

## Terms of reference

### Final External Evaluation

Sport 4 Resilience (S4R): Building resilience of children and young people through sport in Kosovo, Northern Macedonia and Montenegro.

MAIN DONOR	AFD (French Development Agency)
DURATION OF THE PROJECT	3 years, from 1 <sup>er</sup> April 2023 to 31 March 2026
LIEU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Kosovo</b> : cities of Mitrovica/Kosovska Mitrovica, Lipjan/Lipljan, Ferizaj/Uroševac, Obiliq/ Obilić, Fushë Kosova/Kosovo Polje, Peja/Peć, Prizren, Shtime/Štimlje et Prishtina/Priština.</li> <li>- <b>Macédoine du Nord</b> : cities of Skopje, Tetovo, Kumanovo et Shtip.</li> <li>- <b>Monténégro</b> : cities of Rožaje, Podgorica, Nikšić, Kolašin, Budva, Cetinje and Ulcinj.</li> </ul>
PARTNERS (IF APPLICABLE)	Montenegro: Regional Sport Initiative - Playing Together (REGSPO) North Macedonia: Together Advancing Common Trust (TAKT)
MAIN OBJECTIVE OF THE PROJECT	To contribute to the development of civic-minded, tolerant and resilient young people in the face of societal challenges in Kosovo, Northern Macedonia and Montenegro.
EVALUATION OBJECTIVES	<p>General objective :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To provide an external opinion on the relevance and performance of the project, with reference to the project description and a focus on results.</li> <li>- To highlight the main lessons learned from the project, good practices and recommendations, in order to feed into PLAY's current and future programs, in the same sectoral areas and using similar approaches to achieve their objectives.</li> <li>- To participate in the elaboration of a second phase of the project</li> </ul>
SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	<p>The external evaluator will assess the project against the following criteria, as defined by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC): relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Cross-cutting issues such as gender, the environment, transparency and the "do no harm" principle will also be included in the analysis.</p> <p>The methodology for data collection is to be determined by the consultant and validated by PLAY. However, the consultant is expected to carry out field missions to obtain the necessary qualitative and quantitative data to provide evidence of the impact of PLAY's response on members of the communities targeted by the project. The evaluation will be conducted primarily through secondary data analysis, focus groups, direct observation and key informant interviews. These interviews should include a wide range of project stakeholders, including beneficiaries.</p>
EVALUATION DATES	October – December 2025 (adaptable, to be confirmed with the evaluator)

TENDER REFERENCE	S4R/EFE001
DEADLINE FOR SENDING APPLICATION	16/05/2024

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAY .....	3
PROJECT CONTEXT.....	3
PROJECT CONTEXT AND RATIONALE .....	3
PROJECT ACTIVITIES .....	3
MAIN STAKEHOLDERS IN THE PROJECT.....	4
SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION .....	5
RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND CRITERIA .....	5
1/ RELEVANCE .....	6
2/ COHERENCE .....	6
3/ EFFICIENCY .....	6
4/ EFFECTIVENESS .....	7
5/ IMPACT.....	7
6/ SUSTAINABILITY .....	8
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY .....	8
PLANNING.....	9
DELIVERABLES .....	10
INCEPTION REPORT .....	10
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT.....	10
FEEDBACK ON DELIVERABLES.....	12
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA.....	12
APPLICATION PROCEDURE .....	13
RATING OF THE APPLICATION .....	13
CONTACT .....	14
APPENDIX .....	14

## PLAY

---

PLAY is a non-governmental organization founded in 1999 and based in Paris. Independent, private and not-for-profit, PLAY operates with strict political and religious impartiality, in accordance with the principles of non-discrimination and transparency. PLAY believes that sport is a source of solutions to the challenges facing our society. PLAY's mission is to design and implement inclusive educational projects for children and young people in vulnerable situations, using sport as a teaching tool.

## PROJECT CONTEXT

---

### PROJECT CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

Sport 4 Resilience is a multi-country project that aims to contribute to the development of civic-minded, tolerant young people who are resilient in the face of societal challenges in Kosovo, Northern Macedonia and Montenegro.

The three-year project to build the resilience of children and young people through sport - which began on 1 April 2023 - is an extension of an initial project co-funded by AFD to support active and inclusive education for all children through active pedagogy (EJO), which was carried out in Kosovo, Burundi, Senegal and Liberia from 2019 to 2022. PLAY International capitalized on the successful, high-impact elements of this project to spread its good practice to other territories with more similar problems: Montenegro and Northern Macedonia, as well as Kosovo. Aimed at strengthening the youth of the Western Balkans with a view to creating more inclusive societies that are more resilient in the face of the societal risks that affect them, S4R uses sports games as a tool for education and awareness-raising to address issues identified as common to all three countries: the inclusion of ethnic minorities and the lack of economic opportunities and civic engagement. Drawing on a varied ecosystem and innovative, adapted teaching approaches, the project focuses on formal education, and aims to strengthen children's psychosocial skills and their resilience in the face of discrimination based on gender and minority status, while supporting national educational priorities. In addition, in informal education, the project focuses more on civil society and young people in order to strengthen their resilience in the face of the risks of radicalization and discrimination.

### PROJECT ACTIVITIES

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1:** Strengthen children's life skills and resilience to gender and minority status discrimination in formal education.

**SO1 Outcome 1:** A set of educational contents on inclusion and cooperation in the face of discrimination and violence is co-created/adapted.

Main activities planned : Diagnostic study carried out on the factors favouring discrimination based on gender or minority status in the school sector, identify the priority messages that need to be conveyed to tomorrow's generation in order to reduce and, in the long term, end such discrimination; co-creation of sports teaching materials follow PLAY International's own methodology, field testing/validation sessions will then be implemented for each content developed with the target audiences of children/adolescents.

**SO1 Outcome 2:** The quality of educational provision by teachers to children is strengthened.

Main activities planned: Training of trainers for partner CSO teams on the educational content created on gender and ethnic discrimination; training teachers in active teaching methods, to equip them to run sports sessions that develop the psychosocial skills of the children they work with - production of a training manual and sports kits; deployment of educational sports activities for children by trained teachers.

**SO1 Outcome 3:** Partnerships are established with institutions to integrate PLAY International's active methodologies into the initial training of teachers and children.

Main activities planned: Accreditation of educational content by MESTI in Kosovo and continued advocacy with Ministries of Education in the three countries; Advocacy with several universities to include PLAY's active pedagogy methods in the curriculum (undergraduate program) for student teachers; Training of university teachers (and/or assistant teachers) in PLAY methodology; Academic training of student teachers by professors and assistant professors with PLAY support and guidance.

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 2:** To strengthen the resilience of young people (15-24 years old) to the risks of radicalisation and discrimination in the Western Balkans region.

**SO2 Outcome 1:** A set of resilience-building educational content for young people is created.

Main activities planned: Diagnostic study to identify psychosocial competencies that promote resilience of Western Balkan youth to the risks of radicalisation and discrimination; Co-creation of educational materials - production of a training manual, a training plan and finally the translation of the content into the different languages that will be needed for the implementation of the project.

**SO2 Outcome 2:** Local CSOs are strengthened and structured to enable them to mobilize and strengthen youth and the communities in which they operate.

Main activities planned: Training of trainers for partner CSOs (TAKT and REGSPO) on pedagogical content to address the risks of radicalisation and discrimination in the Western Balkans region, training of beneficiary CSO members in PLAY pedagogical tools (social sports games) on pre-identified psychosocial skills; networking of trained CSO/youth at regional level to share good practice.

**SO2 Outcome 3:** Young people in the Western Balkans region are sensitised to issues promoting common values and social cohesion and able to carry out collaborative projects promoting these values.

Main activities planned: Deployment of youths' activities by trained local CSO members with young people aged 15-24 to strengthen their tolerant and anti-discriminatory attitudes; identification of young volunteers from the Western Balkans to create and implement a collaborative project; organisation of workshops by PLAY and partners to support youth groups in the construction of their collective project and implementation of projects.

## MAIN STAKEHOLDERS IN THE PROJECT

---

- Operational partners: TAKT and REGSPO
- Participating CSOs: 75 members from 20 local CSOs (6-7 CSOs per country).
- The Ministries of Education and Sport of the three countries involved in the project;
- The target schools and universities and their teachers, professors and directors;

- Children, young adults and their families as well as student teachers as indirect beneficiaries of the project.

## SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

---

The main purpose of this evaluation is to provide PLAY and the donor with an assessment of the project in terms of its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and achievement of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will also draw on the internal feedback gathered by PLAY and the final evaluation report from a first project implemented in Kosovo (2019-2023) in order to assess whether these lessons have been taken into account and applied, and to evaluate the DAC criteria in the light of the developments implemented during this project. The evaluation should provide evidence-based, tangible and useful information, allowing lessons learned to be incorporated into PLAY's and the donor's future decision-making process regarding a phase 2 of the S4R project.

Given the nature of the S4R project, youth issues will be a key consideration in the evaluation, which will assess the efforts made to mobilise children and young people in and out of school by promoting tolerance, critical thinking and social cohesion.

In addition, the evaluation will need to incorporate a gender perspective into its system of analysis, and thus endeavour to disaggregate data and indicators by sex where relevant, and to take account of the results produced by S4R in terms of gender equality.

Similarly, it is expected that the assessment will also analyse the impact of S4R on the environment.

The specific aim of the assessment will be to:

1. To measure the extent to which the initial objectives have been achieved.
2. To highlight the main lessons learned from the project and recommendations, to feed into the good practice of current and future PLAY programs in the same sectoral areas that use similar approaches to achieve their objectives.
3. To highlight recommendations for the development of the second phase of the project.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND CRITERIA

---

The evaluation should use the following DAC criteria and corresponding Evaluation Questions. The consultant may review and revise the evaluation questions (but not the criteria), in consultation with PLAY teams (HQ and country), as part of the inception phase of the evaluation, and as required.

## 1/ RELEVANCE<sup>1</sup>

The extent to which the objectives and design of the intervention meet the needs, policies and priorities of the beneficiaries, the world, the countries and the partner/institution<sup>2</sup>, and continue to do so if circumstances change.

Note: Evaluating relevance involves examining the differences and trade-offs between different priorities or needs. It involves analyzing any changes in context to assess the extent to which the intervention can be (or has been) adapted to remain relevant.

The following questions must be answered:

- 1.1 Does the continuation of the actions make it possible to meet the needs of direct and indirect beneficiaries?
- 1.2 Were the project methodologies and activities relevant to achieving the project objectives?
- 1.3 Were the indicators well defined and relevant for measuring the achievement of the project's results and objectives?
- 1.4 Were the target values for the indicators realistic?

## 2/ COHERENCE

The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, a sector or an institution.

Note: The extent to which other interventions (particularly policies) support or undermine the intervention, and vice versa. Internal coherence refers to the synergies and linkages between the intervention and other PLAY-led interventions, as well as the coherence of the intervention with relevant international norms and standards to which PLAY adheres. External coherence considers the coherence of the intervention with the interventions of other actors in the same context. This includes complementarity, harmonization and coordination with other actors, as well as the extent to which the intervention adds value while avoiding duplication of effort.

The following questions need to be answered:

- 3.1 Is there complementarity, harmonization and coordination between this project and other similar projects run by other players in the same field (including to avoid duplication of aid)?
- 3.2 Were there any synergies and interconnections between this project and other PLAY projects in the same thematic area?

## 3/ EFFICIENCY

The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in a cost-effective and timely manner.

Note: "Cost-effective" refers to the conversion of inputs (funds, expertise, natural resources, time, etc.) into outputs, outcomes and impacts, in the most cost-effective manner possible, relative to alternatives available in the context. "Timely" delivery is within the planned timeframe, or a timeframe reasonably adapted to the demands of the evolving context. This may include assessment of operational effectiveness (the quality of management of the intervention).

The following questions must be answered:

---

<sup>1</sup> All the definitions of the criteria are taken from the document entitled "Better criteria for better evaluation", published by the DAC Network on Development Evaluation in December 2019.

<sup>2</sup> Includes the government (national, regional, local), civil society organisations, private entities and international bodies involved in financing, implementing and/or supervising the intervention.

- 4.1 Was the project carried out efficiently (in terms of human, financial and all other resources) in terms of results?
- 4.2 Were the beneficiaries sufficiently involved in implementing the project? Did the project leaders receive feedback from the beneficiaries? How was this feedback taken into account to improve the implementation of the project?

The consultant will analyze the efficiency of the project management arrangements and duly justify any problems encountered. All factual elements relating to the quality and quantity of inputs should be provided, and any delays should be measured, comparing dates with the last programming update. Any major deviations and delays in the project must be analyzed. Conclusions on the cost-effectiveness of the outputs should be presented.

#### 4/ EFFECTIVENESS

The extent to which the intervention has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and outcomes, including any differential outcomes between groups.

The following questions must be answered:

- 4.1 Is the quality of the results obtained satisfactory, as initially planned?
- 4.2 Did the achievement of the results lead to the achievement of the project's specific objective? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the initial objective? If there is a gap between the effects of the activities and the project objective, how can this be explained?
- 4.3 What, if any, were the project's innovative and effective approaches that might be relevant to other players operating in the same sector as the project and in the country concerned?

The consultant should focus on the achievement of results in the short and medium term (and not on activities); he/she is required to explain all the causes of variances and their implications. The level of achievement of results should be assessed using indicators covering the specific objective (result) and providing a transparent chain of argument.

#### 5/ IMPACT

The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative effects, intended or unintended, at a higher level.

Note: impact concerns the final significance and potentially transformative effects of the intervention. It seeks to identify the social, environmental and economic effects of the intervention that are longer term or broader in scope than those already taken into account by the effectiveness criterion. Beyond the immediate results, this criterion seeks to capture the indirect, secondary and potential consequences of the intervention. It does this by looking at holistic and sustainable changes in systems or norms, as well as potential effects on human well-being, human rights, gender equality and the environment.

The following questions must be answered:

- 5.1 What evidence is there that the project has contributed to achieving its overall objective?
- 5.2 What, if any, were the unexpected effects of the project, both positive and negative? Was the project able to monitor, mitigate and respond to any unexpected negative effects?
- 5.3 Are the apparent effects attributable to the project?

## 6/ SUSTAINABILITY

The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

Note: Includes a review of the financial, economic, social, environmental and institutional capacity of the systems required to maintain the net benefits over time. Includes analyses of resilience, risks and potential trade-offs. Depending on the timing of the assessment, this may involve analysing the actual flow of net benefits or estimating the likelihood of net benefits continuing over the medium to long term.

The following questions must be answered:

- 6.1 What evidence is there that the interventions and/or results of the project will be sustained after the project ends? What could be improved or changed to further the sustainability of the approach?
- 6.2 What are the possibilities for continuing the results of the project with a view to a second phase?
- 6.3 What are the factors for the sustainability of the project already in place or recommended?

Human, organizational (including policies and institutions) and financial factors, as well as environmental and gender sustainability, are the key drivers of sustainability.

## EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

---

PLAY recommends taking into account the following mixed methodologies in order to collect relevant data. However, the consultant is expected to determine the final methodological approach to be presented and validated during the start-up phase of the consultancy. Final approval will be given by the PLAY focal point.

The evaluation will be based on the findings and factual elements identified during the review of relevant documents, including the interim project report in French produced as part of the project and the quantitative and qualitative data collected by the teams throughout the project using the KoBo tool. PLAY will provide the external expert with all the project documentation available at the start of the consultancy. The specific context of the project must also be taken into account.

The consultant will be expected to undertake field visits as well as interviews with stakeholders, including target beneficiaries, government authorities, partners, etc. The participation of stakeholders in the evaluation should be full and continuous, in order to reflect the views, expectations and vision that these stakeholders have on the contribution of the project to its objectives. Stakeholder participation in the evaluation should be full and continuous, reflecting the views, expectations and vision that stakeholders have of the project's contribution to the achievement of its objectives. In particular, it will be necessary to organize at least one mission per country and to visit and interview the following people:

- PLAY International teams ;
- Partner teams: TAKT and REGSPO
- Institutional partners from each country: Ministry of Education and Sport; Municipal representatives (Sport and Education departments)
- The direct and indirect beneficiaries of the project.



To ensure good communication with all stakeholders, it is the consultant responsibility to plan the hiring of interpreters/translators when necessary.

The methodology must take into account the safety of participants throughout the evaluation (including recruitment and training of survey staff, data collection, analysis and report writing). Finally, the methodology must meet quality standards.

The methodology described above is indicative; the consultant is expected to provide a detailed methodology and work plan. He/she will also be free to collect additional data in order to answer all the research questions listed above.

## PLANNING

Date	Actions
<b>Appel d'Offre</b>	
12/04/2024	Publication of the terms of reference
16/05/2024	Deadline for sending application
31/05/2024	Date of the selection (maximum deadline)
01/07/2024	Signing of the contract (maximum deadline)

The evaluation is expected to take place from October to December 2025 and the final evaluation report should be completed and validated by PLAY by 15/01/2026. Applicants must provide an evaluation work plan detailing the number of working days required per activity (see table below).

Assessment activities	Suggested programme
Review of project activities, implementation policies and reporting mechanisms, based on available documents	To be completed by the consultants
Development of the Inception Report, which describes the methodology for data collection and analysis.	To be completed by the consultants
Data collection	To be completed by the consultants
Analysis of project performance based on DAC criteria and corresponding research questions, as listed above	To be completed by the consultants
Drawing up the Final Evaluation Report	To be completed by the consultants
Finalization of the Final Evaluation Report, taking into account comments from PLAY and the donor (AFD) on the quality and accuracy of the report.	10 days

The consultant is expected to schedule regular meetings with the PLAY focal point for the evaluation, in order to keep him/her informed of developments in the evaluation schedule. This may be done by telephone or in person.

## DELIVERABLES

---

The following deliverables must be given to the PLAY representative, who will then share them with the teams and partners concerned for comment.

All deliverables must be available in digital format, compatible with Word/Windows and in English.

Deliverables	Deadline
Start-up Report	Due by 01/10/2025
First draft of the Final Evaluation Report	Due by 31/12/2025
Final version of the Final Evaluation Report (translated in Albanian, Macedonian & Montenegrin)	Due by 15/01/2026

For all deliverables, the expert is expected to highlight factual elements, based on evidence, and to comment on any discrepancies.

### INCEPTION REPORT

The Inception Report must include the following elements:

- A detailed description of the methodology to be used for the assessment
  - o Data collection method
  - o Data collection tools
  - o Sampling
  - o Quality control approach
- Data analysis methods
- Justification for revising the Assessment Questions (if applicable)
- Detailed work plan
- Analysis of anticipated limits and mitigation measures

### FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

The consultant will produce a Final Evaluation Report, including the following elements:

<b>Executive summary</b>	It should be concisely written and reusable as a stand-alone document. It should be short, no more than five pages. It should focus on the main analytical points, indicating general conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations.
<b>Project summary</b>	The project summary serves as an introduction and provides information on the context of the project. It therefore contains a short passage on the project's objectives and the local issues and needs to which the project will have to respond, a description of the groups of targeted beneficiaries and a summary of the intervention logic. This part will also include the indicators corresponding to the three levels of the intervention logic: overall objective/impact, specific objectives/results, activities. The project summary does not contain any assessments or comments on the issues involved in implementing the project.

<b>Methodology</b>	The methodology section should detail the tools used in the evaluation: locations, sample sizes, tools used, dates, team structure, limitations encountered and other relevant details.
<b>Results</b>	<p>The Results section should present the results of the evaluation objectively and without personal judgement in order to provide an accurate representation of the project.</p> <p>The results should also include an explanation of the extent to which the selected CAD criteria have been met.</p> <p>The consultant will have to highlight the most relevant results linked to the project's performance and detail them while pointing out the project's sensitive points and/or shortcomings. The results must be precise, concise and direct. They must be based on and consistent with the Evaluation Questions.</p> <p>The consultant is expected to provide a self-contained explanation of his or her assessment that can be understood by anyone who is not familiar with the project, while at the same time providing useful information to stakeholders. The consultant must avoid the following pitfalls: results not based on evidence, lack of technical content (e.g. experts providing an analysis that does not take account of the general state of knowledge in a given sector or subject).</p>
<b>Conclusions, Lessons Learned, Best Practices and Recommendations</b>	<p>These elements should be presented in a separate final chapter. Where possible and relevant, for each major finding there should be a corresponding recommendation. The consultant should present the main conclusions and recommendations based on the answers to the Evaluation Questions summarized in the Results section.</p> <p>The recommendations should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible and written in such a way that the stakeholders involved are clearly identified. The recommendations flow from the conclusions and address the major issues relating to the project's performance. They must take account of the applicable rules and other constraints, linked for example to the context in which the project is being implemented. They should not be written in general terms, but should be clear proposals for solutions tailored to the project. These recommendations should focus on the most important issues and not on minor and less relevant aspects of the project.</p> <p>Through the findings, lessons learned, good practices and recommendations, the evaluation will generate knowledge and contribute to transparency for beneficiaries, the donor and PLAY. This evaluation will provide information on the processes or activities that PLAY has implemented, in order to enrich the knowledge and lessons learned to improve current and future performance in prevision of a second phase of the project.</p>
<b>Annexs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Terms of reference for the evaluation</li> <li>- Assessment tools used (questionnaires, checklists, scoring grids, etc.)</li> <li>- List of people (job titles only, no full names) and organizations consulted</li> <li>- List of literature and documentation consulted</li> </ul>

In addition to the Final Evaluation Report, all statistical analyses and other relevant information, graphs, etc. must be provided to PLAY by the evaluator.

A single project-wide report must be produced, in which the results specific to the respective country are clearly identified.

## FEEDBACK ON DELIVERABLES

Please note that Inception Reports and Final Evaluation Reports are subject to validation by PLAY and AFD before finalization and payment of fees.

Following submission of the first draft of the Inception/Final Evaluation Report by the consultant, PLAY and AFD will provide comments and highlight any factual errors within 10 working days of receipt.

For the drafting of the Final Evaluation Report, the consultants are informed that PLAY will express its opinion on the quality of the evaluation report and each of its components. This opinion must be taken into account by the consultant. For each recommendation, PLAY will also indicate to what extent (Yes, Partially, No) the organization agrees with the recommendations proposed by the consultant, and will report accurately on the views of the stakeholders consulted.

Any comments must be taken into account by the consultant before the two reports can be considered finalized. The consultant shall take note of the comments and judge whether the report needs to be modified or not and, if so, explain briefly the reasons why the comments cannot be taken into account. The consultant shall submit a revised version of the report to PLAY within ten days of receipt of the comments from PLAY and AFD. The revised version should clearly highlight any changes made.

## ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

---

The consultant is expected to have the following qualifications and skills:

- Master's degree in development or studies in a similar field.
- Experience in monitoring and evaluation, particularly in terms of education and/or sport and development projects.
- Knowledge and/or experience in the design and implementation of similar M&E activities in unstable contexts is required.
- A good knowledge of the context of the target countries is appreciated.
- Solid analytical skills and the ability to synthesize and present results clearly.
- An excellent level of written and spoken French and English is essential (Albanian or other languages of the target countries would be appreciated)
- Good knowledge of the educational context in the target countries is an advantage.

The consultant shall identify a focal point for communications and reporting purposes, with appropriate knowledge and experience, for the duration of the evaluation. At the inception session, the focal point should submit a comprehensive contact list including all persons involved in the evaluation.

## APPLICATION PROCEDURE

---

The managing consultant is asked to include the following in his/her application:

- CVs of staff deployed (including field team)
- Organization chart of the team structure
- Extracts from previous work (max. 10-20 pages) on at least two different projects; description of similar past experience, including a description of the evaluation criteria, the projects, the areas of intervention and the total budgets.
- The Technical Proposal including a detailed methodology and work plan in English
- A detailed Financial Proposal (presenting a good quality/price ratio and indicating unit costs) and including the hiring of interpreters/translators for local languages.
- The enclosed declaration of integrity (appendix 1) signed.

Please note that the consulting company is expected to comply with all government regulations, and that government taxes will remain the responsibility of the company.

In carrying out this evaluation, consultants are expected to respect humanitarian principles and ensure the confidentiality of the data collected. Consultants are also asked to follow PLAY's Code of Conduct at all times.

All data collected as part of this evaluation will remain the property of PLAY. By the end of the final evaluation, the external evaluator will submit all documentation related to PLAY and the project to PLAY management. The Final External Evaluation Report produced under this contract may not be shared externally without the prior written consent of PLAY.

It is the consultant's responsibility to budget for translators, as well as medical/health/repatriation insurance.

It will be the consultant's responsibility to ensure the presence of local languages interpreters to conduct the interviews in each country. PLAY will not be able to provide assistance on this.

PLAY will not be responsible for the costs of transport, access, accommodation and food. It is the responsibility of the evaluator to take the necessary steps to ensure access and accommodation for the teams in the field.

The consultants may choose to conduct the interviews remotely, by videoconference, in which case PLAY will be able to facilitate contact with the parties considered by the consultants.

The price will be fixed for the duration of the contract. The price will be paid according to the following schedule:

- 1st instalment: 50% on signature of the expert services contract,
- 2nd instalment: 50% on acceptance of the final report by the donor.

## RATING OF THE APPLICATION

---

Applications will be scored according to the following criteria:

I. Technical Proposal	60pts
-----------------------	-------

a.	Technical knowledge of the personnel deployed (CV, organizational structure of the team, experience in carrying out similar final evaluations. The similarity of the evaluation criteria, projects and area covered will be noted in the same way.)	30pts
b.	Specificity of the context/relevance of the methodology and work plan	25pts
c.	Examples of previous work	5pts
II. Financial proposal		40pts
TOTAL		100pts

Any proposal submitted after the deadline will be automatically rejected. PLAY will only seek clarification from applicants where the information provided is not sufficient to make an objective assessment of the proposal submitted. Any error or major deviation from the instructions listed in the Terms of Reference may lead to the proposal being rejected.

## CONTACT

---

Applications and requests for information relating solely to the scope of the assignment should be sent by e-mail to: [operation@play-international.org](mailto:operation@play-international.org)

## APPENDIX

---

### Declaration of integrity, eligibility and environmental and social commitment

Title of the invitation to tender : \_\_\_\_\_  
(the "Contract")

A : \_\_\_\_\_ (the "Owner")

1. We acknowledge and accept that the Agence Française de Développement (the "AFD") only finances the project owner's projects on its own terms, which are determined by the Financing Agreement between the AFD and the project owner. Consequently, there can be no legal link between the AFD and our company, our consortium or our subcontractors. The project owner retains sole responsibility for the preparation and implementation of the procurement process and its subsequent execution.
2. We certify that we are not, and that none of the members of our group and our subcontractors are, in one of the following cases:
  - 2.1) be in a state of, or have been the subject of, bankruptcy, liquidation, judicial settlement, safeguard or cessation of activity proceedings, or be in any similar situation resulting from proceedings of the same nature;
  - 2.2) have been convicted for less than five years by a judgment which has the force of res judicata in the country where the Project is carried out for one of the acts referred to in Articles 6.1 to 6.4 below or for any offence committed in the context

of the award or performance of a contract<sup>3</sup> ;

2.3) appear on the Financial Sanctions Lists adopted by the United Nations, the European Union and/or France, in particular to combat the financing of terrorism and breaches of international peace and security;

2.4) in professional matters, have been guilty of serious misconduct in the past five years in connection with the award or performance of a contract;

2.5) not having fulfilled our obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions or our obligations relating to the payment of taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of the country in which we are established or those of the country of the project owner;

2.6) have been convicted within the last five years by a judgment that has the force of res judicata for one of the acts referred to in Articles 6.1 to 6.4 below or for any offence committed in connection with the award or performance of a contract financed by AFD;

2.7) be subject to an exclusion order issued by the World Bank, as of 30 May 2012, and be on the list published at <http://www.worldbank.org/debarr><sup>4</sup> ;

(2.8) is guilty of misrepresentation in providing any information required as part of the Contract award process.

3. We certify that we are not, and that none of the members of our group and our subcontractors are, in one of the following situations of conflict of interest:

3.1) shareholder controlling the project owner or subsidiary controlled by the project owner, unless the resulting conflict has been brought to the AFD's attention and resolved to its satisfaction.

3.2) have a business or family relationship with a member of the project owner's staff involved in the selection process or control of the resulting contract, unless the resulting conflict has been brought to the attention of AFD and resolved to its satisfaction;

3.3) control or be controlled by another tenderer, be placed under the control of the same company as another tenderer, receive subsidies directly or indirectly from another tenderer or award subsidies directly or indirectly to another tenderer, have the same legal representative as another tenderer, have direct or indirect contacts with another tenderer enabling us to have and give access to information contained in our respective tenders, to influence them, or to influence the project owner's decisions;

3.4) be engaged for a consultancy assignment which, by its nature, is likely to prove incompatible with our assignments on behalf of the project owner;

3.5) in the case of a procedure for the award of a works or supply contract :

---

<sup>3</sup> In the event of such a conviction, you may attach to this Declaration of Integrity any additional information that will enable you to consider that the conviction is not relevant in the context of the contract financed by AFD.

<sup>4</sup> In the event of such a decision to exclude, you may attach to this Declaration of Integrity any additional information that will enable you to consider that this exclusion decision is not relevant in the context of the contract financed by AFD.

- i. to have prepared ourselves or to have been associated with a consultant who has prepared specifications, plans, calculations and other documents used as part of the competitive tendering process in question;
  - ii. be ourselves, or one of the firms with which we are affiliated, engaged, or to be engaged, by the Employer to carry out supervision or control of the works under the Contract.
4. If we are a public establishment or a public company, we certify that we have legal and financial autonomy and that we are managed in accordance with the rules of commercial law<sup>5</sup>.
5. We undertake to inform the project owner without delay, who will inform the AFD, of any change in the situation with regard to points 2 to 4 above.
6. In connection with the award and performance of the Contract :
  - 6.1) We have not committed and will not commit any unfair operation (act or omission) intended to deliberately deceive another person, intentionally conceal information from them, surprise or vitiate their consent or make them circumvent legal or regulatory obligations and/or violate their internal rules in order to obtain an illegitimate benefit.
  - 6.2) We have not committed and will not commit any unfair operation (action or omission) contrary to our legal or regulatory obligations and/or our internal rules in order to obtain an illegitimate benefit.
  - 6.3) We have not promised, offered or granted, and we will not promise, offer or grant, directly or indirectly, to (i) any person holding a legislative, executive, administrative or judicial office within the State of the Employer, whether appointed or elected, on a permanent basis or not, whether remunerated or not and whatever their hierarchical level, (ii) any other person who performs a public function, including for a public body or a public company, or who provides a public service, or (iii) any other person defined as a public official in the State of the project owner, an undue advantage of any kind, for himself or for another person or entity, in order for him to perform or refrain from performing an act in the exercise of his official duties.
  - 6.4) We have not promised, offered or granted, and we will not promise, offer or grant, directly or indirectly, to any person who directs or works for a private sector entity, in any capacity whatsoever, any undue advantage of any kind, for themselves or for any other person or entity, in order that they perform or refrain from performing any act in breach of their legal, contractual or professional obligations.
  - 6.5) We have not committed and will not commit any act likely to influence the process of awarding the Contract to the detriment of the Employer and, in particular, any Anti-competitive Practice the object or effect of which is to prevent, restrict or distort competition, in particular by tending to limit access to the Contract or the free exercise of competition by other companies.
  - 6.6) We, or one of the members of our consortium, or one of the subcontractors will not acquire or supply equipment and will not operate in sectors under United

---

<sup>5</sup> Article to be deleted where appropriate in the event of a contract concluded with a public company without competitive tendering.



Nations, European Union or French Embargo.

6.7) We undertake to respect and to ensure that all our subcontractors respect the environmental and social standards recognised by the international community, including the fundamental conventions of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and the international conventions for the protection of the environment, in accordance with the laws and regulations applicable in the country where the Contract is carried out. We also undertake to implement the environmental and social risk mitigation measures defined in the environmental and social management plan or, where applicable, in the environmental and social impact notice provided by the project owner.

7. We, the members of our consortium and our subcontractors authorize AFD to examine the documents and accounting records relating to the award and performance of the Contract and to submit them for verification to auditors appointed by AFD.

Name : \_\_\_\_\_ As : \_\_\_\_\_

Signature : \_\_\_\_\_

Duly authorised to sign the tender for and on behalf of <sup>6</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

As of : \_\_\_\_\_ day of : \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>6</sup> In the case of a joint venture, enter the name of the joint venture. The person signing the tender on behalf of the Tenderer shall attach to the Tender the Power of Attorney granted by the Tenderer.