

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR END OF PROJECT EVALUATION AND CAPITALIZATION FOR THE PROJECT “CARING- CHALLENGING SOCIAL AND GENDER NORMS TO REDUCE VIOLENCE AGAINST CHILDREN IN SCHOOL”

Terre des hommes Romania and Terre des hommes Hungary is seeking a qualified external evaluator for conducting an **end of project evaluation** and a **capitalization exercise** for the EU funded project CARING - [Challenging social and gender norms to reduce violence against children in school](#).

1. Presentation of Terre des hommes

Terre des hommes (Tdh) founded in 1960 is the leading Swiss child relief agency committed to improving the lives of millions of the world's most vulnerable children. Through innovative protection and health projects, Tdh provides assistance to over three million children and their families in almost forty countries each year. In Europe, Terre des hommes intervenes directly or indirectly in many countries, relying on teams based in Hungary, Albania, Greece, Kosovo, Romania, Moldova and Ukraine. Every year thousands of children and their families benefit from projects implemented either at a national or regional level.

In Romania, Terre des hommes (Tdh RO) has been active since 1992. For the past few years, the delegation has been working on three main intervention areas: (1) Strengthening child protection and juvenile justice systems, (2) Protection of children affected by migration and/or trafficking and (3) Social inclusion of minorities.

Tdh opened its Regional Hub in Budapest in 2006, with a double function: to provide expertise and advice for Tdh operations in Europe and to develop regional projects. Across Europe, regional projects implemented in collaboration with a wide range of partners focus on improved services for children in contact with the law and ensuring the rights of children on the move by promoting their development in education and (re)integration.

Tdh's work in Access to Justice contributes directly to Sustainable Development Goal N°16, namely 16.2 reducing violence against children and 16.3 reinforcing access to justice. It also endeavors to protect the rights of children in conflict with the law (articles 37 and 40 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child) and of children victims (article 19), as well as the involvement of the family and the community in the development of children (article 5), and the protection of the rights to non- discrimination (article 2), to have their best interest taken into consideration (article 3), to life survival and development (article 2), right to participation in all matters affecting them (article 12). In 2020, 93,400 children, young people and members of their communities were supported in access to justice.

2. Context

Context

At the level of the EU, violence in schools is one of the most visible and pervasive forms of violence against children. School related gender-based violence (SRGBV) has resulted because of gender norms and stereotypes and enforced by unequal power dynamics. SRGBV is considered complex, multifaceted and it involves several forms such as physical, sexual and/or psychological violence with manifestations including verbal abuse, bullying, coercion, and rape. Subject matter experts emphasize that education holds a key role in challenging the root causes of gender-based violence (GBV) by addressing notions of gender, and stereotypes around masculinity and femininity and how they impact the lives and relationships of children ([UNICEF, et.al., 2016](#)). Research shows that across the countries: Romania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece and not only, the system of social and gender norms is increasing the use of violence, the acceptance of it and limiting the intervention of third parties. Therefore, addressing the gender dimension of violence against children in schools and challenging social norms become imperative not only to better understand the manifestations

but also to enable professionals to design prevention programs through which boys and girls are made aware of and empowered to transform unequal and harmful gendered power relations.

Several key objectives of the [EU Gender Equality Strategy 2020-2025](#) such as ending GBV and challenging gender stereotypes are being pursued within this project by, for instance, supporting the decrease of physical violence against girls and by improving the awareness on the issue. The EU Parliament recently adopted the resolution [European Child Guarantee](#) calling on the EU member states to prevent GBV and to safeguard every child.

The project addresses the themes and priorities of the Call (Citizens, Equality, Rights and Values Programme (CERV) as it involves the strengthening of gender-specific and child-centred responses to school related violence, through capacity-building, awareness-raising and consolidated multi-disciplinary cooperation among relevant actors. The proposal responds to priority 3 of the Call as it challenges gender norms and behaviours in schools by implementing an integrated approach:

- targeting [young people \(aged 13-18\)](#) to consolidate non-violent relationships between peers.
- involving [school staff](#) (educational staff and school management) to challenge harmful social and gender norms and behaviours and to empower young people to become change agents tackling prejudices and gender stereotypes and norms.
- reaching [parents](#) to support their children in SRGBV awareness raising in schools and communities.
- consolidating the cooperation between schools and [relevant public institutions](#) at local/ county level to implement prevention measures.

The overall goal of the project is to decrease gender-based violence (GBV) in the 32 participating schools by equipping around 1200 facilitators, school staff and management, parents, as well as youth with increased awareness of harmful social and gender norms and behaviors, knowledge on how to challenge them and promoting positive ones.

Title: CARING - CHALLENGING SOcial AND GENDER NORMS TO REDUCE VIOLENCE AGainst Children in School”

Project time frame: This 24-month project run from **1 May 2023 until 30 April 2025** and is coordinated by Terre des hommes Romania.

Project description

CARING project is based on an integrated and holistic approach to address SRGBV in 4 EU countries (Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece and Romania) by working with young people to take action in preventing violence, with schools to reinforce their prevention measures, with educational staff to build their capacity to change behaviors and endorse positive attitudes, with parents/caregivers to support young people in raising awareness and with relevant public institutions to improve cooperation with schools on violence prevention.

The project is challenging social and gender norms, shifting behaviors of school staff and young people who, in turn, will become change agents promoting positive practices on gender-equity in their communities. This will be achieved through capacity-building activities with school staff from 32 schools (8 schools/implementing country); through trainings with young people (aged 13-18); through 32 child-led awareness-raising events, and round tables with relevant actors for multi-disciplinary cooperation. The outputs and results of the project will be disseminated widely across Europe, through the [ChildHub](#), platform as well as through the partnership’s networks and channels.

Therefore, the project is aiming at reaching the following specific objectives:

- SO1. Assess the specific social and gender norms which are promoting and maintaining GBV in the 32 selected schools from 4 countries.
- SO2. Increase the capacities of educational staff and school management (estimated 320 persons) to adopt a tolerant, inclusive, and non-violent communication, behavior and to promote positive practices related to gender-equity in schools.

- SO3. Improve awareness and knowledge of at least 250 young people (aged 13-18) on gender stereotyping and gender equality with a focus on empowering them to become change agents and promote non-violent behavior and communication.
- SO4. To strengthen the multi-agency cooperation at local/county level in partner countries during the project and beyond to promote a gender-sensitive approach in their efforts to address prevention of violence in schools and communities.

The project activities were gathered in *four Work Packages (WPs)*:

- Project management and coordination (WP1).
- Capacity and knowledge building (WP2).
- Child participation and awareness raising (WP3).
- Cooperation and exchange strengthening (WP4).

The project brings together 6 NGOs with expertise in child protection, with a strong reputation and longstanding cooperation with relevant stakeholders in their respective countries and with experts and professionals from EU countries and beyond, due to their similar interventions globally through their widespread delegations. Partners have been selected based on previous good collaborations and per Tdh's partners selection criteria that incorporates Gender & Diversity considerations from Tdh's G&D Policy.

Terre des hommes Romania (Tdh RO) for more than 25 years aims at strengthening child protection and juvenile justice systems, ensuring protection of children and youth affected by migration, and social inclusion of Roma and other vulnerable groups. Tdh Romania is the project coordinator and leader of WP1 and WP3. Tdh RO will ensure all set indicators will be reached at consortium level. Tdh RO will reach up to 8 schools from the counties of Dolj, Gorj, Olt and Bacau.

Terre des hommes Foundation Lausanne In Hungary (Tdh HU) serves as the regional office for operations of Tdh in Europe, focusing on advocacy and documentation of the situation of vulnerable children and youth across the region. Tdh HU has vast experience in enhancing cooperation amongst practitioners and is managing the ChildHub portal, a unique online learning platform for multidisciplinary professionals. Therefore, Tdh HU is leading WP2 and WP4.

Terre des hommes Hellas (Tdh GR) strengthens the child protection system for both migrant and Greek children and offers opportunities that encourage children and young people to express their views and influence decision-making. With experience in supporting children with protection concerns and their families in a multidisciplinary manner, Tdh GR will bring its expertise on integrated approaches to violence and on community-based interventions.

Brave Phone is one of the most recognisable organizations in Croatia when it comes to protection of children. With strong experience in raising awareness on the issue of violence against children, it has established a respectable reputation amongst practitioners and authorities.

Institute Of Social Activities And Practices Bulgaria (SAPI) is an NGO active in the field of child protection for more than 18 years, with strong expertise in capacity building and service provision, and provides specialized services for children victims and in conflict with law. They will be involved in all project activities, taking on the rapid assessment in Bulgaria and support Roditeli in the networking meetings.

Association Roditeli is promoting positive parenthood in Bulgaria as a major value in society and family. Through several projects, Roditeli is encouraging the active engagement of parents and other significant caregivers in their children's lives including by applying child participation. Roditeli is carrying out all planned project activities in 4 schools, participate in all joint activities, organize networking meetings with statutory stakeholders.

3. Objectives of the evaluation and capitalization exercises

The *primary objective of the project evaluation* is to assess the relevance and impact of the CARING project in achieving its goals. The evaluation will focus on:

- Assessing the **effectiveness** and **transformative impact** of the implemented activities aimed to address increased awareness on GBV issue in schools by challenging social and gender norms and behaviours of

school staff and young people, including identification of areas for improvement, and making recommendations for enhancement.

- Assessing the **relevance** of the intervention.
- Sustainability & replicability: **evaluating the sustainability** of the project's outcomes in implementing countries and the potential for replication in other EU member states.

*The primary objective of the **capitalization report** is to provide with **organizational learning and knowledge** for concluding all important lessons learnt from the way the project was set up, implemented and managed; and how it has succeeded or, potentially, not succeeded to achieve all its intended (or unintended) results.*

The capitalization exercise will collect best practices, lessons learnt and recommendations on further use of the CARING deliverables which will be put together in one document and widely disseminated among project partners. The report will include sections on easiness of accessing all project deliverables, tips on how to use the CARING assessment, training methodologies, how to select from the training methodology the activities for youth and teachers depending on the assessment, reported impact on beneficiaries, best practices for implementing activities and recommendations for shaping activities to best respond to targeted audiences and goals.

The capitalization report will be used as the main deliverable to present the best practices of the project and provide the links to methodologies used and content of training courses. This will be shared with educational authorities and not only. The capitalization report will be disseminated to other actors in the fight against violence (NGOs, National Authority for Child Protection, as well as to the members of the Joining Forces Alliance (composed of the 6 largest child-focused international NGOs) and to Tdh delegations throughout the world.

4. Scope of the evaluation and capitalization

The external evaluation and capitalization exercises will **cover the entire CARING project**, including all partner organizations. Geographically, it will cover the **four local implementation countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece and Romania**.

The evaluation & capitalization processes will start **during the last two months of the project**; thus, it will focus on the project activities carried out and results achieved up to the end of the project implementation.

The external evaluation & capitalization should focus on gathering data and information from Tdh and project partners as well as direct beneficiaries.

5. Intended users of the evaluation and capitalization results

The results of the final evaluation will be used by the:

- **CARING project team:** to reflect on and learn from how the project has performed and how it can inform the follow-on future CARING 2.0 initiatives.
- The **broader Access to Justice programme team within Tdh:** to learn from project findings, build institutional knowledge, and assess how findings can generally inform future programming in this field.
- **Senior management of all implementing organizations as well as Tdh HQ:** to assess how project learning can inform future programmatic portfolio decisions and strategy-making and what effective and corrective actions might need to be taken going forward in similar or continuation projects.
- **the donor EC DG Justice and Consumers:** to assess how its support and funds have contributed to delivering project objectives and positive changes for children's beneficiaries of restorative justice.

6. Evaluation criteria and questions

The **evaluation** should respond to the following questions:

Effectiveness:

1. How effectively capacity building and awareness raising activities worked for targeted groups of beneficiaries in adopting a tolerant, inclusive and non-violent communication behavior and to promote positive practices related to gender-equity in schools?
2. What training methods have been most effective for building the capacity of teachers to act as facilitators for their peers? What were the challenges and how were they overcome to reach the set capacity building outputs? How relevant were the innovative and practical methods used to empower teachers to address GBV issue at school level?
3. What was the trend of gender-based violence cases registered in school during the project implementation period compared with previous period (before the project start)? What measures/operational strategies were implemented by school management to prevent and to reduce gender-based violence manifestation in schools?
4. What is the understanding of gender-based violence approach and promotion of positive practices among project participants? How do participants describe in their own words the concept of reducing GBV and how do they incorporate this approach in daily interactions within school/community?
5. What were the effects of peer-to-peer activities in terms of promoting positive behaviors and gender equality activities/ initiatives by involving girls and boys in these actions?
6. How effective were the meetings with statutory stakeholders in terms of strengthening the multi-agency cooperation at local/county level for promoting a gender-sensitive approach in addressing prevention of violence in schools and communities? What changes occurred in addressing the referral process and providing protection to the GBV victims at community level?
7. To what extent the participating parents to violence against children and gender-based violence awareness raising activities got involved in combating and preventing VAC at school/community level?
8. How effectively were the social media resources produced by the project to raise awareness, spread favorable attitudes and encouraging messages aiming to reduce VAC and GBV in schools and communities?

Relevance:

9. How well does the project align with current legal, social, and institutional priorities for child protection in educational environments in implementing countries and at EU level?
10. Are there significant gaps between the project's objectives and the needs of key stakeholders (e.g., children, teachers, parents and local communities' representatives)? If yes, which ones?

Sustainability:

11. How sustainable are the project results once the project and donor funding ends?
12. Has the project influenced any institutional practices that contribute to reducing gender-based violence in schools and communities where activities were implemented?
13. To what extent could the project model be replicable for other EU countries, aiming to advocate for legislative changes for supporting an effective implementation of reducing GBV in educational environments?
14. Based on the main findings from the effectiveness and relevance perspectives, what sort of interventions should Terre des hommes and the implementation consortium focus on?
15. Did the project contribute to any educational policy review or improvement aiming to ensure safety of school students and reduce GBV in schools?

Child participation& empowerment:

16. How effective was the child participation component and the work with the children's groups throughout the project? To what extent was the voice of the child ascertained as a key aspect of the assessment and intervention processes? Are there any lessons learnt in terms of effectiveness?
17. Did the adopted child participation approach empower school children and contribute to their confidence and safety to address GBV either in school or in their communities? (in line with outcome indicator: % of boys and girls who report an improvement in their psychosocial well-being)
18. To what extent the awareness raising and training techniques used for children empowered them to fully understand and promote the concept of reducing GBV? How did the project approach contribute to empowering children to transform unequal and harmful gendered power relations in their schools?
19. How accessible and relevant are the project developed tools to the children, considering their age, language, and experiences?

The capitalization exercise should respond to questions focusing on successes & challenges encountered during project implementation, adjustments needed, quality of implementation, partnership aspects, resources needed vs resources available. Below are listed some guiding questions:

1. Which were the best practices used during project implementation who conducted to achieving project set goals and objectives?
2. Overall, how satisfied are you with the quality/performance of this project? Any further comments? What kind of feedback did the stakeholders/beneficiaries share with the project team?
3. What are the main assumptions, information gap in CARING project's theory of change that we need to verify?
4. What are the main gaps in evidence during the project implementation Tdh needs to learn about?
5. How easy to apply and conduct were the evidence gathering processes of the project?
6. How efficient were the tools applied during the project implementation for informing project outputs? What about the balance between qualitative and quantitative data gathering processes?
7. Did the project staff and implementing partners organize reflection meetings for gathering lessons learnt, best practices and recommendations aiming to enhance project implementation? To what extent were these project learnings implemented?
8. What was the result of this implementation? How were the results influenced by shaping project implementation based on what was learnt along running the project activities?
9. Is there anything needed to complement the set of indicators for accountability and learning purpose? What are the qualitative questions linked with our quantitative indicators that we must consider for ensuring rich, robust and useful information?
10. Did this project lead to any unexpected changes/ outcomes? If yes, please provide details (including why you didn't expect this to happen).
11. What activities need to be changed to make the project more effective? What new or different activities can be suggested to be considered for further replicability?
12. What about the project duration, timing or sequence of activities? Was it a perceived need to change it? If yes, why?
13. Was the Gender & Age & Diversity Marker applied during the project implementation? What was the progress made in this regard after using the tool? What should be done differently next time? Any learnings from this process?
14. How were the dynamics between partners and stakeholders? What went well? What were the challenges and why?
15. Would you involve different stakeholders or partners? If yes, who/ why? (If possible, list the partners you would choose to work with again, and those you would not), and argue the choices.
16. Was the budget sufficient? If not, why not? What activities were under-resourced?
17. Did the project have enough staff to carry out the planned activities? If not, why not? What additional competencies would have helped this project?
18. What additional support from the Region or the HQ might have helped?

19. To what extent lessons learnt and project recommendation are enabling the replicability and transferability of the approach and results to other European countries, specifically to those with similar particularities of violence in schools: Spain, Italy, Cyprus, Poland, Latvia, Slovakia?

7. Methodology

Interested applicants are invited to **propose their methodology for the conduct of the evaluation and capitalization processes**. 2 separate reports will be submitted at the end of the evaluative processes: one evaluation report and one capitalization report.

Qualitative approaches to data collection will be preferred, not excluding the use of quantitative methods. Field visits are expected to be provided in at least 2 out of the 4 implementing countries.

Existing M&E data and collected quantitative and qualitative information (from the rapid needs assessment, quantitative mid-term, feedback forms after the training of trainers, facilitators and sessions with children) will also be made available for the evaluator.

The CARING project team members should be closely involved in the data collection tools development (for consultation). They typically include one country or local coordinator per organization. Tdh and partners will be able to facilitate contact with the school representatives, local partners and children who will also be involved for data collection.

Generally, a participatory approach should be followed throughout the evaluative processes. ***The methodology proposed should also be feasible in an online format.***

The evaluation methodology should keep in mind the following **underlying principles**:

- **equality and non-discrimination** of any individual involved in the data collection and consultation process.
- **participation and inclusion of different diversity groups** to the extent possible, while ensuring that participation and inclusion does not cause any harm or distress to the individual.
- **transparency and accountability** throughout the evaluation and assessment process towards all organizations and individuals involved.
- **confidentiality** must be preserved, and names and personally identifiable information should not be collected or, if they are necessary, they should be duly coded and encrypted.
- **informed consent and assent**: should be sought from all participants, including providing them with information on the objective of the evaluation and how data will be used as well as ensuring the opportunity to ask and confirm questions before agreeing to participate.
- **child safety**: whenever children are involved, the evaluator(s) and anyone affiliated with the evaluation (assistants, translators) must sign the Tdh Child Safeguarding Policy and Code of Conduct and adhere to its principles.

8. Deliverables

During the contract, the Evaluator will provide as deliverables **–one set for the project evaluation and another one for the capitalization report (in English)**: Other languages will not be accepted. Applications must be submitted as a single application package. Documents sent separately will not be accepted.

1. **INITIAL (INCEPTION) REPORTS – in 1 week within contract start**, that includes the following: results of the initial desk review, the proposed methodology and data collection tools, an evaluation/analysis plan (in Tdh's template to be shared after contracting), and overall work plan for the assignment.

2. **DE-BRIEFING and presentation of findings from the field – in 4 weeks (after previous stage)**, that includes:
 - **Data collection reports** (documents analysis, discussions with the team and beneficiaries, feedback from beneficiaries)
 - **Short review** indicating the first findings, provisional conclusions, main trends identified etc.

3. **PRELIMINARY REPORTS – in 1 week (after the previous stage)**, comprising of:
 - **Narrative report** (min. 20 - max. 25 pages);
 - **Summary table with the main conclusions, main lessons learned and recommendations.**
 - **Short review and PPT** with main lessons learned, recommendations and conclusions.

4. **FINAL REPORTS – in 1 week (after the previous stage)**, one for the **Evaluation** and one for the **Capitalization**, each comprising of:
 - **Executive summary** (max. 3-4 pages)
 - **Narrative report** (max. 25 pages for the evaluation report and max. 15 pages for the capitalization one))
 - **Summary table with the main conclusions, main lessons learned and recommendations.**
 - **Annexes:** Containing the technical details of the evaluation, surveys protocols and questionnaires when the case, protocols of interviews, tables or graphics, secondary review references, persons and institutions contacted, a PowerPoint presentation of the findings and recommendations, transcription of relevant selection of interviews, focus groups, observations

After each stage, a feedback meeting is organized with Tdh and feedback is incorporated in the evaluation document. The evaluator is also expected to be available for regular and brief check-in calls, as necessary, throughout the assignment to share updates on the progress.

9. Chronogram

We estimate that the evaluator will require at most 25 working days. The intermediary stages of the Final Report are flexible, but the final versions of both the Project Evaluation and the Capitalization Report are to be approved by Tdh by **April 23, 2025, latest**. The final schedule will be mutually agreed considering Tdh's timeline and the suggestions made by the Evaluator in the Technical Offer.

Deliverables to be provided:	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Week 6	Week 7
Provisional Calendar:							
1. INITIAL (INCEPTION) REPORT							
2. DE-BRIEFING							
3. PRELIMINARY REPORT (design)							
4. FINAL REPORT (delivered)							

10. Roles and responsibilities

Tdh will designate an **Evaluation Manager** who will be the main focal point vis-à-vis the evaluator.

Evaluator roles and responsibilities:

- To deliver the assignment as per the signed contract, Terms of Reference and the Technical and Financial Offer and relevant annexes, including Tdh policies where applicable (e.g. those related to Data Protection and Child Safeguarding). To submit all required deliverables as per the agreed deadlines.

- To ensure that all the underlying principles (described in the methodology section) are respected throughout the evaluation.
- To ensure that the Evaluation Manager is regularly informed in case of any questions and issues (particularly, delays and blockages) that may emerge during the assignment and may require mutual discussion/planning.
- To be available for quick updates, whenever requested, on the progress of the assignment.
- To generally ensure the confidentiality of the process as well as the information and documents received from the Evaluation Manager and the people involved at any stage in the evaluation.
- To immediately inform the Evaluation Manager in case of any risk of not being able to comply with any of the above points.

11. Profile of the consultant/evaluator: qualifications and experience

Tdh will accept applications from individuals, teams, academic entities, NGOs and companies as long as they are officially registered with a European tax number (i.e. are able to issue an invoice) and have evaluation, research, impact study or similar and/or consultancy as their object of activity, which can be proven by legal documentation.

Required experience and skills:

- ✓ At least 3 quality research/evaluations/impact studies prepared for 3 different projects. Examples can be annexed unless confidential. Previous experience in conducting research/evaluations of projects in justice systems is a significant asset.
- ✓ Extensive experience in monitoring and evaluation, particularly within the context of restorative justice and children's rights.
- ✓ Proven skills in using quantitative and quality data collection and analysis methods.
- ✓ Strong understanding of data collection methodologies, with experience in evaluating tools and systems.
- ✓ Excellent analytical and report-writing skills
- ✓ Fluency (written and oral) in English.
- ✓ Strong computer proficiency to prepare quality written reports with clean data visualization and presentation of findings.
- ✓ Master's degree (or higher) in a relevant field, such as human rights, public policy in social sciences, law, research and evaluation, management or other related field(s) from an accredited university.

Contract awarding criteria:	No. of points
Technical Offer – best approach: The Technical Offer will contain: Methodology and tools proposed, showing understanding of the objective of the study and the Terms of Reference (ToR); a chronogram showing details for the realization of each of the evaluation phases. The best Technical Offer will be granted with 50 points out of the total score of 100.	50 points
CV and expertise corresponding to the required criteria	25 points
Financial Offer –demonstrating congruence with the technical approach submitted. The Financial Offer will be granted with 25 points out of the total score of 100. Prices will be expressed in Euro and should be inclusive of all expenses, charges, taxes incurred by the Contractor in fulfilment of its obligations. Additional costs for translation, logistics, transportation, accommodation, per diem etc. will not be covered separately by Tdh.	25 points
TOTAL possible	100 points

The points thus received will indicate the hierarchy of the bidders and the one that will be contracted. The Technical Offer will be evaluated by a Commission formed of representative staff from Tdh Romania and TdH Hungary. All bidders will be informed by email of the results of the selection.

12. Budget

The proposed budget for the evaluation will be provided by the consultant in the Financial Offer. All costs should be included in the budget, such as translations costs etc. as mentioned on page 9.

Upon the review of the Financial and Technical Offers, Tdh may choose to negotiate the final price with the preferred evaluator considering the Financial Offer and Tdh's available budget. Tdh may also consider the combination of the quality and competitiveness of the Technical and Financial offers, choosing the best value for money. Half of the payment will be made at the beginning of the evaluation, with the other half being paid after its conclusion.

According to the Grant Agreement with the donor, the capitalization exercise will be contracted and covered by Tdh HU, and the final evaluation by Tdh RO, so separate quotes are to be indicated in the financial offer for the respective deliverable.

13. Application procedures

Questions relating to the assignment, the project or the application process can be submitted to Manuela.Gazibar@tdh.org. Answers that may concern all applicants will be shared with everyone as deemed necessary. Interested applicants shall submit their application via e-mail to the following e-mail address: manuela.gazibar@tdh.org. The e-mail should have the subject-line: CARING End of project evaluation proposal & capitalization exercise. The deadline for submission is March 2nd, 2025. (23:59).

The application package shall include:

- Technical Offer – max. 10 pages
 - Expression of interest
 - Methodology and tools proposed, showing understanding of the objective of the study and the Terms of Reference (ToR)
 - A chronogram showing details for the realization of each of the evaluation phases. The schedule proposed should include time for briefing and debriefing with Tdh representatives as far as possible.

The Technical Offer will be developed by the bidder on its own design, but it will not exceed 10 pages.

The Technical Offer will mention on the first page the following information: Company/NGO name, Address, Phone number, email, registration number, legal representative name and function, contact person (if different) name and function, phone number and email, if different. The Technical Offer will be signed and stamped on the last page by the legal representative, mentioning the company/NGO, name of the legal representative, date, signature, stamp.

- Financial Offer – separate quotes are to be indicated for the project evaluation and the capitalization exercise, with a detailed line-item budget, indicating costs in EUR. The indicated prices should be 1) NET amounts to be received by the consultant plus 2) all local taxes.
- Up-to-date CV of the evaluator(s) – max. 3 pages/CV.
- Example of previous work carried out (if any, unless confidential or if it can be anonymized);
- Contacts of 3 professional references.
- Confirmation of legal registration (e.g. tax number, EU VAT number) of the applicant for providing evaluation services and the ability to issue an invoice.
- Declaration of impartiality (in the applicant's format).

Applications – incl. all annexes – must be in **English**. Other languages will not be accepted.

Applications must be submitted as a single application package. Documents sent separately will not be accepted.

The assessment of the applications will last until: March 6, 2025. During the evaluation process, Tdh Romania, may ask for clarifications and check the references provided.



The content of this document represents the views of Tdh Ro in its capacity as consortium member on the current project only and it is sole responsibility. The European Commission does not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains. Funded by the European Union.