REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

[Provision of Evaluation Services of OSCE SALW Assistance Projects]

The Organization for Security and Co-operation (OSCE) seeks proposals from qualified contractors for the provision of Evaluation Services of OSCE SALW Assistance Projects, in accordance with the requirements, terms and conditions stipulated herein.

This Request for Proposal (RFP) consists of this document and the following annexes:

Annex A: Terms of Reference
Annex B: Technical Compliance Form
Annex C: Financial Proposal – Pricing Format
Annex D: Acknowledgement Letter
Annex E: Technical Proposal Submission Form
Annex F: Proposed Time Schedule Table

In submitting a proposal, the Proposer accepts in full and without restriction the requirements of this RFP including the Terms of Reference and the OSCE General Terms and Conditions for Services as the sole basis of this tender process, and waives his own conditions of sale, whatever they may be.

Proposals must be received by the OSCE at the address shown in point 1.3, no later than 11:00 hours (CET), on 17 June 2014. Proposals received after the designated time will be automatically rejected. Submission of proposals by fax or email is not accepted.

No pre-tender Meeting is foreseen.

Any questions pertaining to this RFP shall be addressed in writing, by email, with exact reference to the number and the subject of this RFP, to the attention of Irene Menjivar, Chief of Procurement and Contracting Unit (balazs.fule@osce.org), no later than 17:00 hours (CET), on 6 June 2014. The OSCE will notify all the proposers in writing of the questions raised and the corresponding responses. Kindly refrain from telephone calls and personal visits.

1. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

1.1 General

The OSCE intends to award a Contract for the provision of evaluation services of OSCE SALW assistance projects, in accordance with Point 9 - Proposed Time Schedule and Deliverables cited in the Terms of Reference. The services are expected to commence tentatively on 01/07/2014 and to be completed by 31/12/2014.

Proposers shall submit a proposal directly responsive to the terms of this tender. Proposals should include detailed information demonstrating compliance with the requirements, terms and conditions of this RFP. It is the responsibility of the Proposer to verify all aspects of the services involved prior to submitting a proposal.

This RFP, including its Annexes and Attachments will form part of any purchase order or contract entered into by the OSCE as a result of this RFP.

1.2 Proposal Format

The Proposal has to be submitted in two separate parts, the technical and financial part.
The Technical Proposal shall address all aspects of the Terms of Reference of this RFP and should include models, examples and technical solutions to problems raised in the specifications giving an answer to each of the points mentioned with regard to the methodology, deadlines and organization. The technical proposal must respond to the technical specifications and provide, as a minimum, all the information needed for the purpose of awarding a contract. The level of practical details provided in the tender will be extremely important for the evaluation of the tender.

The Technical Proposal MUST NOT contain any price or cost information.

The Financial Proposal shall contain clear, concise price information presenting all costs associated with the assignment, including but not limited to remuneration for staff, transportation, equipment and materials, insurance, surveys, etc. Prices (excl. taxes) shall be quoted in EURO unless indicated otherwise. Prices shall be quoted on the basis of the delivery terms specified in the solicitation document. In case the delivery terms are not indicated, DAP (INCOTERMS 2010) shall apply.

1.2.1 Technical Proposal

Company Profile:

1. Completed and duly signed Vendor Registration Form [http://www.osce.org/procurement/74772]
2. Copy of the company’s registration document/license(s)
3. Descriptive summary of the company’s professional capacity and experience, including a list of services as reference relevant to the subject of this solicitation that were provided to other clients.
4. References with names and contact details: addresses and telephone numbers according to point 10.1 of the ToR.

Documents to submit to demonstrate the substantial responsiveness of the Tender (with reference to points 10.1 and 10.2 of the Terms of Reference):

(i) Duly completed Technical Proposal Submission Form (Annex E);

(ii) Duly completed Vendor Registration Form. The Bidder should include on this form a brief description of the Bidder’s organization;

(iii) A description of the approach, methodology and work plan for performing the Services, including a list of the proposed key experts by speciality, the tasks that would be assigned to each key expert, and their timing. The detailed plan for the evaluation — from research design to measurement and data — shall be in line with the technical requirements, including OSCE policies on SALW, so that it is possible to assess whether the Bidder understands and covers all aspects to the project, including demonstrating a fully relevant, convincing and innovative methodology. Furthermore, the Technical Proposal shall demonstrate the efficiency, quality and usefulness of the proposed solution, the match between the work program and the intended completion schedule;

(iv) Duly completed Technical Compliance Form (Annex B) with an item-by-item commentary on the Terms of Reference demonstrating substantial responsiveness to the requirements;

(v) CVs recently signed by the proposed key professional staff and the authorized representative submitting the Proposal (preferably in an international format). Key information should include number of years working and degree of responsibility held in various assignments during the last ten (10) years. For each evaluation team member, please provide information on university education; documented extent of SALW and SCA evaluation experience; length of evaluation experience; and
number published peer reviewed relevant empirical studies (from the list of publications it shall be clear which of the publications were peer-reviewed, and which concerned SALW and/or SCA).

(vi) Duly completed Time Schedule Table (Annex F) to indicate the exact number of days necessary to perform the contractual tasks.

Please note that the Technical Proposal MUST NOT contain any price or cost information.

1.2.2 Financial Proposal

Completed and signed Annex C “Pricing Format”. The currency of the Proposal is EURO.

Since the OSCE is exempt from TAXES and DUTIES, all prices are to be expressed exclusive of VAT and other taxes and duties.

Food and lodging costs shall be included into the remuneration costs. Flights are reimbursed based on the supported evidence (tickets under the relevant expert’s name together with the corresponding invoices and the stubs of the boarding passes). Upon flying, reimbursement shall be based on the most economical air fare.

Where the means of transport is by ship or rail, those shall be reimbursed for the class corresponding to second-class rail fare (on presentation of the original return ticket as supporting evidence).

1.3 Submission of Proposals

Your proposals must be enclosed in two separate envelopes, one for the technical and the other for the financial part of the Proposal, clearly marked as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFIDENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TENDER – DO NOT OPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICAL PROPOSAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference No.: SEC/RFP/10/2014 – Provision of Evaluation Services of OSCE SALW Assistance Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Date/Time: 11:00 hours (CET), on 17 June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of your Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFIDENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TENDER – DO NOT OPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL PROPOSAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference No.: SEC/RFP/10/2014 – Provision of Evaluation Services of OSCE SALW Assistance Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Date/Time: 11:00 hours (CET), on 17 June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of your Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Technical and Financial envelopes must be secured in one sealed envelope, clearly marked and addressed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFIDENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TENDER – DO NOT OPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson, Bid Opening Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCE Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallnerstrasse 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference No: SEC/RFP/10/2014 – Provision of Evaluation Services of OSCE SALW Assistance Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Date/Time: 11:00 hours (CET), on 17 June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of your Company:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposals delivered to any other address will be rejected.

The Proposal must indicate the date, bidder’s name, address, and must be signed by an authorized representative of the bidder.
2. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

As a general rule, only tenders that are technically acceptable and that provide all the necessary evidence required in the RFP will be considered for financial evaluation. The proposals will be evaluated according to the following criteria, not necessarily listed in order of priority:

a) Demonstrated ability and willingness to meet RFP requirements.
b) Demonstrated managerial capability for executing the contract.
c) Demonstrated understanding of the OSCE’s need for quality service.
d) Detailed work plan demonstrating the capability to provide the required services.
e) Responsiveness to the RFP.
f) Cost comparison between responsive proposers. From among all technical acceptable proposals, the award will be made to the bid that presents the best value for money based on the quality and cost based selection method.

Both the quality of the technical proposal and the offered price in the financial proposal will be taken into consideration. The ratio between technical and financial proposal will be 60% to 40% respectively.

3. MISCELLANEOUS

3.1 Bank Guarantee

The successful proposer will not be required to provide a Bank Guarantee.

3.2 Language of Proposal

Proposals must be submitted in the English language.

3.3 Period of Validity

Proposals and all price offers shall remain valid and open for acceptance for at least ninety (90 days) from the date of the receipt of the Proposals.

3.4 Contract award and the right to accept any Proposal or to reject any or all Proposals

Instructions to Bidders and the General Conditions of Contract for Services can be found at [www.osce.org/procurement](http://www.osce.org/procurement).

Please note that the terms set forth in this RFP, including the contents of the annexes will form part of any contract awarded by the OSCE. Any such contract will require compliance with all factual statements and representations made in the bid.

This RFP does not commit the OSCE to consider any proposal or to award a contract or to pay any costs incurred in the preparation or submission of proposal, or to procure any services from any proposer. This RFP contains no contractual offer of any kind. Any proposal submitted will be regarded as an offer by the proposer and not as an acceptance by the proposer of any offer by the OSCE. No contractual relationship exists, except pursuant to a purchase order or contract document signed by the authorized representatives of both parties. The OSCE reserves the right to reject any or all proposals received in response to this RFP, to split the award, and to negotiate with any of the proposers or other firms in any manner deemed to be in the best interest of the OSCE.

3.5 Acknowledgement of Receipt of this RFP

Upon receipt of this RFP, you are kindly requested to return the attached Acknowledgement Letter (Annex D) as soon as possible to: balazs.fule@osce.org, advising whether or not your company intends to submit a proposal.

Irene Menjivar
Chief, Procurement and Contracting Unit
ANNEX A – TERMS OF REFERENCE

SEC/RFP/10/2014

1. Background

Illicit trade in, or theft of, SALW and related ammunition is believed to increase the risk for armed conflict and violent crime inside or outside the SALW source countries. Moreover, accidental explosions at munitions sites are common across the world. Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and related Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition (SCA) are high not only on the UN agenda - as manifested by the UN Program of Action on SALW - but also on the agenda of IGOs such as the OSCE that work to implement the UN instruments.

Apart from regulating licit brokering of SALW and related SCA, one way to reduce illicit trade and accidental explosions is stockpile management and control.3 OSCE’s work on SALW can be traced to the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons (2000) and the Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition (2003). The OSCE has moreover issued the Handbook of Best Practices on Small Arms and Light Weapons (2003), the OSCE Handbook of Best Practices on Conventional Ammunition (2008), and the OSCE Plan of Action on SALW (2010). Section IV of the Handbook of Best Practices on Small Arms and Light Weapons deals with stockpile management and control, and outlines four elements:

- indicators of surplus: participating states need to assess whether and to what extent they have surplus weapons and ammunition;
- improving stockpile management and security: participating states are urged to implement nine procedures and measures;
- destruction and deactivation;
- financial and technical assistance: participating states agree to consider offering technical, financial and consultative assistance in response to requests from participating states.

2. Description and Scope of the Evaluation Topic

There is a considerable amount of SALW and related SCA in former Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia. From 2003 to November 2013 the OSCE received 40 requests for assistance from 17 participating States concerning safety and security of stockpiles, destruction of surplus ammunition, disposal of rocket fuel, and unexploded ordnance and explosive remnants of war. Of these requests, 36 concerned SALW and SCA. Following these requests the OSCE had by December 2013 carried out projects on stockpile management and security of SALW and related SCA in Belarus, Cyprus, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, and Ukraine. The projects have almost exclusively been carried out by OSCE field operations, the exceptions being Cyprus and Belarus. The projects cover safe destruction and safe storage, and as such involve not only tasks such as destruction through either explosions or dismantling, but also improving and sometimes building sites for safe destruction and storage, and building capacity of concerned national agencies through training and workshops. The total operational expenditure (excluding long-term OSCE staff) is approximately 6.710.000 Euro.

The choice of SALW and related SCA as object of an independent evaluation is timely. OSCE SALW related projects have been ongoing for a large number of years, have had a substantial financial scope, are common across field operations, can be assumed to be common also in the future, have a high degree of evaluability, and have not been exposed to independent evaluations.

---

1 E.g., UN Document S/2008/258.
2 OSCE Document FSC/DEC/11/09 (2009) details how participating States can direct request to the OSCE for support to SALW projects, and how requests should be addressed by the OSCE, from initial consultations and assessments through the production of a detailed project plan.
3. Objectives and Scope of Assignment

This shall be a strategic level evaluation where the report target group is field operation (FO) leadership and management at the OSCE Secretariat. Evaluation results should foremost be used to inform the overall OSCE SALW programme.

The evaluation shall be structured, systematic and concise, and build on carefully collected and referenced data instead of expert judgements. Narrative analysis shall be minimized; ability to replicate findings and conclusions shall be paramount. The OIO will assist in identifying information sources, including internal documents and third party sources.

The evaluation shall cover six OSCE SALW and related SCA projects (whether active or completed) covering weapons and ammunition throughout their duration up until December 2013. Case selection will be carried out in consultation with the Office of Internal Oversight (OIO), and shall prioritize projects with large financial and thematic scope and duration, taking geographical distribution into account. Some projects have a narrow focus, are interlinked, and follow upon each other in sequence or run simultaneously. Other projects are more comprehensive. In the former case, the projects will be treated as a single comprehensive project and hence case. Case country candidates may include Belarus, Kyrgyzstan, Montenegro, Tajikistan, Georgia, Serbia, Moldova and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Melange related projects and heavy conventional weapons projects will not be evaluated.

As the focus is partly on on-going projects the evaluation will to varying degrees constitute a mid-term evaluation rather than a final end-of-activity evaluation. All findings shall be approached and interpreted with this in mind. Moreover, key stakeholders - FO representatives, FSC staff, and representatives of countries receiving OSCE SALW support - shall be consulted as suitable during the evaluation.

On the basis of the six case studies and with evaluator feedback, the OIO will author a concise synthesis report that provides overall patterns and conclusions (lessons learned, best practices and recommendations).

4. Evaluation questions

The evaluation will primarily aim to identify recommendations, lessons learned and best practices regarding relevance, added value, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability in line with the OECD DAC evaluation criteria and in this specific case also with the OECD Guidelines on Conflict, Peace and Development Cooperation:

- relevance and added value: are the projects relevant? what value do they add to the OSCE SALW and related SCA policy?; has there been a suitable balance between SALW (arms and ammunition) projects, Melange projects and heavy conventional weapons projects?;
- effectiveness: to what extent are the objectives achieved/likely to be achieved?; what are the major factors influencing achievement/non-achievement?;
- efficiency: were activities carried out on time?; were activities carried out in the most efficient way? A value of money analysis shall include a comparison with expenditures levels for similar UNDP, NATO and EU projects;
- impact: what has happened as a result of the projects, and why; what difference have the projects made for the beneficiaries?;
- sustainability: to what extent did the benefits - or are the benefits expected to - continue after assistance projects cease?; what are the major factors influencing sustainability?; is continued OSCE SALW project support warranted?
The evaluation shall also pay attention to possible deficiencies of management processes with regard to vertical coordination between field operations and the OSCE Secretariat in Vienna, and horizontal coordination between field operations. The former is important as it assures consistency between the OSCE’s strategic objectives and field level projects and consistency across field level activities; the latter assures that best practices and methods are shared across projects.

5. Indicators and assessment criteria

To assess impact (immediate outcomes), and depending on the focus of the projects in question, this evaluation shall rely on two general metrics, unless otherwise agreed upon with the OIO:

- the OSCE policy on stockpile management, as found in the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons, section IV, subsections B and C, which spells out procedures and measures, including capacity building. The criteria are identical to those found in section IV of OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition. It has been further operationalized in terms of nine criteria, as found in the OSCE Handbook of Best Practices on Small Arms and Light Weapons, section III, on stockpile management and security. In addition, section III of OSCE Handbook of Best Practices on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition contains overlapping criteria;
- number of destroyed weapons and ammunitions.

Assessing higher level impact in terms of, e.g., violent crime rates is methodologically challenging, since a number of confounding factors (e.g., economic growth, unemployment, policing, and other factors influencing violent crime) need to be considered. Moreover, some of the OSCE projects have as of December 2013 been of short duration, and/or are not finalized. Another alternative is to assess impact in terms of the number of accidental munitions explosions, and SALW street price (controlling for illicit imports and exports). The former would assess whether OSCE projects have as intended created explosion secure storage facilities and removed unstable ammunition, whereas the latter would constitute an indicator of whether theft has diminished. Indicators for assessing higher level impact will be developed in close consultation with the OIO.

Moreover,

- The unit of analysis shall be the SALW project year. This means that the evaluation sample will be composed of a series of panel data of different duration to provide for a large number of annual observations. By using annual snapshot data instead of a single final year snapshot data, development across time can be traced and compared across case studies, and the empirical basis for conclusions increases. For instance, it is possible that effectiveness and efficiency increases or decreases over time, that is, there may be diminishing or increasing returns;
- Data shall be collected from OSCE records (project reports; overall and annual SALW/SCA activity reports issues by the FSC; etc.), the ample number of detailed third-party studies, and interviews with staff from FSC, FOs and host countries;
- Criteria for sustainability shall be developed in close consultation with the OIO;
- OSCE projects vary in duration and financial and thematic scope. Size and duration may in turn be associated with efficiency: for instance, larger projects may have relatively smaller fixed costs (e.g., travels and workshops) and hence economy of scale benefits in such regards. Moreover, local direct (price for goods and services) and indirect (e.g., VAT) costs levels vary, and the same applies to unit destruction costs for SALW items as well as for improving or erecting stockpile buildings. Cost related issues such as these shall be taken into account by the evaluators when assessing efficiency. In addition, caveats on efficiency estimates shall be stated in the evaluations.
6. **Liaison Arrangements**

Evaluators are required to carry out the evaluation in close and regular communication, collaboration and agreement with the OIO. The OIO will facilitate all meetings with OSCE staff and host country representatives as required, and organize all field visits that will be accompanied by OIO staff as appropriate. Other liaison arrangements will be carried out upon mutual agreement. Any deviations from the research and measurement design discussed above, as well as selection of cases, shall be executed only after written agreement with the OIO.

7. **Expected Output and Performance Indicators**

The work shall involve desk research as well as field visits and shall result in the following deliverables:

7.1 Inception report;
7.2 Six draft individual concise case studies of at most 25 pages each (including, cover page, executive summary but excluding annexes), authored by consultants;
7.3 Six final individual case study reports;
7.4 On the basis of the case studies and with evaluator feedback, the OIO will author a concise synthesis report that provides overall patterns and conclusions (lessons learned, best practices and recommendations).

8. **Qualifications of Bidder (Please also see Point 10)**

External data and benchmarks for project objectives shall to be used to different degrees. Case studies shall be systematic, comparable, and at the quality level of peer reviewed studies in high-quality international scientific journals. It is therefore necessary that external evaluators ideally hold a Ph.D., have documented SALW and SCA expertise, evaluation experience, and a documented background in peer reviewed internationally published research involving measurements and comparisons across many cases and dealing with areas of relevance for the evaluation in question. Specific case expertise is highly desirable.

To ensure consistency and efficiency, the case studies should ideally be carried out by not more than two evaluators, one of which will act as project leader and point of contact with the OIO.

The bidder company should have experience from contracts of similar scale/volume during the last 3 years.

9. **Proposed Time Schedule and Deliverables**

Given the focused nature of the case studies and the reduction of narrative elements, the extensive support and close communication that will be offered by the OIO, the ample data availability, and careful selection of evaluators, the evaluation is expected to be finalized in an expedient manner. The evaluation is expected to be carried out between July and November. The OIO will be responsible for writing the synthesis report on which the external evaluators will provide feedback.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Month/date</th>
<th>Estimated expert days</th>
<th>Travel</th>
<th>Payment schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design phase (with external experts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception expert workshop/meeting; Detailed measurement and design discussion</td>
<td>Early July</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 experts to Vienna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review OSCE records, third party sources, submission of inception report (point 7.1 of ToR)</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft reports (6 individual case studies)</td>
<td>Late July</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback, discussions, with OIO, FSC, FOs (meetings and Skype)</td>
<td>Late July</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visits, 3 per consultant: interviews, data collection</td>
<td>Late August</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6 case study visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of interview and field data</td>
<td>Early September</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second draft reports (6 individual case studies – point 7.2 of ToR)</td>
<td>Late September</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback, discussions, with OIO, FSC, FOs (meetings and Skype)</td>
<td>Late September</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final draft reports (6 individual case studies – point 7.3 of ToR)</td>
<td>Early October</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop with OSCE to discuss draft report and further develop recommendations. Complete the draft taking into account comments.</td>
<td>Mid-October</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 experts to Vienna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of final reports (6 individual case studies)</td>
<td>Late October</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis report authored by OIO, reviewed by case study authors (point 7.4 of ToR)</td>
<td>Early November</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback, discussions, with FSC, FOs and consultants (meetings and Skype)</td>
<td>Late November</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total estimated expert days</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Qualifications of Bidder

10.1. Qualification of bidding company

a) The bidder must demonstrate experience and capability to carry out research and analysis of equivalent scale/volume.

Evidence requested
For requirement a):
- Covering at least the previous 3 years, the bidder shall present an annotated list describing the principal successful services provided, including their financial size, dates, duration and recipients (public or private) demonstrating the above requirements. In addition, a brief summary of results should be included.

10.2. Qualifications of expert team

The tenderer must provide a team of 2 experts, evidencing their:
   a) expertise in the areas of SALW and SCA;
   b) relevant university education (Political Science, Social Science, Peace and Conflict Research, International Relations, Development Studies or equivalent) and degree earned;
   c) minimum of 2 years of evaluation experience for each of the experts;
   d) professional level English language skills;
   e) for the expert team coordinator, at least 2 years of experience in project management and a Ph.D.

Evidence requested
For requirement a), b) and c):
   - detailed CVs with lists of publications (this can be included in the CV). It shall be clear which of the publications that were peer reviewed, and which concerned SALW and/or SCA (CV format as found in the tender documentation);
   - copy of the university degree earned;
   - information evidencing at least 2 years of evaluation experience in the form of an annotated list of evaluations.

For requirement d):
   - for non-native English speakers, 3 years of experience working in an English speaking environment and/or a self-certified level B2, and/or scientific publications in English. This information should be included in the CV.

For requirement e):
   - detailed CV of the expert team coordinator;
   - annotated list (separate from the CV) describing in detail the most relevant projects that demonstrate the experience of the expert team coordinator in managing projects.

11. Data, Services, Personnel, and Facilities to be provided by the OSCE

OSCE will provide evaluators with OSCE documentation and interview language translation as required.
# ANNEX B – TECHNICAL COMPLIANCE FORM

**Notes to Bidders:** Please complete the table demonstrating substantial responsiveness to the technical specifications described in the Terms of Reference. Please do not simply write “Comply” or “Yes” – please provide as much information as needed to show how you comply with the requirement. Reference to other datasheets and materials in the bid can also be made.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ToR Ref.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>COMMENTS ON COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS OF REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Description and Scope of the Evaluation Topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Objectives and Scope of Assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Evaluation questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Indicators and assessment criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Liaison Arrangements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Expected Output and Performance Indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Qualifications of Bidder (Please use the below information to fill in relevant parts of Section B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Proposed Time Schedule and Deliverables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1.</td>
<td>Qualification of bidding company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2.</td>
<td>Qualifications of expert team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name and signature of authorized Company representative:
ANNEX C – FINANCIAL PROPOSAL – PRICING FORMAT

**Notes to Bidders:** Please use this form for the submission of your Financial Proposal. Food and lodging costs shall be included into the remuneration costs. Flights are reimbursed based on the supported evidence (tickets under the relevant expert’s name together with the corresponding invoices and the stubs of the boarding passes). Upon flying, reimbursement shall be based on the most economical air fare. Where the means of transport is by ship or rail, those shall be reimbursed for the class corresponding to second-class rail fare (on presentation of the original return ticket as supporting evidence). Please fill white cells only. Cells to correspond the number of experts may be added or deleted.

SEC/RFP/10/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Daily Remuneration Rate (EUR excl. VAT)</th>
<th>Subtotal Amount (EUR excl. VAT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader / Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expert Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost / Expert / Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By signing this Financial Proposal, Bidders accept that any Purchase Order or Contract pursuant to this Proposal will be subject to the OSCE General Conditions of Contract [http://www.osce.org/procurement](http://www.osce.org/procurement).

Start/Completion time:

Payment terms: 30 days net, scheduled according to the fulfilled tasks in points 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4 in the Time Schedule Table. Each point requires a separate "Certification of Acceptance of Tasks" in order to initiate payment.

Validity of offer (90 days minimum):

Warranty period (if applicable):

Company name:

Authorized representative’s name and signature:

Address:

Email:

Telephone:
ANNEX D – ACKNOWLEDGEMENT LETTER

SEC/RFP/10/2014

Subject: Provision of Evaluation Services of OSCE SALW Assistance Projects

Closing date: 11:00 hours (CET), on 17 June 2014.

A pre-tender meeting will not be held.

Company Name: .................................................................

Contact Points: ...................................................... (email, telephone, fax.)

We

_/\  INTEND

_/\  do NOT INTEND

to submit a bid/proposal in response to the above-mentioned tender.

If you do not intend to submit a bid, please specify the reason:

..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................

Signature:

Date:

Please return this form to balazs.fule@osce.org as soon as possible.

The Tenderers are kindly reminded that returning this form does not constitute submitting an offer in any way.
ANNEX E – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORM

**Note to Bidders:** The Bidder shall fill in and submit this Technical Proposal Submission Form together with all other Forms contained in Section III of these Bidding Documents, forming the Bidder’s Technical Proposal. Bidders are advised to check with RFP Article 1.2 for all documents that are required to be submitted as part of the Technical Proposal.

Date: [Bidder to insert date]

RFP No. SEC/RFP/10/2014

To: [Please insert name of OSCE Executive Structure]

Ladies/Gentlemen:

We, the undersigned, offer to provide the Services in accordance with your Request for Proposal No. SEC/RFP/10/2014 and our Proposal. We are hereby submitting our Proposal, which includes this Technical Proposal, and a Financial Proposal sealed under a separate envelope.

We hereby declare that all the information and statements made in our Proposal are true and accept that any misinterpretation contained in it may lead to our disqualification.

We confirm to comply with eligibility requirements specified in the Bidding Documents. We also confirm that any and all information provided on the Qualification Form attached hereto and being an integral part of this Technical Proposal is correct and truly reflects our experience, qualifications and capacities.

We accept and agree that the terms and conditions of Contract contained in the Bidding Documents will apply to any contract resulting from this bidding exercise.

We agree to abide by this Proposal for the Proposal Validity Period specified in the Bidding Documents.

We understand that the OSCE is not bound to accept any Proposal, and that the OSCE reserves the right to accept or reject any Proposal and to annul or suspend the bidding process whether in whole or in part and to reject all Proposals at any time prior to the award of contract, without the OSCE incurring any liability whatsoever.

We remain,

Yours sincerely,

Authorized Signature:
Name and Title of Signatory:
Name of Firm:
Address:
Date:
### ANNEX F – TIME SCHEDULE TABLE

**Note to Bidders:** The Bidder shall fill in and submit this Time Schedule Table together with all other Forms contained in these Bidding Documents, forming the Bidder’s Technical Proposal. Bidders are advised to check with RFP Article 1.2 for all documents that are required to be submitted as part of the Technical Proposal.

The Time Schedule Table in point 9 of Annex A is for information purposes and indicates an estimated number of expert-days. Please fill white cells only with Arabic numerals.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Month/date</th>
<th>No. of Expert days</th>
<th>Travel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design phase (with external experts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception expert workshop/meeting; Detailed measurement and design discussion</td>
<td>Early July</td>
<td>2 experts to Vienna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review OSCE records, third party sources, submission of inception report (point 7.1 ToR)</td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft reports (6 individual case studies)</td>
<td>Late July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback, discussions, with OIO, FSC, FOs (meetings and Skype)</td>
<td>Late July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visits, 3 per consultant: interviews, data collection</td>
<td>Late August</td>
<td>6 case study visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of interview and field data</td>
<td>Early September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second draft reports (6 individual case studies – point 7.2 of ToR)</td>
<td>Late September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback, discussions, with OIO, FSC, FOs (meetings and Skype)</td>
<td>Late September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final draft reports (6 individual case studies – point 7.3 of ToR)</td>
<td>Early October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop with OSCE to discuss draft report and further develop recommendations. Complete the draft taking into account comments.</td>
<td>Mid-October</td>
<td>2 experts to Vienna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of final reports (6 individual case studies)</td>
<td>Late October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis report authored by OIO, reviewed by case study authors (point 7.4 of ToR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft</td>
<td>Early November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback, discussions, with FSC, FOs and consultants (meetings and Skype)</td>
<td>Late November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total estimated expert days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>