



KINGDOM OF BELGIUM

Federal Public Service

Foreign Affairs,

Foreign Trade and

Development Cooperation

Public Procurement procedure for the evaluation of the Belgian fragility approach

Terms of Reference

Nr. S2 / 2022 / 03

**Special Evaluation Office of the Belgian Development
Cooperation – S2**

November 2022



Table of Contents

B. TECHNICAL PRESCRIPTIONS	3
B1. Introduction	3
B2. Institutional context	3
B3. Motivation.....	6
B4. Objectives and expected results	6
B5. Scope and sample.....	7
B6. Evaluation questions.....	8
B7. Approach and course.....	10
B8. Timing	12
B9. Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team.....	12
B10. Management of the evaluation	13
B12. Tender requirements	14

B. TECHNICAL PRESCRIPTIONS

B1. Introduction

This part contains the terms of reference for the evaluation of the Belgian fragility approach as foreseen in the indicative programming 2020-2022 of the Special Evaluation Office (SEO). SEO has the task of evaluating the Belgian Development Cooperation. It is an external evaluation service, administratively placed under the authority of the President of the Direction Committee of the Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation. The evaluations of SEO aim to report on the use of public funds, to learn from what works and what does not work, in order to improve the Belgian Development Cooperation and support decision-making.

The complete tender specifications are only available in Dutch and French. Please consult these documents if you are interested to submit an offer.

B2. Institutional context

B2.1 The international debate¹

States of fragility. Over the past two decades, fragility has become an important topic within the field of development cooperation. Since 2005, the OECD has published annual (and biennial) reports on trends and data related to fragile situations. The most recent report (OECD, 2022)² classifies 60 countries and territories as fragile (up from 57 in 2020). These areas house around a quarter of the world's population and more than three-quarters of the extremely poor worldwide. On the one hand, fragility is seen as a source of local, regional and global instability. On the other, fragility is seen as a strong barrier to achieving the global objectives of the 2030 Agenda (Marley & Desai, 2020). No fragile country or region is on track to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) around hunger, health and gender equality. Prospects for other SDGs are similarly bleak, while at the same time the gap in progress between fragile and non-fragile contexts continues to widen. This is particularly true of the 15 extremely fragile contexts identified in the States of Fragility 2022 report (down from 13 in 2020), leading to great concern that the most deprived countries risk falling even further behind.

A multidimensional concept. Initially, fragility was primarily associated with the inability or unwillingness of a state to provide or organise security and other essential services for its citizens. As also, for example, in the 2013 Act on Belgian Development Cooperation, "the condition of a State in which the government and public institutions lack the means and/or political will to ensure the security and protection of citizens, to manage public affairs efficiently and to combat poverty amongst the population." Other dimensions were also added

¹ The international context description in these terms of reference is strongly inspired by the OECD-DAC narrative. The evaluators are free to also take into account other views in their approach.

² [States of Fragility 2022 | en | OECD | OCDE](#)

afterwards. Within the current debate, fragility is broken down into economic, environmental, political, security and social dimensions. With the growing realisation that human capital can also contribute substantially to understanding and addressing fragility, human capital was added as a new, sixth dimension in the OECD States of Fragility 2022 report.

A dynamic concept. Not only has there been a shift from one to multiple dimensions, there is also a growing realisation that fragility is not a static reality. Two elements are important in this regard. The first element is that fragility depends as much upon risk as it does upon the resilience present in a given situation. At present, the OECD defines fragility as "the combination of exposure to risk and insufficient capacity of the state, systems and/or communities to manage, absorb or mitigate those risks" (OECD, States of Fragility 2020, p. 17). The second element is that fragility varies in intensity. Today's fragile situations are no longer viewed as 'failed' or 'failing'. Nor do they share the binary nature of a first generation of fragile situations. Until 2014, the OECD categorised situations as either fragile or non-fragile. Today, they move within a spectrum of fragility scores, ranging from mildly to extremely fragile.

B2.2 From concept to operationalisation

Principles for intervention in fragile situations. The fact that fragility is strongly associated with local, regional and global instability and delays in achieving the 2030 Agenda has led international actors active in fragile situations to scrutinise and adjust their modes of intervention there. In particular, the 2007 OECD-DAC *Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States* still serve as a powerful guide in this regard. Specifically, these are the following 10 principles: (i) take context as the starting point; (ii) do no harm; (iii) focus on state building as the central objective; (iv) prioritise prevention; (v) recognise the links between political, security and development objectives; (vi) promote non-discrimination as a basis for inclusive and stable societies; (vii) align with local priorities; (viii) agree on practical coordination mechanisms between international actors; (ix) act fast, but stay engaged long enough; and (x) avoid pockets of exclusion.

The New Deal. Another important political anchor for intervention in fragile situations was the *New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States*. This New Deal, which linked not only bilateral donors but also recipient fragile states and international organisations (united in the *International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding*), came about in the sidelines of the *High Level Forum* in Busan in 2011. In the spirit of the Paris Declaration (2005), the New Deal placed a strong focus on results orientation and national self-ownership. Explicit goals were also set, aimed at both peacebuilding and strengthening the state. A key objective here was to pursue the legitimacy of state-driven political processes. This brought to the forefront, in addition to state authority and state capacity, a third – and often neglected – dimension of fragility. The New Deal also refers to the riskiness of interventions in fragile situations, but at the same time emphasises that the risk associated with non-intervention may be even greater.

The humanitarian-development-peace nexus. In 2020, 25% of all ODA of DAC members in fragile countries went to humanitarian aid, 63% to development cooperation and 12% to peace (OECD, States of Fragility 2022). How to increase the effectiveness of aid in fragile situations remains a difficult issue. In particular, the focus on effective collective international action in fragile and conflict-stricken situations where humanitarian aid, development cooperation and peacebuilding overlap has seen a sharp rise in recent years. In 2019, the OECD-DAC Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus was adopted. This recommendation, which originated at the instigation of the *International Network on Conflict and Fragility* (INCAF) and is now receiving broader operational guidance within the '*DAC-UN Dialogue on implementing the DAC Recommendation*', calls upon actors working in the three

different areas to strengthen policy and operational coherence. A recent progress evaluation points to some positive changes in organisational attitudes and practices, but also indicates some significant bottlenecks. Of the three pillars, the peace pillar has proven especially difficult to integrate. This includes a lack of sufficient use of political commitment and diplomatic instruments. Furthermore, the core of the nexus – enhanced coherence and complementarity – presupposes not only joint analysis and programming, but also the prioritisation of truly collective outcomes. There is also insufficient regard for 'localising' the nexus approach and linking it to crucial dimensions, such as gender equality and climate change. Finally, there is a need for greater 'nexus literacy' among the various actors involved.

B2.3 The Belgian fragility approach

Policy and strategy. The 2013 Law on Belgian Development Cooperation establishes fragility as one of the criteria for determining the partner countries for governmental cooperation. That same year saw the publication of the Strategy Paper on Fragile Situations. The objective formulated in this strategy paper reads as follows: "[t]he Belgian cooperation contributes to the construction of an efficient, legitimate, resilient state, to the strengthening of the state (*Statebuilding*) and of the population in the partner countries that are in a fragile situation and to the strengthening of relations between the government authorities and the population, in other words to the strengthening of the legitimacy of the state." The main thrust of the paper is the international framework around fragility. Both expected long-term goals of the Belgian fragility approach and guiding principles follow from the aforementioned New Deal and the OECD-DAC *Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States*. Furthermore, the paper lays some Belgian emphases, including a focus on gender equality, transition from humanitarian aid to development, democratic governance and rationality of aid architecture. Another important thing is the paper explicitly states that the fragility approach is a matter for all aid channels, and thus extends beyond the purely governmental realm.

Development. The Belgian fragility approach was further developed and refined starting in 2015. This was mainly done through two ways: policy support research and participation in the work of INCAF³. Between 2015 and 2017, academics conducted participatory research, both in Belgium and on the ground and across the various channels of Belgian Development Cooperation, around the development and concrete application of the fragility approach. This led, among other things, to a *Guidance on fragility* (2017), a *Roadmap for a comprehensive approach for Belgian development policy* (2018) and the FRAME (Fragility and Resilience Assessment and Management Exercise) tool, which standardises risk analysis in fragile partner countries in accordance with the five OECD-DAC fragility dimensions. In addition to this policy support research, Belgium also actively participated in INCAF's policy guidance and awareness-raising activities. This has been done in recent years through the newly created service D5.2 (Transition to Development and Good Governance), which, based on an analysis of the root causes of fragility, seeks to provide appropriate responses in the context of Belgian Development Cooperation. These responses subscribe emphatically to the nexus approach discussed above, which received a policy translation at the Belgian pan-governmental level in 2017 in the form of a *comprehensive approach* strategy paper. Following this strategy paper, various interdepartmental taskforces were created, including for the Sahel region and the Great Lakes region. In 2022 the DGD started a new policy supporting programme that also focuses on fragility.

³ The International Network on Conflict and Fragility

In addition to INCAF, D5.2 also tracks other international actors that assign a central strategic place to fragility, including the European Union, the World Bank and the African Development Bank.

The Peer Review of Belgian Development Cooperation⁴ emphasises that the institutional framework was reviewed taking into account fragile settings, but also finds that further deepening and consolidation of the efforts made are necessary.

B3. Motivation

Special Evaluation Office. For several years now, the Special Evaluation Office (SEO) has been trying to take more explicit account of the programming cycles of Belgian DC actors and has been focusing on policy-oriented and strategic evaluations. Previous broad consultations by the SEO revealed a keen interest in an evaluation of Belgian Development Cooperation in fragile situations. This interest was confirmed by the DGD's strategic committee in 2020.

Belgian Development Cooperation. Belgium concentrates a significant portion of its Official Development Assistance (ODA) in fragile contexts. Whereas until 2019, eight out of 18 government cooperation partner countries were considered fragile, after the exit of six partner countries and the addition of two new partner countries (Guinea and Burkina Faso), the balance has shifted to 11 fragile countries out of 14 according to the latest *States of Fragility* report (2022). Of those 11 countries, Burundi and the DRC are considered extremely fragile. Consequently, this significant shift towards fragile partner countries also fuels the need for an evaluation of Belgian Development Cooperation's approach to fragility.

Moreover, 34.5% (in 2018) of Belgium's total ODA goes to fragile countries, a percentage higher than the OECD-DAC average. This figure is even higher when looking purely at bilateral attributable aid. In that case, it is 63% (Peer Review of Belgian Development Cooperation 2020).

B4. Objectives and expected results

B4.1 Objective

Policy-supporting and strategic evaluation. Using external evaluations, the SEO is aiming for independent and substantiated findings. These findings can be used by policy and administration to refine or adjust the Belgian fragility approach on the one hand, and for its propagation and application at bilateral – governmental and non-governmental – and multilateral levels on the other. The evaluation aims to produce concrete and applicable recommendations that can contribute both at policy and operational levels to optimising the Belgian fragility approach.

Largely formative evaluation. The main objective is to draw lessons from the application of the Belgian fragility approach. This applies to all the evaluation criteria used for this evaluation, including the criterion of 'effectiveness', which is primarily associated with summative evaluation. More important than the analysis of effectiveness from the perspective of accountability is the question of the extent to which the results achieved in fragile situations

⁴ [OECD Development Co-operation Peer Reviews: Belgium 2020 | en | OECD](#)

can be linked to the application of the policy principles and instruments in the Belgian fragility approach.

B4.2 Anticipated results

The evaluation will produce the following results:

R1. Mapping of the Belgian Development Cooperation in fragile situations (incl. international comparison)

R2. Findings and conclusions regarding the coherent application of the Belgian fragility approach, both internally (within and outside FPS Foreign Affairs) and internationally (points of reference on fragility, including the *New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States* and the *International Network on Conflict and Fragility*)

R3. Findings and conclusions regarding the instrumentation, the application of the Belgian fragility approach and the results of interventions in fragile countries

R4. Recommendations addressing policy, administration and development actors involved

B5. Scope and sample

B5.1 Scope of the evaluation

Policy. The evaluation focuses on the Belgian policy principles and instruments of the Belgian fragility approach, and in particular their application in fragile partner countries for governmental cooperation. This approach is closely linked to other dimensions of Belgian foreign policy, including the *comprehensive approach*, the *humanitarian-development-peace nexus*, effective multilateralism and migration. These dimensions are part of the scope of the evaluation only insofar as they are found to have a substantial impact in the application of the Belgian fragility approach in the partner countries. This applies in particular to humanitarian aid, which was the subject of another recent review.

Levels and channels. It follows from the previous paragraph that not only will the application of the Belgian fragility approach be examined at the central administrative level and in the diplomatic missions in fragile partner countries, but also in the relevant multilateral missions. In terms of channels, choosing to focus on the partner countries of governmental cooperation does not mean that governmental aid through the Belgian Development Agency Enabel will be the only thing looked at. Fragile contexts are complex and multidimensional and require a coherent and comprehensive approach across channels and actors. Both governmental and non-governmental cooperation, collaboration through the Belgian Investment Company for Developing Countries (BIO) and the multilateral cooperation form part of the analyses. The same is true for the interventions financed via the services of the FPS Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation 'Transition to development and good governance D5.2', 'Peace Building S0.1', 'Humanitarian aid D5.1' and 'Society building and social development D2.5'.

Period. The evaluation looks at fragility-linked dynamics and interventions taking place during the period 2015-2022. The period chosen allows for an evaluation of the application of the Belgian fragility approach with sufficient distance. From 2015, the aforementioned policy support research on fragility took concrete form and reflections and pilot activities were organised with various actors in Belgian Development Cooperation, both in Brussels and in the field. 2015 also saw the decision to reduce the number of partner countries, with an

increased focus on fragile partner countries. Furthermore, the period chosen makes it possible to examine the extent to which Belgian Development Cooperation has adapted to the challenges posed by the coronavirus pandemic in fragile contexts, or even the consequences (e.g. food security) of the war in Ukraine.

B5.2 Sample of partner countries

The fragile partner countries will be analysed with varying degrees of depth. All fragile and non-fragile partner countries will be looked at with a broad lens during the period 2015-2022. During the field missions, a focused lens will be put on three fragile partner countries.

All eleven partner countries in the governmental cooperation are eligible for the mapping and more general overarching analysis. A broad analysis of the ODA to non-fragile partner countries will also be carried out as a reference for comparison.

For the in-depth analysis, the evaluation focuses on six governmental development cooperation partner countries, in three different regions. For each region, one country will be the subject of a site visit and another of a comprehensive analysis without a site visit. For the Sahel, these are Niger (site) and Mali (desk), for Central Africa, DR Congo (site) and Burundi (desk), and for West Africa, Guinea (site) and Burkina Faso (desk). The latter two are new partner countries from 2015. Of these six countries, DR Congo and Burundi are characterised as extremely fragile in the latest *States of Fragility* report (OECD, 2022).

For each of the six country studies, there are six interventions to be evaluated in depth. The choice of the interventions will be made during the mapping phase based on a reasoned proposal from the evaluators.

B6. Evaluation questions

The evaluation will provide an overall answer to the following central evaluation questions. The specific evaluation questions may be further adjusted or supplemented at the reasoned suggestion of the evaluators during the scoping and mapping phase of the evaluation

B6.1. Central evaluation questions

EQ 1. Is the policy framework and instrumentation of Belgian Development Cooperation adapted to fragile contexts? How are international principles and strategic guidance (including strategy papers on fragility and comprehensive approach, nexus) translated into a coherent fragility approach in the specific fragility context of the partner countries?

EQ 2. What results does Belgian Development Cooperation achieve in response to the volatile, complex contexts of fragility and what is the balance between short-term and long-term objectives and results? Does Belgian Development Cooperation have appropriate means and tools for the operationalisation of the fragility approach in the field?

B6.2 Specific questions

The questions below are inspired by the DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact), without being broken down by criterion.

- Take context as the starting point is the first of the ten *Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States*. Are the contextual analyses and understanding of the local fragility context sufficiently robust and does Belgian cooperation succeed in aligning with the local fragility context?
- Are international principles and Belgian strategic guidance (10 principles, INCAF, comprehensive approach, Acropolis, nexus, strategy papers, Leave No One Behind, conflict sensitivity, localising) sufficiently reflected in the concrete fragility approach at the partner country level?
- What degree of synergy/coherence is there between Development Cooperation and the other pillars of Belgian foreign policy in the fragile partner countries? Do the different pillars reinforce each other?
- What degree of partner country ownership is present in the fragility approach in the respective country?
- Are the channels and instruments of Belgian development cooperation adapted to the volatile, complex and multidimensional context of fragile countries? And is the degree of flexibility in using these channels and instruments adapted to the volatility of fragile contexts?
- Do the set of Belgian development interventions complement one another and respond to local needs? In particular, are the more punctual interventions (peacebuilding service and transition service) complementary to the more structural funding through Enabel, the NGAs and the multilateral actors?
- Is the current blend of the deployment of various channels and instruments of Belgian development cooperation the most efficient in a fragile context?
- Are the stated objectives of Belgian interventions realistic and achievable in a fragile context? What are the results achieved and can they be considered successful in a fragile context? Do the interventions provide demonstrable added value to the beneficiary population? What are the main reasons for results that were not obtained?
- Intervening in fragile situations is risky: Is the Belgian risk appetite, both in terms of acceptance of failing interventions and in terms of security risks for development actors, adapted to the fragile contexts in which they work?
- Is Belgian development cooperation also succeeding in contributing to long-term goals in volatile fragile contexts? Can sustainable outcomes be identified?
- Are the cross-cutting themes of Gender and Environment adequately reflected in the fragility approach?

B7. Approach and course

B7.1 (Methodological) approach and scoping

The evaluators begin with an initial broad consultation of the key stakeholders of Belgian Development Cooperation and a study of key international and Belgian strategic and conceptual documents. Recent studies and international evaluations on fragility are also consulted. Relevant voices from academia and international forums on fragility (e.g. INCAF) are identified and consulted.

This first phase will culminate in a methodological note that elaborates upon both methodological and practical approaches. In this phase, both the evaluation questions from the special specifications and the proposed methodological approach from the bid can be refined (with the approval of the steering committee).

Special attention should also be paid to the practical approach in terms of data collection in fragile contexts, the feasibility limits of field missions, remote data collection, safety of the evaluators and the evaluated.

The "do no harm" principle also applies to this evaluation.

B7.2 Mapping and analysis of Belgian Development Cooperation in fragile partner countries

The mapping will be based on an in-depth study of the available data and information on Belgian ODA going to fragile partner countries. The mapping will provide insight into the mix of channels and tools that are being used in the fragile partner countries and into the sectors that are being supported, and visualise evolutions/trends in the period 2015-2022. To the extent that similar data on support of other donors in fragile countries is available, an international comparison will be made.

The mapping will also compare the Belgian ODA that goes to fragile partner countries to the ODA that goes to non-fragile partner countries. When looking at the non-fragile partner countries, the exiting partner countries from 2015-2019 can also be taken into account.

This mapping will not only analyse the financial ODA flows, but will include an initial analysis of the types of actions and specific responses in fragile contexts as well.

This phase will be concluded with a broader stakeholder consultation round and a broader study of available documents. Recent evaluations of the SEO on core funding, the Belgian strategy for humanitarian aid and the country strategies in the framework of the first management contract of Enabel are being consulted for optimal coherence with this evaluation.

The mapping will culminate in some initial preliminary findings and hypotheses that need to be further explored in a focused manner in the country studies phase.

Based on the mapping, the interventions that will be evaluated during the 6 country studies will also be identified.

B7.3 Country studies

In the country studies, the fragility approach in six partner countries will be evaluated. Three countries in the field (DRC, Niger, Guinea), three countries remotely (Burundi, Mali, Burkina Faso).

In each of these countries, the results of about six interventions will also be assessed to get a tangible picture of the results that are achievable and are being achieved or not in a context of fragility.

'Take context as a starting point': the starting point for these country studies is a thorough analysis of the (fragility) context of the 6 partner countries involved. Existing (Frame) analyses can be a part of this, but should also be viewed critically.

This phase will culminate in 6 country reports, each building on the findings and hypotheses from the previous phases and providing answers to the evaluation questions in the specific context of the countries concerned.

Other relevant donors are also consulted on their fragility approach in the three partner countries that form part of the field missions.

In the three countries visited, a restitution is also organised with key stakeholders at the end of the on-location mission. However, taking into account all possible sensitivities, again: Do no harm.

The other three cases are discussed at an online meeting, in which the actors in the partner country can participate as well.

In these phases, it is expected that experts on context analysis and experts/evaluators from the partner countries themselves will also be called upon.

The evaluators should allocate the necessary time to consult deeply with the stakeholders during field missions and thoroughly evaluate the selected interventions.

B7.4 Final report

Based on the mapping and country studies, the evaluators will formulate their conclusions and an initial impetus for recommendations.

Given the formative nature of this evaluation, this initial impetus for recommendations will be further refined in a workshop and reviewed for feasibility with key stakeholders. However, the independent evaluators are still the ones holding the pen when writing up the final conclusions and recommendations.

B7.5 Restitution

After approval of the final report, the evaluation process is concluded with a public restitution of the main conclusions and recommendations.

B8. Timing

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| • Kick-off | January 2023 |
| • Methodological note | February 2023 |
| • Mapping | April 2023 |
| • Country studies | April – July 2023 |
| • First draft final report + workshop | August - September 2023 |
| • Final report: | October 2023 |
| • Restitution: | November 2023 |

B9. Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team

B9.1 Required expertise and experience

The evaluation team should have sufficient expertise and experience in the following areas:

- Development and fragility context in general and more specifically in the countries proposed for this evaluation;
- Evaluation methodology and approach in complex areas
- Knowledge of the Belgian institutional system of Belgian development cooperation and foreign policy.
- Knowledge of international challenges related to fragility.
- Expertise in context analysis

B9.2 Required language skills

A good knowledge of Dutch, French and English is required. If the team leader does not have a good knowledge of Dutch or French (level C2 of the European reference framework), he or she must at least be assisted by a co-team leader who has such knowledge. For a good understanding of the documents drawn up by the Belgian administration, at least one core member of the evaluation team must have knowledge of Dutch or French at mother tongue level (level C2 of the European framework of reference). Local language knowledge in the selected partner countries must also be present in the team.

B9.3 Composition

Gender balance is encouraged in the team. This may include looking at the task allocation and the number of working days anticipated. The evaluation team should also draw upon expertise from the partner countries themselves. This means a full-fledged role as evaluator within the team, not only as facilitator of the field missions.

B9.4 Constructive set-up

The SEO believes that the use of an evaluation partly depends on the progression of the evaluation process and the level of constructive participation of the various stakeholders involved.

B10. Management of the evaluation

B10.1 SEO – leading official

The Special Evaluation Office (SEO) is charged with launching the evaluation and providing administrative oversight. The office represents the contracting authority and as such will appoint the leading official for the evaluation. In this capacity, the leading official will assess the conformity of the evaluation (based on the legal framework and the special specifications), as well as the quality of the process and the results of the evaluation.

The leading official will manage the entire evaluation process, from beginning to end. The SEO, in its capacity as contracting authority, is solely responsible for leading the evaluation process.

B10.2 Stakeholders

The actors involved (stakeholders) are individuals, groups or organisations who have direct or indirect responsibilities and/or interests in the objective of the evaluation (policy, project, programme, sector, country, etc.) They will be consulted at certain points in the evaluation (through interviews, questionnaires, focus groups, etc.).

B10.3 Steering Committee

The Special Evaluation Office will put together a Steering Committee composed of the various stakeholders involved in the evaluation, and possibly some independent experts. The committee will provide advice both on the proposed methodological approach and on the findings, conclusions and recommendations resulting from the evaluation.

The Steering Committee will convene at least four times: on the occasion of (i) the methodological note, (ii) the mapping, (iii) the country reports, and (iv) the provisional final report.

The SEO will chair the Steering Committee and is also responsible for the general supervision of the evaluation contract and the final approval of the results of the evaluation.

B11. Format and languages

B11.1 Language of the reports

All the documents are to be drawn up in Dutch, French or English. The final report must be drawn up in English, French or Dutch, and must also contain a summary in the other two languages. In the summary, the most important conclusions and recommendations must be explained and substantiated.

The country reports should be drafted in the most appropriate international language for the partner country.

The final report must be able to be read and understood by a wide audience.

B11.2 Length of the reports

Evaluation processes require a significant time investment from the actors involved. Therefore, it is important to limit the length of the various reports:

- The methodological note will have a maximum of 30 pages
- The mapping will have a maximum of 50 pages
- The country reports will have a maximum of 40 pages
- The final report will have a maximum of 60 pages
- The final report summaries will have a maximum of 8 pages, including illustrations.

The summaries must be readable documents, accessible to a broad audience. The summaries must be independent documents, not merely the result of copying and pasting the conclusions and recommendations.

The annexes are not bound by these limits.

Photos will be provided to illustrate the country reports and final report/cover photo.

Content guidelines and layout instructions for the various reports will be provided by the Special Evaluation Office at the start of the evaluation.

B12. Tender requirements

Tenderers will be asked to submit a brief bid with both a financial and a technical part. Here as well, the tenderers' ability to draw up clear and concise documents will be valued.

B12.1 Financial part

The financial bid must include an estimate of the cost, with expenditure headings per phase of the evaluation, per evaluator and per field mission. Per field mission, at least 20 working days in the field are planned (not including international travel).

B12.2 Technical part

The technical bid comprises four parts:

- a description of the proposed methodological approach and a view on the terms of reference,
- a description of the practical approach of the evaluation and of the task allocation within the evaluation team,
- the expertise and experience of the team leader,
- the expertise and experience of the team members, international as well as local experts

In the section on methodology and understanding of the terms of reference, it shall be clarified how the evaluation team intends to provide an answer to the questions and expectations posed. In particular, the service provider must clarify its view on the context, the objectives and the evaluation questions, but also on its added value in the context of the evaluation.

The technical bid must clearly define who will take on which tasks within the evaluation team. This applies for both international evaluators and local experts. Given the importance of a

coherent task allocation and coordination within the evaluation team, the role and availability of the team leader must be clearly stated.

The total number of working days for the evaluators is estimated at 260-300 days.

B12.3 Evaluation of the tenders

The technical bid will be assessed on the basis of the following criteria and weightings (for a total of 70%, also see A11):

Proposal of methodology, methodological overview and understanding of the terms of reference (20%);

Practical approach of the evaluation per phase and mutual task allocation (15%)

Expertise and experience of the team leader (15%) re:

- the required language skills;
- knowledge of the Belgian Development Cooperation context;
- knowledge of international questions in the area of fragility;
- evaluation methodology, and in particular in fragile contexts

Expertise and experience of the team members (20%) re:

- the required language skills;
- knowledge of the Belgian Development Cooperation context;
- knowledge of international questions in the area of fragility;
- evaluation methodology, and in particular in fragile contexts
- context analysis
- Development and fragility dynamics in selected partner countries. The evaluation team should also draw on expertise from the partner countries themselves. This means a full role as an evaluator within the team and not just as a facilitator of field missions.