



SEACOP V – Seaport Cooperation Project, Phase V

Terms of reference to recruit skilled persons for a final evaluation

April 2023

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
1	GENERAL INFORMATION	4
2	BACKGROUND	4
2.1	General context	4
2.2	Project overview	4
3	OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS SOUGHT	6
3.1	Assignment objectives	6
3.1.1	<i>Purpose and objectives of the evaluation</i>	6
3.1.2	<i>Overall objectives and expectations of the assignment</i>	6
3.2	Scope of the evaluation	7
4	CRITERIA AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS	8
5	ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTION	9
5.1	Methodology used	9
5.2	Procedure	10
5.2.1	<i>Development phase</i>	10
5.2.2	<i>Documentation phase</i>	11
5.2.3	<i>Collection phase</i>	11
5.2.4	<i>Feedback phase</i>	11
5.3	Expected deliverables	12
6	STRUCTURE OF WORK	12
6.1	Project evaluation management and governance	12
6.2	Point of contact	13
6.3	Coordination arrangements	13
6.4	Organising field assignments	13
6.5	Schedule	14
7	PROFILE AND TEAM COMPOSITION	14
7.1	Desired profile(s)	14
7.1.1	<i>Expected expertise</i>	14
7.1.2	<i>Anticipated team structure</i>	15
7.2	Content of tenders	15
7.3	Tender assessment methods	15
	ANNEX: THEORY OF CHANGE	16

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DCSD	Directorate of Cooperation of Security and Defence
DGDDI	Direction Générale des Douanes et Droits Indirects (French Customs)
EF	Expertise France
EU	European Union
EUROPOL	European Union Law Enforcement Agency
FIIAPP	Fundación Internacional y para Iberoamérica de Administración y Políticas Públicas
FRONTEX	European Border and Coast Guard Agency
JMCU	Joint Maritime Control Unit
MAOC-(N)	Maritime Analysis and Operation Centre - Narcotics
MIU	Maritime Intelligence Unit
NCA	National Crime Agency
UKBF	United Kingdom Border Forces

1 GENERAL INFORMATION

Title of assignment	Final evaluation for SEACOP - Seaport Cooperation Project - phase V
Beneficiary/beneficiaries	National and local administration through the focal points, Joint Maritime Control Units (JMCU), and Maritime Intelligence Units (MIUs)
Country	Multi-country - West Africa, the Caribbean, and Latin America
Estimated budget or total number of planned days	30 days, 15,000 EUR

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 General context

The trafficking of illicit goods (not only drugs, but also environmental criminality) is an international phenomenon that has a devastating impact on social and economic development as well as on public health. Its development can rely, among others, on the increasing use of maritime routes and containerisation of international trade in the context of globalisation and, therefore, the difficulty faced by the relevant authorities in ports to control a growing volume of goods. Trafficking of illicit goods is orchestrated by transnational criminal groups operating across different continents which are often also involved in other criminal activities (e.g.: kidnapping, money laundering, etc.). Terrorist groups could be drawing large parts of their funding from organised crime activity, including illicit trade. Therefore, the illicit maritime trade is not an isolated phenomenon, it must be understood and addressed taking into account the complex criminal environments and the criminal convergence points in the three targeted regions.

Trafficking across the Atlantic is one the most important illicit flow routes, in particular for drug trafficking, coming from Latin America via the Caribbean and West Africa with Europe as the main final destination. As criminal networks constantly adapt their methods and resources, it is important to target all affected regions at the same time and to anticipate the displacement effects of an efficiently targeted transit area. This is the reason why SEACOP works with authorities in all three regions of Latin America, the Caribbean, and West Africa, in close cooperation with EU agencies fighting transnational crime and ensuring border security. The previous SEACOP phases focused on drug trafficking, more specifically cocaine, while this fifth phase aims to address transnational organised crime and related illicit trade more comprehensively, prioritizing, in line with the EU's Strategy on Drugs 2021-2025, international cooperation among authorities responsible for border security and combatting organized crime focused on profiling and intelligence-sharing.

2.2 Project overview

The Seaport Cooperation Project - phase V (SEACOP V) is a project financed by the European Union (EU) under the Instrument contributing to Peace and Stability and is implemented by Expertise France (EF) in partnership with Fundación Internacional y para Iberoamérica de Administración y Políticas Públicas (FIIAPP).

The project is multi-country (West Africa, the Caribbean, and Latin America), taking place over the course of 30 months (12/05/2021 - 12/10/2023) with a budget of 5,000,000 EUR. The target groups are 29 National and local administration, Joint Maritime Control Units (JMCU), and Maritime Intelligence Units (MIUs). Implementing partners are UKBF, CIVIPOL, DGDDI, DCSD, Policia Judiciaria do Portugal, MAOC-(N), NCA, and FRONTEX.

The overall objective of SEACOP V is to support the fight against illicit maritime trafficking and associated criminal networks consistent with human rights in the targeted countries and regions to alleviate its negative impact on security, public health, and socio-economic development.

In line with this overall objective, SEACOP V precisely aims to:

- Outcome 1: Reinforce the effectiveness of the SEACOP maritime intelligence and maritime/riverine control network geographically and technically
- Outcome 2: Sustainably integrate knowledge and knowhow on maritime threats and interdictions emanating from the transatlantic illicit trafficking routes into national and regional curricula
- Outcome 3: Improve cooperation and information sharing at national, regional, and transregional level, including with EUROPOL and FRONTEX.

To reach these outcomes, five related outputs are sought:

- Output 1.1: Strengthened capacities of existing and new JMCUs and MIUs of the SEACOP network in new areas of knowledge and know-how for fighting maritime and riverine illicit traffic
- Output 2.1: Maritime threat assessment regarding illicit trafficking across the Atlantic elaborated in cooperation with key partners
- Output 2.2: National and regional capabilities of education and training structures developed
- Output 3.1: Opportunities for regional and trans-regional information sharing and collaboration created
- Output 3.2: Opportunities for the implementation of concerted joint transnational maritime operations created

The main activities implemented under the various outputs are illustrated in the table below:

	Activities
Output 1.1	1.1.1 Deliver effective capacity building and methodology support for existing JMCU and MIU 1.1.2 Support the setting up of new or recent JMCU and MIU 1.1.3 Deliver effective capacity building for newly created JMCU and MIU 1.1.4 Set up awareness raising and dedicated trainings in the area of riverine and multi modal trafficking
Output 2.1	2.1.1 Develop a needs assessment for new targeted country 2.1.2 Develop a threat assessment of the illicit trafficking across the Atlantic
Output 2.2	2.2.1 Develop partnerships with training facilities. 2.2.2 Development of a program of training of trainer

Output 3.1	3.1.1 Set up regional events for improved information sharing and collaboration 3.1.2 Set-up transregional events for improved information sharing and collaboration 3.1.3 Promote, ease and support the use of information sharing platforms
Output 3.2	3.2.1 Support participation to joint operations against drug trafficking and criminal networks 3.2.2 Promote collaboration with the Joint Investigation teams

Expertise France operates with a complete and robust Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system which aims for continuous improvement of the quality, regularity, and accuracy of data collection, processing, and analysis. As such, this project uses a 3-tier M&E approach as illustrated below:

- Result-based monitoring: With the Logframe as the basis
- Progress monitoring: For activities
- Budget monitoring: For Expenses, ideally by activity or output

The project's Theory of Change is annexed to this document.

3 OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS SOUGHT

3.1 Assignment objectives

3.1.1 Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

Given the challenge and complexity of the project (substantial budget, multi-country and multi-actor intervention, with a holistic multi-sector approach) and in accordance with recommendations in the project's M&E plan, the project team wishes to carry out an external final evaluation.

This final evaluation is planned to enable the project to determine the relevance and level of achievement of project objectives, development effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. This evaluation also serves the purpose of feeding lessons learned into the decision-making process of the project stakeholders, including donors and implementing partners.

This evaluation is a milestone for the project to ensure its accountability to the donor, the European Union, the implementing agency (Expertise France), the project partner (FIIAPP), and the project beneficiaries, i.e. national and local administration, Joint Maritime Control Units (JMCU), and Maritime Intelligence Units (MIUs) in states where project interventions take place.

3.1.2 Overall objectives and expectations of the assignment

The main objective of this evaluation is to provide, FIIAPP, the agency Expertise France (field and head office teams), and the European Union:

- A comprehensive, independent assessment of the performance of the SEACOP V project, paying particular attention to the results, against the agreed objectives,
- Lessons and recommendations, to improve, where relevant, current and future work.

In particular, the final evaluation seeks out the following expectations:

- An overall analysis of project performance: By answering the evaluation questions, verifying whether the needs remain the same, analyzing the effectiveness of project management, sustainability, potential for impact, and the factors generating or hindering performance (recurring obstacles, etc.).
- Implementation strategy: Confirm and inform the operational strategic choices and explore any necessary changes through developing recommendations.
- Learning: Build upon the work started by the in-house project team and identify good practices and lessons learned to make recommendations to redirect and improve intervention. The evaluator shall be responsible in availing the findings.

The evaluation will focus on how it will be used¹. This approach is based on the principle that an evaluation must be judged according to its usefulness. It will therefore be planned and implemented in such a way as to increase the likelihood that its results will be used, ensuring stakeholder participation and ownership. The evaluator must ensure that they apply the principles of this approach throughout the evaluation process. In particular, recommendations from the evaluation must be tangible and operational. The results should be presented clearly and concisely to have an impact on decision-making. The evaluation will be used primarily to adapt the project to the changing context, identify successes and potential to replicate results, identify reasons for delays, develop recommendations for adaptive management, etc.

As the evaluation embraces a participatory approach, it is geared to cater for two sets of audiences, a primary and a secondary audience. The primary audience consists of the donor and largely the stakeholders/partners considering their direct involvement in the implementation of the project. They include, the national partners (government institutions and civil society), Expertise France (field teams and head office), project partner (FIIAPP), and the donor European Union Trust Fund. The secondary audience is all actors involved or interested in the issue of illicit maritime trafficking and criminal networks in West Africa, the Caribbean, and Latin America. Findings from the evaluation are expected to initiate a butterfly effect, for instance stir up conversations that could lead to changes in policy in maritime trafficking.

The evaluator should provide evidence to explain the analyses, cause, and effect linkages, and attempt to identify any factors that are enhancing or hindering progress. Their work must foster accountability, decision-making, and learning.

3.2 Scope of the evaluation

The scope of the evaluation will include the following:

Period: From the start of the project (12/05/2021 - 31/10/2023)

Components: All components

Country: Multi-country (West Africa, the Caribbean, and Latin America)

Beneficiaries: National and local administration through the focal points, Joint Maritime Control Units (JMCU), and Maritime Intelligence Units (MIUs)

¹ [Utilisation-focused-evaluation.pdf \(intrac.org\)](https://www.intrac.org/publications/evaluation/evaluation-approaches/evaluation-approaches)

4 CRITERIA AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will use the criteria defined by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC): Relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.

The evaluation questions detailed below have been developed in a participatory manner within the project team. They will be reviewed by the evaluator during the evaluation start-up phase, to suggest a final version in the inception report approved by the steering committee.

Evaluation criteria	Specific evaluation questions
Relevance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were the project objectives relevant to the needs expressed by beneficiary states and with the identified problems? 2. Were the project objectives, expected results and activities clearly formulated and consistent with each other? 3. Were the project objectives and approach relevant in relation to the initial capacity and progress of national/regional stakeholders? 4. How has the project been relevant in line with previous phases of it?
Coherence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent in the project compatible with interventions in the target regions 2. How has the project dealt with the findings of the previous evaluation of phase III-IV? 3. To what extent do the activities undertaken enable the donor to achieve the objectives of its development policy?
Effectiveness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent have results been achieved: for each output and outcome indicator at a national/regional level? 2. How was the vertical and horizontal logic of the logframe compared to reality? 3. Is there a transfer of capacity between JMCU & MIUs following support given by the project?
Efficiency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the way that the project is managed (human resources, division of roles and responsibilities, organisation chart, interactions, budget availability linked to strategic choices) optimal to achieve results? 2. Have there been delays during the implementation time and how have these been mitigated (if at all)?
Sustainability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What indications (strong or weak) are there that practices and behaviors of actors within beneficiary (particularly JMCUs and MIUs) states are changing? 2. Will the support provided by the project have a lasting positive impact? 3. What sustainability measures have been put in place to ensure the benefits of the project will have a long-lasting impact?
Impact	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the project's contribution to achieving the overall objective? 2. What are the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects brought about by the project either directly or indirectly, and either expected or unexpected?

The consultant is expected to provide a value judgment on each of the evaluation questions raised by going through the criteria. As part of this analysis, the consultant will ensure that the judgments made for each of the six evaluation criteria make it possible to cover all of the key stages of the project cycle.

The consultant should also verify whether the following cross-cutting issues: promoting human rights and gender equality were considered when documents were identified/developed and to what degree they were present in the implementation and supervision of the work.

To expound more on gender, integrating a consolidated gender approach will guide all stages of the evaluation process: methodological approach (sampling, evaluation questions), data collection (always disaggregated by sex and age as far as possible), analysis of data (always disaggregated by sex and age as far as possible, integration of gender dynamics in contextual analyses), recommendations taking into account gender-related experiences, etc.

5 ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTION

The following section lays out the anticipated methodology.

5.1 Methodology used

A consultant or team of consultants working remotely for 30 days² is expected to conduct the final evaluation utilising a mixed method approach consisting of both qualitative and quantitative primary and secondary data collections. The evaluation should triangulate data from multiple sources and stakeholders to infer reliable findings.

Furthermore, the consultant is expected to employ a participatory approach when conducting the evaluation. This implies that they are expected to engage the stakeholders in each step of the evaluation as well as take gender into account in sample selection, analysis, and reporting.

The consultant is expected to undertake the following tasks (tentative below):

- Participate in a Kick-off meeting: The purpose of the meeting is to come to a clear and shared understanding of the evaluation. The identified limitations will be discussed, and mitigation measures will be set out.
- Create an evaluation plan and present it to the project team for approval
- An initial desk review will be conducted with the documents and data shared initially. Initial interviews will be conducted if necessary.
- Based on the information collected, an inception report will be drafted and submitted to Expertise France for validation.
- Collecting and analysing information (interviews, focus groups, case studies, field visits, online surveys, etc.)

² Cumulative, if a team is proposed.

- An on-the-spot feedback meeting held by the evaluator to present the preliminary results following the collection phase
- Creation of a draft report with preliminary results
- Producing the final evaluation report (including a summary)

The tasks illustrated above are discussed in great length in the subsequent sub-sections.

5.2 Procedure

The consultant is asked to closely link with Expertise France, FIIAPP and the evaluation steering committee when setting out their reasoning, and regularly throughout the assignment, from the point of developing the scoping outline up to the meeting to present the draft report. In particular, observations and initial areas of analysis must be shared at the end of the assignment, before the draft report is written.

5.2.1 Development phase

The in-house M&E expert shall be the point of contact between the evaluator(s) and the project team, and will be at their disposal during the preparatory phase.

During this preparatory phase, the consultant(s) must:

- Gather and consult all the information and documents relating to the project that need to be evaluated (project outline, implementation, and monitoring documents inclusive of key reports) and that contribute to understanding the project context. Documents to consult will be available from the following places: the project team, the M&E Expert etc.
- Identify all project stakeholders.
- Reconstruct the project intervention logic by reviewing the project's logical framework to (i) clarify the intervention objectives and translate them into a hierarchy of expected changes and (ii) help to assess the internal coherence of the intervention and (iii) identify the initial hypotheses (or assumptions, which are often implicit) that guided the project being developed, and retrospectively assess their legitimacy.
- Develop the framework of the evaluation in more depth based on the terms of reference, the documents collected, and the reconstructed intervention logic. Specifically, this will involve: (i) outlining the key questions for the evaluation to focus on; (ii) outlining the stages of reasoning that will make it possible to answer the questions (judgment criteria); (iii) specifying the indicators to be used to answer the questions and the corresponding sources of information (documentation, interviews, focus groups, surveys, etc.).

Based on this methodology, the consultant(s) will suggest an overarching evaluation framework document (no more than 10 pages) once they have begun the assignment. The evaluation framework will be discussed with the steering committee and the consultant to guide discussions about how they plan to structure the evaluation process and to check how feasible it is.

If changes are made to the intervention logic, any objectives redefined by the evaluator must be shared with Project Manager and the project team.

This preparatory phase is key and will serve to sign off the methodology proposed by the consultants. Key stakeholders that the consultant shall meet with shall be from the donor (the EU), and the implementing partner and partner agencies.

5.2.2 Documentation phase

The consultant will first put together a precise and analytical overview of the project, in the form of a descriptive project analysis, which must be shared with Expertise France before they begin the assignment. This document must include in particular:

- A brief overview of the context and how it has developed
- A description of the project (objectives, content, contributors, way of working, etc.).
- An analytical summary of the project's progress from the point of conception up to the date of the evaluation, which highlights key points in its development and presents the allocation and level of funding mobilized, outlining any key difficulties encountered and any changes that have occurred.

This presentation to be included in the final report should not exceed 5 to 8 pages. Additional information may be included in the annex.

5.2.3 Collection phase

Primary data collection is planned for September 2023 but expected to be completely remote, unless the evaluator(s) live in one of the target countries. This collection process will be carried out remotely by an evaluator(s). It will include:

- The use of qualitative and quantitative collection methods set out by the evaluator with all project stakeholders, based on a sample suggested by the evaluator.
- Surveys
- Focus Group Discussions
- Interviews
- Document review
- A remote workshop with project stakeholders
- An on-the-spot feedback meeting held by the evaluator to present the preliminary results following the collection phase.

5.2.4 Feedback phase

Findings from the evaluation shall be presented to project stakeholders (project partners, donors, and implementation team) in planned feedback workshops (virtual). Once the consultant has presented their observations, they then put together their findings and appraisal of the project in relation to each evaluation criterion and/or evaluation questions and present their general conclusions to provide an overall assessment of the evaluated project. The conclusions must be ranked in order of importance and order of reliability.

The consultant will identify strategic and/or operational lessons and/or recommendations. These should be linked to the findings, grouped, and prioritized.

Recommendations should also be made where gender issues have arisen during project delivery, particularly if the project has a negative impact on gender equality.

5.3 Expected deliverables

The deliverables must be submitted by email in Word format to the recipients who will be indicated to the evaluation team during the start-up phase. They must be written in English. The final report summary should be translated into French and Spanish.

Deliverables	# pages max.	Estimated Delivery date
1. Scoping outline: Inception report	10	4/8/2023
2. Documentation outline inclusive of annexes: interview guides, data analysis plan, questionnaires, etc.	10	25/8/2023
3. 1st Draft evaluation report	30	29/9/2023
4. Presentation to the project team	PPT	Beginning of October 2023
5. Final report including a summary of approx. 4 pages	40	17/10/2023
6. A summary in the format requested by EF	4	31/10/2023

In addition, a slideshow-type presentation must be produced for each steering meeting.

The final draft report, which should not exceed 40 pages excluding annexes, will be produced at the end of the consultant's work as well as an overview presentation in PowerPoint (to be kept only if useful). Expertise France will provide comments and observations to the consultant within three weeks of receipt of the draft report. It may be forwarded to (specify who depending on the project being evaluated) who may also provide comments.

The final report, incorporating these observations, must be provided within 15 days of receipt of the comments. If these observations differ in their assessment from those of the consultants, the consultants can add them to the final report and provide comments.

6 STRUCTURE OF WORK

6.1 Project evaluation management and governance

The evaluation is managed by the Expertise France Project Director and FIIAPP, with support from a steering committee comprised of the M&E Expert and EF's and FIIAPP's Project Managers.

The key roles of evaluation steering committee members are:

- To facilitate contact between the evaluation team, EU services, and external stakeholders.

- Ensure that the evaluation team has access to all sources of information and documentation related to the work being evaluated and that they consult them.
- Identify and set out the evaluation questions.
- Discuss and comment on reports produced by the evaluation team. Feedback from each member of the reference group is collated by the Project Team Leader and then forwarded to the evaluation team.
- To support the feedback process from results, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned from the evaluation.
- To ensure effective follow-up of the action plan based on the recommendations produced once the evaluation is completed.

6.2 Point of contact

As mentioned in previous sections, the in-house M&E expert for this project shall serve as the point of contact.

The key roles for the point of contact are:

- Organise the evaluation kick-off meeting with the evaluation team
- Prepare and make available to the evaluation team the relevant corpus for the initial literature review
- Facilitate and monitor the planning of the scoping interviews
- Review and suggest improvements to the scoping note proposed by the evaluation team, in particular to the collection protocols proposed in the annex (interview guides, observation grids, etc.)
- Organise meeting #2 of the evaluation steering group to finalise the scoping note
- Approve the substance of the final version of the scoping note
- Facilitate and monitor the collection of field data
- Organise an interim meeting #3 with the steering group to discuss the interim report
- Review and propose improvements to the draft final report
- Organise meeting #4 of the steering group to co-construct the conclusions and recommendations
- Approve the final evaluation report
- Formalise a dissemination plan
- Disseminate the final report to the steering group
- Approve and disseminate the evaluation summary
- Organise a follow-up meeting on the recommendations
- Draft the follow-up document on the recommendations
- Implement the selected recommendations
- Capitalise on the results of the evaluation

6.3 Coordination arrangements

The consultant must work closely with the in-house M&E expert to put together their reasoning, through regular contact throughout the assignment, from the scoping outline to the meeting to present the draft report. In particular, observations and initial areas of analysis must be shared at the end of the assignment, before the draft report is written.

As this assignment is expected to be conducted remotely, regular contact shall be kept through email exchanges and possibly via online forums coordinated via Zoom or similar platforms.

6.4 Organising field assignments

The evaluator shall be expected to work closely with the Project Director and point of contact. They shall provide comprehensive beneficiary lists and or similar material to the evaluator. It is expected that the project director shall communicate with the beneficiaries to make them aware of the final evaluation to ensure better cooperation. The evaluator is expected to organize the interviews and conduct the survey.

Organising online workshops/feedback sessions to facilitate exchanges shall be the responsibility of the point of contact.

The working languages for this assignment shall be English and French or Spanish.

6.5 Schedule

The total assignment is estimated at 30 person days, between June and October 2023 as detailed below for information:

Activities	Location	Period
1. Development phase	Remotely	3
2. Documentation phase	Remotely	5
3. Data collection	Remotely	15
4. Source analysis and checks	Remotely	4
5. Feedback	Remotely	3

The evaluator must include a detailed workplan in their bid, including the days to be working per activity as well as the indicative dates and locations. This workplan will be discussed and approved during the inception meeting.

7 PROFILE AND TEAM COMPOSITION

7.1 Desired profile(s)

7.1.1 Expected expertise

- 1) **Number of experts per assignment: 1+**
- 2) **Profile of appointed expert(s) to undertake the contract:**

Qualifications and experience

- Excellent understanding of the EU's M&E approach
- Post-graduate in a field relevant to the assignment: in social sciences/international cooperation/security/political sciences or equivalent experience.

- Professional experience in the fields of expertise in conducting development project evaluations for at least 8 years
- Multi-stakeholder coordination experience
- Demonstrated experience in conducting remote evaluations
- Good knowledge of specific contexts of project intervention countries

Technical skills:

- Good knowledge of M&E systems for development programs and projects
- Experience and knowledge of field-based M&E
- Development of evaluation systems
- Knowledge sharing and design of learning materials

Administrative skills:

- Excellent command of Microsoft Office tools (MS Office: Word, Excel, PowerPoint, and LibreOffice equivalents) and the Internet
- Experience using video conferencing platforms such as Zoom or Google meet
- Excellent communication and organizational skills

Language skills:

- Excellent command of written and spoken English (good writing, synthesis, and analysis skills, etc.).
- Requirement of excellent spoken and written command of either Spanish or French

7.1.2 Anticipated team structure

The task is to be conducted by one individual consultant or a team of consultants.

7.2 Content of tenders

Tenders should include:

- **Technical outline:** Demonstrate an understanding of and comment on the terms of reference, methodology, CV, and similar experience, and include the components mentioned in the terms of reference (detailed workplan)

Financial outline: overall budget for the evaluation, including the following: daily rate; and proposed terms of payment.

7.3 Tender assessment methods

Expertise France will select the bid with the best score based on the following table:

Criteria	Maximum score
1. TECHNICAL OUTLINE SCORE, INCLUDING:	80
1.1. Methodology score	80
» Demonstrated understanding of the ToR and the objectives of the services to be provided	20
» Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, the relevance of the proposed tools, and analysis of the difficulties and challenges encountered	30
» Structure of tasks and schedule	10
» CV of the evaluator(s)	20
2. FINANCIAL OUTLINE SCORE	20
Total score	100

ANNEX: THEORY OF CHANGE

