who depend on these platforms?
- Security: With the launch of IMSMA Core, GICHD shifted from not only providing IM software but now arranging for the hosting of systems and data on behalf of partners/states. To what extent have information security practices kept pace with this evolution?
- Data Standards & Accuracy: GICHD actively contributes to defining IM standards for mine action such as publication of minimum data requirements in IMAS 5.10. To what extent are these data standards promoted and enforced through IM programmes offered by GICHD? To what extent are these data standards followed by beneficiaries? How can GICHD's IM products/services improve data accuracy within mine action programs?
- Scale: The pace of IMSMA Core rollout is currently limited by GICHD's IM capacity to support concurrent programmes. What steps can be taken to accelerate the migration to IMSMA Core from legacy versions of IMSMA?
- Savings: GICHD's recurring costs for IM system hosting, maintenance and support are increasing as IMSMA Core expands to more partners. What is the appetite among beneficiaries to contribute towards these costs? What are the minimum resources needed to deploy and sustain IMSMA Core? What opportunities does GICHD have to reduce recurring IM costs or achieve greater IM efficiency?
- Innovation: IMSMA Core offers a promise of a foundation that can be built on with capabilities such as advanced data analytics, workflows for automated imagery analysis, incorporating machine learning / artificial intelligence, and other emerging technologies. What steps can be taken to foster such innovation?

Evaluation Methods

The evaluation will use the following methods to answer the evaluation questions mentioned above:

- Desk study of relevant GICHD documents including concept notes, funding proposals, project briefs, financial data, and the reports and background documents of previous evaluations and reviews of the GICHD, its programmes, and activities;
- Interviews and, if deemed appropriate, surveys with relevant stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries of the GICHD;
- Key informant interviews with GICHD staff, members of the Advisory Board, external partners, and beneficiaries;
- Site visits to at least two national mine action centres supported by GICHD, one representing a perceived IM success, another where IM has been perceived as challenging; and
- Relevant financial data provided by the GICHD.

Evaluation Standards

The sectoral evaluation of the GICHD's tools, products and publications shall be carried out according to the DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation as well as to the International Mine Action Standard 14.10 Evaluation of Mine Action interventions

Evaluation Team

The evaluation team should be comprised of expertise in:

1. Evaluation of international development/humanitarian programmes;
2. Mine action and/or related sectors;
3. Humanitarian information management; and
4. Information/digital technology

The GICHD implements a Gender and Diversity policy and strives for gender balance in the evaluation team.

All of the following competences and skills are required for the evaluation. The evaluator must:
1. Hold an independent position, and in particular not be an employee of the Swiss Federal Administration, the GCSP, GICHD or DCAF, or a direct project partner of the three Centres, and was not at any time employed by these institutions within the past 24 months;
2. Not at the same time be a contractor of the GICHD;
3. Have proven experience and competence in evaluating partnerships between governmental and non-governmental organizations and think tanks in the domain of peace and security (i.e. security policy, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, international humanitarian law and human rights, humanitarian policy and/or response, sustainable development, etc.);
4. Have proven experience and competence with regard to information management in humanitarian contexts;
5. Have an advanced knowledge on mine action trends as well as on key questions in the humanitarian domain; and
6. Be sensitive to gender and diversity considerations.

Deliverables

The evaluation will be managed by the GICHD's Head of Information Management. The evaluation team will periodically report to the Interdivisional Coordination Meeting (IDCM), which shall serve as a sounding board for this evaluation.

Under the mandate assigned to the evaluation team the following deliverables are expected (all in English):

– Inception Report with the following information: refined methodology, refined evaluation questions, list of interviewees, workplan, and a proposal regarding format and structure of the evaluation report. The Inception Report shall be addressed to the IDCM for discussion and approval.
– Draft Report, including key findings and recommendations shall be addressed to the IDCM and then to the GICHD Management Board for comments.
– Final Evaluation Report: Evaluation Report of max. 20 pages, plus annexes and an executive summary of max. 2 pages, including key findings and recommendations.
– The evaluator will present the Inception Report, Draft Report, and Final Report to GICHD stakeholders and answer questions asked from the stakeholders about each report. The evaluator will prepare slides summarizing key points for each report (inception, draft, final).

The evaluation report will be addressed to the GICHD Management Board.

Location

The majority of the work will be conducted remotely from the contractor's place of business. Travel is expected to at least two field locations in mine-affected countries. Assuming COVID conditions permit, onsite presentations will be made of draft and final reports at GICHD's Geneva office.

Legal requirement

Interested candidates/entities must provide a guarantee that they are registered as an independent legal entity. By applying to the tender, the applicant authorizes the GICHD to use their personal information to administer the tender and for internal purpose only. The detailed information will not be passed onto other parties without obtaining the applicant's explicit written consent first.

Timeframe

- 21 June 2021 – Start of engagement
- 9 July 2021 – Inception report due
- 4 October 2021 – Draft report due
- 5 November 2021 – Final report due

Proposal Format

Each applicant must submit the following as a minimum:

1. A **technical offer** specifying the methodology used to complete the requested services, including a proposed timeline to complete each task and its associated deliverables (maximum 4 pages);
2. A **financial offer** specifying the number of days needed to accomplish the mandate, the daily fee, as well as any other costs as relevant (costs for equipment such as laptops, software, and connectivity are not covered by the GICHD and must be included in the consultant services at no extra cost);
3. At least 2 samples of previous similar work;
4. CV of project team members(s) and description of availability to deliver services within the timeline required;
5. Two reference contact details; and
6. Bidders are requested to provide their policy on gender equality and inclusion as part of their

submission.

All applicants will be contacted and informed of the status of their applications.