



International Republican Institute

Sudan: Political Party Development

Prepared June 27, 2011

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Table of Contents

- I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND
 - a. Purpose of the Request for Proposal
 - b. Intended Audience
 - c. Bidder Qualifications and Response Requirements

- II. SUBMISSION & AWARD DETAILS
 - a. Bidding & Award Schedule
 - b. Evaluation Factors for Award
 - c. Questions About the Award
 - d. Submission Information

- III. BACKGROUND OF IRI SUDAN PROGRAM

- IV. SCOPE OF WORK
 - a. Goals of the Evaluation
 - b. Evaluation Questions
 - c. Existing Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanisms
 - d. Response Format
 - e. Resources Available to the Evaluation Team
 - f. Deliverables
 - g. Period of Scope of Work
 - h. AEA Guiding Principles

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

PURPOSE OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

The International Republican Institute (IRI) is a non-profit, non-governmental organization dedicated to supporting democracy worldwide. In this request for proposal, IRI seeks an independent evaluator to conduct an evaluation of its political party programs in South Sudan. Respondents must have prior experience in the evaluation of democracy and governance (DG) programs.

The purpose of this evaluation is to measure the outcomes and impact of IRI's political party program in South Sudan over the past seven years, and provide analytical insights that can serve to inform and improve future programs.

The results of the evaluation will provide important lessons learned and best practices to inform future IRI programming in South Sudan. In addition, it will form part of IRI's final report to its donor, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Lastly, with the evaluation results IRI will determine which, if any, of the programming activities in South Sudan have the potential for replication in other countries and regions in which IRI implements similar work.

INTENDED AUDIENCE

The primary audience for this evaluation is IRI. The Institute will use the results of the evaluation to obtain evidence of program outcomes and impact, as well as develop lessons learned to improve its political party programs in the country and worldwide. IRI will also share the results of this evaluation with USAID's Office of Democracy and Governance.

BIDDER QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS

Bidders and their proposals must meet the following minimum qualifications and response requirement criteria:

1. Personnel Capability and Experience:

The makeup of the evaluation team (if applicable) is at the discretion of the bidder. However, the principal evaluator must have a minimum of five (5) years of experience conducting evaluations in the fields of political party, civil society and governance work. Preference may be given to an evaluator with work experience in Sudan and/or other conflict zones, and who is familiar with regulations and reporting requirements pertaining to federal grantees. The language of every deliverable will be in English. The evaluation team is required to travel to Juba as part of its assessment of IRI programs and systems in South Sudan.

2. Technical Approach - Methodology and Strategy for Analysis of Results:

The evaluation team should propose a clear methodology that addresses all the evaluation questions. The team may utilize both quantitative and qualitative methodologies, but given the logistical challenges collecting quantitative data in South Sudan, IRI expects that the team will need to rely mostly on qualitative research methods such as focus groups, interviews and/or questionnaires, as appropriate. All focus groups, interviews and questionnaires conducted during the evaluation should be recorded, transcribed (if permission is granted by the interview participant) and submitted to IRI so that the findings can be checked and further analysis can be conducted if necessary.

3. Past Performance:

The proposal should include a brief description of the evaluation team, its firm/institution and outline of recent experience on projects of a similar nature. It should also provide information that will facilitate an examination of the team's financial and managerial capacity to provide the services. As a reference, the proposal should also provide previous evaluation work *in the field of democracy and governance* such as final evaluation reports (maximum of two reports) and include three recommendations.

4. Detailed Budget:

IRI expects to award a contract of up to \$100,000; however, IRI will consider bids on an individual basis at their own merits exclusive of the set dollar amount. Submissions should include a detailed budget outlining expected costs for personnel, data collection, and other relevant costs. *Travel-associated costs should be excluded from the budget as IRI will provide all travel and logistical arrangements, and will offer lodging in Juba at the secure IRI compound. Medical, emergency extraction and travel accident insurance will be provided by International SOS as part of the contract.*

II. SUBMISSION & AWARD DETAILS

All proposals are due by 5:00 PM EST on July 27, 2011. See table below for a detailed bidding and award schedule.

BIDDING & AWARD SCHEDULE

Event	Date
1. RFP Distribution	6/27/2011
2. Questions About the Award from Bidders (via email)	6/27-7/7/2011
3. Proposal Due Date	7/27/2011
4. Selection Discussions and Interviews with Bidders	7/27-8/3/2011
5. Anticipated Decision and Selection of Evaluation Team	8/5/2011
6. Anticipated Date of Contract	8/19/2011
7. Final Report Due	12/30/2011

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Any award to be made pursuant to this RFP will be based upon the proposal, with appropriate consideration given to operational, technical, cost, and management requirements. Evaluation of offers will be based upon the evaluation team's responsiveness to the RFP, the evaluation team's capability and prior experience in democracy and governance (DG) evaluations, and a review of the proposed budget.

The following elements will be the primary considerations in evaluating all submitted proposals and in the selection of an evaluation team:

1. Key Personnel Capability and Experience (30%)
2. Technical Approach (30%)
3. Past Performance in DG and Demonstrated Competence (20%)
4. Reasonableness of Detailed Budget (20%)

A detailed description of the evaluative criteria for each of these factors can be found in the "Scope of Work: Response Requirements" section on page 9.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE AWARD

All questions should be directed to the persons of contact listed below.

Questions with regard to the award will be accommodated June 27 through July 7, 2011, pursuant to the Bidding and Award Schedule detailed above. IRI will respond to each question individually on a rolling basis, within three business days of the receipt of the question.

At the close of the question period, July 7, IRI will compile all questions and answers deemed pertinent to the application of other bidders, and share them with all bidders by July 10. IRI will keep the identity and affiliation of the questioner private. The intent is to ensure that all bidders have equal access to information of potential importance to the design of their proposal.

For this reason, all evaluation teams or firms intending to submit a proposal for this award are recommended to email IRI with their intent to bid as early as possible. This will ensure that they receive the list of questions and answers. All bidders will be given the opportunity to request the list of questions and answers up until the date of submission.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Proposals should be submitted via e-mail to:

Names	Milica Panic, Sudan Program CC: James Turitto, Sudan Program CC: Alysson Oakley, Office of Monitoring and Evaluation
Address	International Republican Institute 1225 Eye St. NW, Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20005
Email	mpanic@iri.org jturitto@iri.org aoakley@iri.org

III. BACKGROUND OF IRI SUDAN PROGRAM

For the last seven years, the International Republican Institute (IRI) has been working in South Sudan to assist political parties in implementing the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) and developing the capacity of parties to function in government. This work is funded through a seven-year grant from USAID's "Governing Justly and Democratically" program. As an illustration of the scale of the program, since 2004, the Institute has trained more than 21,000 Sudanese. IRI's goals have been threefold: to increase the organizational capacity of political parties; to prepare all political parties for participation in the political processes as outlined by the CPA (elections and referendum); and to increase the capacity of political parties to participate effectively in the Southern Sudan Legislative Assembly (SSLA).

Goal 1: Increase the Organizational Capacity of Political Parties

In 2005, at the signing of the CPA, political parties in South Sudan were poorly organized and lacked essential capacities to administratively function and compete in elections. Many political parties were formerly militia armies. IRI has worked closely with all traditional and new political parties in South Sudan to develop their structure and organization. The Institute first began working with the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM). Then, in 2008, the Institute expanded its work to include nine opposition parties (African National Congress, Sudan African National Union, United Democratic Front, South Sudan Democratic Forum, South Sudan Democratic Front, Sudan People's Liberation Movement-Democratic Change, United Sudan African Parties, United Democratic Salvation Front and United Democratic Salvation Front-Mainstream).

An important part of IRI's political party development program is strategic planning training, through which parties are able to identify priorities, address weaknesses and create action plans for the pre-election period. IRI also provides training and technical assistance to parties on such topics as grassroots mobilization, membership recruitment, transparent political financing, internal and external communications strategies, and the creation of women's leagues and youth wings. Further, IRI's programming emphasizes the importance of internal democracy, and encourages the election of party leadership and candidates.

Goal 2: Prepare Political Parties for Participation in the Political Processes as Outlined by the CPA (Elections and Referendum)

The Comprehensive Peace Agreement called for national and state elections at the presidential, parliamentary and gubernatorial levels throughout all of Sudan and a referendum for Southern Sudanese to determine the status of the semi-autonomous region. Prior to the elections in April 2010, the Institute worked with the political parties to provide necessary campaign skills that allowed candidates to compete effectively. IRI introduced a candidate campaign school to focus on these skills, which included trainings on topics such as candidate selection, volunteer mobilization, message development, grassroots campaigning, fundraising, campaign management, media relations, voter targeting and voter turnout. Women candidates were provided special assistance through the campaign schools since the political processes in Sudan had not traditionally included women. The Institute assisted many candidates in holding town

hall meetings and competing in public debates. IRI also worked with the parties on developing fair and democratic candidate selection processes. In addition, the Institute provided trainings to political party agents on proper techniques for election and referendum observation to ensure that political parties had the capacity to identify fraud at polling stations.

Goal 3: Prepare Political Parties for Participation in the SSLA

After the signing of the CPA, representatives of Southern political parties were faced with the daunting task of entering government with virtually no legislative or executive experience. IRI has been working with the semi-autonomous Government of South Sudan (GOSS), the SSLA and state legislatures to increase their capacity to govern effectively.

IRI began working with the SSLA shortly after its formation in 2005. The Institute's work has been focused on developing strong legislative processes and strengthening party leadership. Through party caucus trainings, IRI has provided the SPLM members of parliament with necessary skills to serve as a successful majority party while also working with minority parties on mounting an effective opposition. It has provided capacity building and supplementary skills trainings to all legislators and legislative staff. IRI also partners with the SSLA Women's Forum to support women parliamentarians in developing skills and confidence in their roles as legislators. In addition to this work, IRI has worked closely with parliamentarians and select committees to develop oversight mechanisms. The Institute's work with the parliamentary committees also focuses on strengthening their capacity to draft and debate legislation.

IV. SCOPE OF WORK

This SOW will focus on the outcomes and impact of IRI's political party activities.

GOALS OF THE EVALUATION

The goal of this evaluation is to provide an assessment of the outcomes and impact of IRI's work in South Sudan. It will also highlight key lessons learned and best practices during seven years of programming. The evaluation team will assess:

1. The progress and results made by IRI and its partners towards program objectives through program activities;
2. The expected and unexpected outcomes of IRI's work – both immediate and medium term – and that of its partners as they relate to program objectives;
3. Where possible, the overall impact of the activities implemented by IRI and IRI local partners (political parties and SSLA); and
4. Lessons learned and best practices via recommendations for any changes in approach or activities to maximize the effectiveness and impact of the program for IRI.

IRI's definitions of the terms "outcome" and "impact" are the following:

- An **outcome** is the benefit of an activity/intervention, such as a change in behavior, relationship, or action. Outcomes are often dependent on actions subsequent to an activity/intervention by boundary partners/stakeholders of the implementing agent, or dependent on external factors. Outcomes may follow immediately after a program activity (immediate outcome), several steps after a program activity (intermediate outcome), or significantly after a program activity (long term outcome).
- An **impact** is a change in a system or condition. Impact often depends on external factors and complementary developments. Impact generally takes place at the macro level.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The team will conduct an evaluation with the Institute's local partners using a mixture of qualitative and quantitative research methods; however, the Institute expects the majority of the research to be qualitative, using techniques such as focus groups and interviews.

The team should use a two-prong approach: a "bottom-up" approach that evaluates the results of IRI's activities in light of IRI's program objectives, combined with a "top-down" approach that evaluates IRI's contribution to general principles of political party development.

The approach is intended to act as a "check" on evaluation findings. In essence, the top-down approach will provide a complement to the bottom-up approach: it will highlight system level changes that can be linked to the outcomes/impact identified in the bottom-up approach, as well as identify additional areas of possible impact that could form the basis for future evaluative inquiry.

IRI envisions the two approaches will be conducted separately from each other, using different data sources, and then brought together during the analysis phase to compare the two sets of findings. Using this two-prong approach will help the Institute identify both expected and unexpected results from its political party development programming.

Throughout its work, the evaluation team should be mindful of lessons learned, challenges and recommendations for improvement in all areas as noted above and take into consideration the country's unique conditions.

******The evaluation team is welcome to suggest alternative principles, evaluative questions, and evaluative approach.******

In addition, IRI welcomes other recommendations by the evaluation team on how to proceed on any aspects beneficial to cover for the purpose of this evaluation.

This two-prong approach is further explained below.

“Bottom-Up” Approach

The bottom up approach will focus on tracing IRI's interventions through the results chain - beginning with activities, through to outputs, outcomes and impact where possible. Research methodology would probably be through interviews with staff, trainers, implementers and program participants as well as documentary review. Illustrative program activities are listed below based on each expected result.

The evaluation team will seek to address the general and specific questions provided below by taking into consideration South Sudan's unique conditions.

The evaluation team will approach the assessment of outcomes and potential impact of IRI activities in support of expected results through the following general questions:

- What were the outcomes of activities implemented by IRI?
- How did key program activities contribute to expected and unexpected results?

In addition to the general evaluation criteria listed above, the evaluation team should address the following specific questions related to the outcomes of each expected result. The evaluation team may address additional specific questions regarding each expected result as the team sees fit.

Expected Result #1: Political parties increase their organizational capacity.

The evaluation team will assess the outcomes and potential impact of IRI activities in support of this expected result through the following specific questions:

- What has been IRI's contribution to the process of transforming the SPLM from a rebel movement to a political party?

- How has IRI assisted in developing the organizational capacity of the parties at the national and state levels?
- How has the Institute assisted in the development of party leadership capacity building at the national and state levels?
- Have parties reformed their internal governance structure and are women more involved in those structures? If so, how has IRI contributed to these changes?
- How has IRI contributed to the development of internal party democracy – elections of party leadership, candidate selection process, party conventions, etc?
- How has IRI assisted in the ability of women and youth to be represented and to advocate for their concerns within the party structure?

Illustrative program activities associated with this objective include the following:

- ✓ Development and Capacity Building Trainings for National Party Leadership, State Party Leadership, Women and Youth in Party Politics;
- ✓ Strategic Planning Workshops for National and State Leadership;
- ✓ Trainings and Technical Assistance for Specific Political Party Secretariats; and
- ✓ Workshops on National and Political Party Governing Documents.

Expected Result #2: Political parties increase their level of preparation to participate in the political processes as outlined by the CPA (elections and referendum).

The evaluation team will assess the outcomes and potential impact of IRI activities in support of this expected result through the following specific questions:

- How did IRI contribute to the quality of candidate and party campaigns for the elections?
- What skills did candidates and parties adopt from the IRI trainings?
- What was the contribution of IRI's campaign trainings for women candidates?
- How were party agents able to use the skills learned from the IRI trainings in their capacity as observers during the elections and referendum?

Illustrative program activities associated with this objective include the following:

- ✓ Campaign Workshops for Women Candidates and the Youth;
- ✓ Party Agent Observer Trainings on the Elections and the Referendum;
- ✓ Party/Candidate Campaign Trainings;
- ✓ Political Party Roundtable Discussions;
- ✓ Public Forums for the Elections; and
- ✓ Trainings on the Elections and Referendum Rules/Processes.

Expected Result #3: Political parties improve their effectiveness to participate in governance and build legislative institutional capacity.

The evaluation team will assess the outcomes and potential impact of IRI activities in support of this expected result through the following specific questions:

- How have legislators used the knowledge from IRI capacity building trainings?
- What was the role of IRI in establishing and developing the Women’s Caucus?
- How has IRI contributed to the capacity building of individual committees in the SSLA?
- What has been IRI’s contribution to raising public debate within the SSLA?

Illustrative program activities associated with this objective include the following:

- ✓ Capacity Building Workshops for Legislators, Legislative Staff, Committees and Political Parties in the SSLA;
- ✓ Development of Select Legislative Committees
- ✓ Training for Women Legislators and the Development of the Women’s Parliamentarians’ Caucus; and
- ✓ Workshops for Legislators on National Governing Documents.

A full list of program activities will be shared with the winning bidder upon signing of the contract.

“Top-Down” Approach

The top-down approach seeks to place IRI’s programming within the scope of general political party development in South Sudan. It would remove the lens of the IRI program and look at the changes that have occurred within political parties and the broader society over the last seven years. Through this top-down approach, IRI seeks to gain a better understanding of the larger scope of change that has occurred in Sudan’s political system over the last seven years, and to determine ways that IRI’s work might have contributed to that change. The methodology could include interviewing experts, reviewing poll data and other external and independent documentary evidence (news clips, etc.), but the team would most likely collect data for this approach separately from the data it collects for the bottom-up approach.

The political party system in South Sudan is unique. Many of the parties are young and developed from military structures. Furthermore, the ruling party, the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement, is the dominant party; opposition parties have limited influence.

For this reason, the evaluation team will need to gain useful insight into the development of political parties in South Sudan since 2004. IRI expects that the evaluation team will need to focus on what has changed over the last seven years (rather than only focusing on the current state of the political party system), and illustrate where the Institute has operated as an agent of change. IRI expects the evaluation team to develop principles and criteria to determine the level of change in the political party system over the past seven years. The evaluation team is welcome to consult the list of political party principles developed by IRI, but is not required to do so.

EXISTING MONITORING AND EVALUATION MECHANISMS

Internally, IRI in Sudan measures the extent to which it has achieved its objectives by reporting on several general foreign assistance -indicators designed by USAID ("F-indicators"). The F-indicators measure the outputs of the program, such as the number of political party members attending the trainings. In recent years, the program has begun to develop more mechanisms, such as conducting output and outcome evaluations and identifying custom indicators specific to IRI's program. A full M&E plan will be made available to the evaluation team upon signing of the contract.

EXISTING DATA

Illustrative data collection measures include participant sign-in sheets, open source news, and reports to the donor. These reports come in the form of narrative assessments – quarterly, semi-annual and annual reports – throughout the life of the grant. In addition, the Institute maintains a database of program activities for each activity dating back to the beginning of the program. IRI will share all relevant data with the evaluator prior to the commencement of the evaluation. Finally, it should be noted that the Institute will be conducting two public opinion polls before the end of the year.

RESPONSE FORMAT

To facilitate the evaluation of proposals, bidders are requested to utilize the following proposal format, respond to all associated questions, and address all requirements. Proposals should lay out any assumptions used and provide an explanation if the following criteria cannot be met:

- 1. Executive Summary:** The executive summary should be a brief overview of the proposal that summarizes the main features of the design and the evaluation team.
- 2. Past Performance:** Bidders are requested to include a description of the firm/institution, and outline recent experience on projects of a similar nature. It should also provide information that will facilitate an examination of the team's financial and managerial capacity to provide the services. As a reference, the proposal should also provide previous evaluation work such as final evaluation reports (maximum of two reports) and include three recommendations.
- 3. Personnel Capability and Experience:** Who will be the principal and supporting members of the evaluation team? What are their backgrounds and experiences conducting evaluations in the field of democracy and governance, and particular, of political party development? Have any of the evaluators worked previously in Sudan or in other conflict zones? Please include detailed CVs for each proposed evaluator.

Please note: The evaluation team is required to travel to Juba as part of its assessment of IRI programs and systems in South Sudan.

- 4. Technical Approach – Methodology and Strategy for Analysis of Results:** What is the overall methodology and approach to this Scope of Work, including for each evaluative question? What is the reasoning behind the selected methodology and strategy? How will

data integrity be managed? How will the evaluation team carry out each phase of the evaluation? This description should identify all staff requirements and discuss/justify the contractor's proposed research design, as well as the evaluation team's expectations of IRI at each stage.

- 5. Detailed Budget:** Bidders are requested to submit a detailed budget outlining expected costs for personnel (including daily rates), data collection, and other relevant costs. Travel-associated costs should be excluded from the budget as IRI will provide all travel and logistical arrangements, and will offer lodging in Juba at the secure IRI compound. Medical, emergency extraction and travel accident insurance will be provided by International SOS as part of the contract.

Once an evaluation team is selected, the principal evaluator should be prepared to consult with IRI regarding the final design of the evaluation.

RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

Given the Institute's long history of working on the ground in Sudan, IRI will provide the evaluation team with several critical resources to aid with its work in collecting data for the evaluation.

- *Contact Information:* The Institute, using its participant sign-in sheets and its political party contact lists, can assist the team in contacting subjects to be included in the focus groups and interviews.
- *Office Space:* IRI has a large office space that the team can use for conducting focus groups and interviews.
- *Security Consulting:* The Institute has one, full-time security consultant located at the IRI compound in Juba who can provide the team with advise on security in Juba and throughout South Sudan.
- *Travel, Logistics and Accommodation:* As mentioned above, the Institute will provide all travel and logistical expenses to/from Juba as well as accommodation and meals at IRI's secure compound in Juba. The Institute will also provide travel expenses within the country should the evaluation team travel outside of Juba.

DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team will submit:

- (1) A final evaluation design and detailed timeline for review by IRI prior to beginning fieldwork;
- (2) An oral and written briefing on the status of the evaluation at the midway point;
- (3) A draft report of findings two weeks before the end of the evaluation period;

- (4) All data sets used to complete the evaluation, including interview transcripts and any other data collected by the team, to be submitted with the draft report;
- (5) A final report at the end of the evaluation period; and
- (6) A final presentation to IRI executives and staff on the findings of the evaluation as well as a presentation to the funders (should it be required).

PERIOD OF SCOPE OF WORK

The total duration of this Scope of Work is four months, beginning in mid-August 2011 and ending December 30, 2011.

IRI envisions that the period of performance can be divided into the steps listed below; however, the evaluation team is welcome to propose its own timeline and activities. The evaluation team will:

1. Review IRI resources (the grant agreement, reports, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, etc.);
2. Collect new data through meetings, focus groups, surveys, etc. with local and implementing staff, IRI partners and beneficiaries;
3. Analyze the outcomes of IRI's work based on the evaluative questions as above-mentioned;
4. Analyze the overall impact of IRI's program, including the indirect and cumulative effects of the program and determine its significance on South Sudan;
5. Draft the final evaluation report addressing the following:
 - a. the goals of the evaluation;
 - b. evaluation tools and methodology;
 - c. programming outcomes and impact of the political party development program;
 - d. lessons learned and best practices of IRI's programming in South Sudan from 2004;
 - e. conclusions;
6. Submit the first draft of the report to IRI, and address IRI comments;
7. Submit final report for approval; and
8. Present findings to IRI executives, staff, and funders (if requested).

AEA GUIDING PRINCIPLES

IRI supports the American Evaluation Association's "Guiding Principles for Evaluators" and it expects the evaluation team to abide by them as well.