



This project is funded by the European Union

Breaking the Silence:

Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in Western Balkans and Moldova



REGIONAL ANTI-CORRUPTION INITIATIVE

TENDER ANNOUNCEMENT

Tender Title	External Final Evaluation of the regional project ‘Breaking the Silence: Enhancing Whistleblowing Policies and Culture in the Western Balkans and Moldova’ funded by EU
Duty Station	Home based with travel to SEE Region
Language	English
Eligibility	Legal entities and team of individual consultants ¹
Contract type	Service Contract
Maximum allocated budget	30.000 EUR
Application deadline	March 1 st , 2023 (midnight Central European Time)
Expected starting date	March 27 th , 2023
Expected ending date	July 7 th , 2023
Bids to be submitted to	vacancy@rai-see.org

1. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

Regional Anti-corruption Initiative (RAI) is an intergovernmental regional organization comprised of nine member countries from South East Europe (SEE): Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Moldova, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Romania and Serbia; and three observer countries: Poland, Georgia and Slovenia. Kosovo* institutions are the beneficiary of RAI activities.

RAI’s mission is to lead regional cooperation in support of anti-corruption efforts, by providing a common platform for discussions, through the sharing of knowledge and best practices. RAI acts as a regional hub through which governments of the region combine their efforts to help curb corruption in the SEE.

During April 1, 2020 until March 31, 2023, RAI Secretariat has implemented the regional project ‘**Breaking the Silence: Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in Western Balkans and Moldova**’, funded by the European Union (hereafter: the project). The project covered the geographical scope of Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo*, Moldova, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Serbia. The overarching purpose of the project was to help RAI partners in the government and non-governmental sector to: 1) improve whistleblower reporting/disclosure channels and protection mechanisms, and 2) inform and sensitize the public (general public, professionals, youth) about whistleblowing as one of the most effective means in exposing and combating corruption, as well as about whistleblower rights.

¹ See Section 8 for eligibility details.

* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSC 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration on Independence

Breaking the Silence: *Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in Western Balkans and Moldova*

In addition to being instrumental in the fight against corruption², whistleblowing is considered an integral part of the right to freedom of expression and the freedom of media, because whistleblowers are an important source for investigative journalism.

An effective whistleblower protection program requires: 1) confidential reporting channels, 2) independent and empowered public institutions responsible for handling whistleblower reports, with authority to investigate allegations, promote the use of effective whistleblower protection law and protect employees, 3) prohibition against retaliation, with independent remedy requiring a make-whole remedy and last but not least 4) strong civil, criminal and administrative sanctions punishing corruption.³ The project aimed at contributing to the fulfilment of all, but the last of the noted requirements, by addressing legislative gaps, strengthening public institutions responsible for handling whistleblower reports, supporting inter-sector dialogue, as well as promoting the use of whistleblower protection laws through a public education and information campaign. It did so at a regional level, through collaboration with public institutions, civil society organizations and media, in coordination with other donor funded projects and international organizations. The project built its activities on earlier achieved results in whistleblower protection in Western Balkans and Moldova, and used the EU Whistleblower Protection Directive⁴ as a benchmark.

Beneficiaries of the project and affiliated entities included: ministries of justice, anticorruption agencies, public institutions in the health and education sector, civil society organizations (involved in public policy advocacy, legal aid and other support to whistleblowers and those who wish to learn and engage in such activity in their specific sector: education, youth, health), media, general public with special focus on youth, and professional community gathered around regional and international organizations and networks.

Final beneficiaries of the project were staff handling whistleblower reports and employees as potential whistleblowers; whereas the target groups are the society at large, especially the youth from whom corruption steals prospects.

In line with the design of the project, the impact of the project defined as *'contributing to the strengthened resilience of societies and their administrations to corruption in Western Balkans and Moldova'* could be seen during the lifetime of the project. With that said, [2021 Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index \(CPI\)](#), published in January 2022, revealed that among Project beneficiary jurisdictions, the best ranked in the fight against corruption is Montenegro (rank: 64, score: 46/100), followed by North Macedonia and Kosovo* (shared rank: 87, shared score: 39/100) Serbia (rank: 96, score: 38/100), Moldova (rank: 105, score: 36/100), and Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina (shared rank: 110, shared score: 35/100). Compared to 2020, Project beneficiary jurisdictions which made a progress according to CPI are North Macedonia (by 4 points), Kosovo* (by 3 points), Moldova (by 2 points) and Montenegro (by 1 point), whereas others stagnated (Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia) or regressed (Albania, by 1 point).

Finally, during the first quarter 2022, the project underwent a mid-term evaluation, under the [Results Oriented Monitoring Mission](#) (hereinafter: ROM) carried out by the EC DG NEAR, which resulted in a Results Oriented Monitoring Report (April 2022). The report provided valuable insights and recommendations for the way forward in the remaining period of the project, and will be made available to the Evaluator.

2. PURPOSE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

The purpose of this assignment is to conduct the external final evaluation of the project. Final evaluations take place at the operational closure of an intervention and contribute to accountability by providing an

² According to US Department of Justice data, whistleblowers were the source of the detection of 91.8% of all civil fraud recovered in FY 2017.

³ Presentation by Mr. Stephen Cohn, Chairman of the Board of Directors, National Whistleblower Centre, at the First Annual Multi-Beneficiary Training on Whistleblower Protection, February 2021.

⁴ European Directive (EU) 2019/1937 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2019 on the protection of persons who report breaches of [European] Union law

Breaking the Silence:

Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in Western Balkans and Moldova

assessment of the results achieved. Furthermore, they contribute to learning by explaining the factors that made possible, or hindered, the achievement of results (their focus is therefore on why, not only on what), and by identifying any key lessons that would lead to improved future interventions in the region of operation and elsewhere.

3. OBJECTIVE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programs and activities is an established priority⁵ of the European Commission⁶, as the donor of the project, and RAI Secretariat as the implementing partner. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the quality and the results⁷ of interventions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy, with increasing emphasis on result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.⁸

From this perspective, the external final evaluation should look for evidence of why, whether and how the intervention has contributed to the achievement of these results and seek to identify the factors driving or hindering progress.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide RAI Secretariat and the European Union, as well as other interested stakeholders with:

1. an overall independent assessment of the performance of the regional project 'Breaking the Silence: Enhancing Whistleblowing Policies and Culture in the Western Balkans and Moldova', paying particular attention to its different levels of results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results,
2. key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve current and future interventions by RAI Secretariat.

Additionally, the external evaluation will inform:

3. the decision-making on the appropriateness and thematic priorities of the next phase of the intervention; and,
4. the next phase of programming.

The main users of this evaluation will be RAI Secretariat and Steering Group of RAI, EC DG NEAR and EU Delegations of project beneficiary jurisdictions.

4. METHODOLOGY, EVALUATION CRITERIA AND INDICATIVE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

In this evaluation, both qualitative and quantitative research methods will be applied. The analysis will build on information collected from beneficiaries and stakeholders, available data, as well as a desk review. The methodology should incorporate the following elements:

- Desk research, including review of all relevant project documents: Description of Intervention with Action Plan, LogFrame, analysis and training material developed, on-line learning tools, progress reports, etc.

⁵ COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

⁶ SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf ; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf ; COM(2017) 651 final "Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results", https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf

⁷ Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf.

⁸ The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC>

Breaking the Silence:

Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in Western Balkans and Moldova

- Individual meetings and semi-structured interviews with RAI Secretariat staff, beneficiaries, stakeholders, with particular focus on youth organizations and other CSOs benefiting from project activities.
- Online survey for project beneficiaries, which will allow for comparison of results.

A methodology is expected to be developed by the Evaluator during the inception phase, and shared with RAI Secretariat for approval.

The evaluation will assess the intervention using the six standard [DAC evaluation criteria](#), namely: relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and perspectives of impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess the intervention(s) through an [EU specific evaluation criterion](#), which is the EU added value. The definitions of the 6 DAC + 1 EU evaluation criteria are contained for reference in Annex II.

Furthermore, the evaluation team should consider whether principles of public administration reform⁹ were applied; gender equality and women's empowerment¹⁰ were mainstreamed; the relevant Sustainable Development Goals and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No One Behind and the Human Rights-Based Approach was followed during design, and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the intervention, its governance and monitoring.

The specific evaluation questions, as formulated below, are indicative. Following initial consultations and document analysis, and further to the finalization/reconstruction of the Intervention Logic, the Evaluator will discuss these with the Evaluation Manager¹¹ in their Inception Report a complete and finalized set of Evaluation Questions (hereinafter: EQ). This will include an indication of specific judgement criteria and indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

The indicative evaluation questions include:

- 1. Relevance:** The extent to which the objectives address the real problems and the needs of its target groups, country priorities, associated national policies and donor priorities. Questions to be explored include:
 - 1.1. To what extent are the project's objectives still valid?
 - 1.2. To what extent have the stakeholders been taken into consideration, participated, or been involved in the development and implementation?
 - 1.3. Does the project respond to the needs of the identified target groups and beneficiaries?
 - 1.4. Are the project's objectives and outcomes consistent and supportive of governmental policies, sectoral policies, and EU accession agenda?
 - 1.5. Was the design of the project appropriate for reaching its results and outcomes?
 - 1.6. Have any changes been made to the project's design during the implementation? If yes, did they lead to significant design improvements?

⁹ Read more on principles of public administration reform at: <https://www.sigmaweb.org/publications/principles-public-administration-nov2014.pdf>

¹⁰ Read more on Evaluation with gender as a cross-cutting dimension by following this link (outdated, produced at the time of the GAP II): https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/documents/new-guidance-note-evaluation-gender-cross-cutting-dimension

¹¹ The Evaluation Manager is the staff member of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational Manager of the Action(s) under evaluation.

Breaking the Silence:

Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in Western Balkans and Moldova

- 1.7. Were coordination, management and financing arrangements clearly defined and did they support institutional strengthening and local ownership?
- 2. Project Efficiency** (processes): Were inputs utilised or transformed into outputs in the most optimal or cost-efficient way? Could the same results be produced by utilizing fewer resources? Questions to be explored include:
 - 2.1. To what extent have beneficiaries and stakeholders taken an active role in implementing the project? What modes of participation have taken place?
 - 2.2. To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled and with the planned financial resources?
- 3. Project Effectiveness** (results): The extent to which the objectives of the intervention have been achieved or are expected to be achieved, bearing in mind their relative importance. How well project's results contribute to the achievement of project's objectives?
 - 3.1. To what extent have the project outputs and outcomes been achieved?
 - 3.2. What factors contributed to progress or delay in the achievement of products and results?
 - 3.3. What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples have been identified?
 - 3.4. Have any changes in the overall context in the region affected project implementation and overall results?
- 4. Project Impact:** The effect of the project on its environment - the positive and negative changes produced by the project (directly or indirectly, intended or unintended).
 - 4.1. In which areas did the project have a significant impact (if identifiable at this stage)?
 - 4.2. How have international best practices been advanced through the project activities?
 - 4.3. What factors favorably or adversely affected the project delivery and approach? Was the project successful in overcoming any external negative factors?
 - 4.4. Were there positive spill-over effects?
- 5. Project Sustainability:** Probability of the benefits of the project continuing in the long term.
 - 5.1. Has the project created conditions to ensure that benefits continue beyond the project?
 - 5.2. How well is the project embedded in the institutional structures that will survive beyond the life of the project?
 - 5.3. Has an approach/model been developed that can be further disseminated throughout the region?
 - 5.4. Is the current project sufficient to ensure sustainability of the interventions?
 - 5.5. Which recommendations can be made to inform future strategies and programming?
- 6. Project Coherence:** The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.
 - 6.1. To what extent were the project activities coordinated with other interventions in the region, to secure added value and avoid duplication of effort?

Breaking the Silence:

Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in Western Balkans and Moldova

When answering the above evaluation questions, the evaluator will assess whether and how principles of public administration reform, gender equality requirements, SDG, human rights, as well as EU Added Value, were reflected in the design and implementation of project activities.

5. DELIVERABLES AND DEADLINES

The evaluation process will be carried out in three phases and two activities:

1. Inception phase
2. Interim phase
 - Desk activities
 - Field activities
3. Synthesis phase

Inception Phase

Objectives of the phase: to structure the evaluation and clarify the key issues to be addressed.

Main activities of the Evaluator during the Inception Phase

- Initial review of background documents (see Annex III).
- Kick-off session between RAI Secretariat and the Evaluator.
- Initial interviews with key stakeholders.
- Finalisation or reconstruction of the description of the Intervention Logic/Theory of Change and its underlying assumptions.
- Finalisation of the Evaluation Questions, based on the indicative questions contained in the Terms of Reference and on the reconstructed Intervention Logic.
- Finalisation of the evaluation methodology.
- Workplan of subsequent phases.
- Preparation of the Inception Report.
- Presentation of the Inception Report to RAI Secretariat, supported by a slide presentation.
- Revision of the report (as relevant) following receipt of comments.

Interim Phase

This phase is entirely devoted to gathering and analyzing the information required to provide preliminary answers to the EQs. Work in this phase will consist of two activities.

1. Desk activities - review of documentation and interviews with key stakeholders and other initial data collection using different tools such as surveys.
2. Field activities - further data collection and analysis with the aim of testing the hypotheses identified during the 'Desk activities'.

Desk activities

Objectives of the activities: to analyze the relevant data, draft preliminary answers to the Evaluation Questions and identify the hypotheses to be tested.

Main activities of the Evaluator

- In-depth analysis of relevant documents and other sources.
- Identification of interviewees
- Finalisation of the organisation of the field visits,.
- Preparation of the Desk Note;
- Presentation of the preliminary findings from the desk activities to RAI Secretariat, supported by a slide presentation.
- Consideration of the comments to the Desk Note to be addressed in the next reports.

Field activities

Objectives of the activities: to conduct primary research and validate/modify the hypotheses formulated during the desk activities.

Breaking the Silence:

Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in Western Balkans and Moldova

The Evaluator will seek additional information in the field to complement the inception, data collection and analysis. This will entail in-country data collection and analysis - Approximately 10 working days spent in the SEE Region – minimum 4 beneficiary countries, to capture additional data from the beneficiaries and stakeholders.

Main activities of the Evaluator

- Completion of primary research following the methodology described in the Inception Report.
- Preparation of the Field Note;
- Presentation of the Field Note findings and preliminary conclusions, supported by a slide presentation.

Synthesis Phase

Objectives of the phase: to report on results from the evaluation (final answers to the Evaluation Questions (final findings) and formulate conclusions and recommendations).

Main activities of the Evaluator

- Analysis and synthesis of the evidence and data collected during the previous phases to provide a final answer to the Evaluation Questions.
- Preparation of the Draft Final Report;
- Presentation of the Draft Final Report to RAI Secretariat, supported by a slide presentation.
- Preparation of the Executive Summary.

Evaluation phases	Deliverables and meetings	Timing
Inception phase	• Meeting: kick off	Two weeks
	• Inception Report	
	• Meeting: presentation of Inception Report	
Interim phase: Desk activities	• Desk Note	Four weeks
	• Slide presentation	
	• Meeting: presentation of Desk Note	
Interim phase: Field activities	• Intermediary note	Four weeks
	• Slide presentation	
	• Meeting: debriefing on intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings	
Synthesis phase	• Draft Final Report	Three weeks
	• Meeting: presentation of the Draft Final Report	
	• Comments on the draft QAG	
	• Final Report	
	• Executive summary of the Final Report	

Breaking the Silence:

Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in Western Balkans and Moldova

6. INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

The following is an indicative list of the documents that RAI Secretariat will make available to the selected Evaluator shortly after the contract signature:

- Grant Contract, including the Description of Intervention with Action Plan, LogFrame and Budget;
- Intervention quarterly and interim progress reports, and technical reports available;
- Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Report;
- Relevant laws and political commitments pertaining to the intervention to be evaluated, as reflected in EU related accession documents;
- Intervention analysis and model solutions;
- Content of whistleblowing on-line tools;
- Training material;
- Survey results;
- Materials produced under the Regional Public Information and Education Campaign on Whistleblowing European Commission's
- Contact information of beneficiaries and stakeholders;
- Contact information of staff, experts and partners;
- any other relevant document and information.

Note: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analyzing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the intervention.

7. FINANCES

Maximum gross contracted amount shall not exceed 30.000 EUR. If the applicant is a legal entity subject to VAT in BiH, the offer shall be indicated without VAT. All other legal entity applicants shall indicate VAT-inclusive amounts in their offers, should they be subject to VAT in their respective countries.

Applicants shall send a financial proposal based on a Lump Sum Amount. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all cost components required to perform the tasks identified in the tender announcement, including professional fee, regional and local travel and lodging costs, interpretation and translation expenses, and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the applicant in completing the assignment. The contract price shall be fixed output-based price regardless of potential extension of the specified duration.

Payments shall be done upon completion and approval of the phases/deliverables and as per below percentages:

Completion of Phase 1 and 2 - 50% of total contract amount (approval of Inception Report, Desk and Field Notes),

Completion of Phase 3 - 50% of total contract amount (approval of final Evaluation Report).

Payment schedule is tentative and shall be subject to negotiation in case of unpredicted delays in implementation or other potential implementation interruptions.

In case the selected applicant is a team of individual consultants, the contract shall be signed with the team leader only. All payments shall be made towards the team leader only.

Breaking the Silence:

Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in Western Balkans and Moldova

8. SUPERVISION, REPORTING, EVALUATION ETHICS AND QUALITY CONTROL

The Evaluator will operate under the overall supervision of the Senior Anticorruption Advisor of RAI Secretariat and the immediate supervision of the RAI Secretariat Chief Programme and Communication Officer. All deliverables should be submitted to the Chief Programme and Communication Officer, who will act as the Evaluation Manager. RAI Secretariat and EU shall have ownership of the outputs listed above.

All evaluations must be credible and free from bias; they must respect dignity and diversity and protect stakeholders' rights and interests. The Evaluator must ensure confidentiality and anonymity of informants and be guided by professional standards and ethical and moral principles in observation of the 'do no harm' principle. The approach of framework contractors to observe these obligations must be explicitly addressed in the specific Organization and Methodology, and implemented by the evaluation team throughout the evaluation, including during dissemination of results.

The outputs will be written in English in a concise and user-friendly language. Throughout the evaluation and following approval of the Inception Report, if any significant deviation from the work plan could compromise the quality of the evaluation or jeopardize the completion of the specific contract within the contractual timeframe, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures taken.

The Evaluator shall ensure an internal quality control during the implementing and reporting phase of the assignment. The quality control should ensure that the deliverables comply with the above requirements and meet appropriate DAC quality standards before sending them to RAI Secretariat. The quality control should ensure consistency and coherence between findings and recommendations. It should also ensure that findings reported are duly substantiated and that solutions are supported by the relevant judgment criteria. More specifically, the Evaluator will make sure that:

- the assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted;
- when drafting the report, s/he will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be taking place already;
- the wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, considers the audience of the evaluation report.

9. ELIGIBILITY

This tender is open to all relevant legal entities and teams of individual consultants in accordance with the EU PRAG¹² nationality rule.

10. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

The evaluation will be conducted by a a legal entity or team of individual consultants (hereinafter: the Evaluator). The Evaluator will have substantial experience in conducting results-oriented evaluations of international development projects and programs and/or in complex/strategic assessments, focused on capacity-building in the fields of good governance and rule of law. The Evaluator will have professional experience with project cycle management, DAC evaluation framework, logical framework approaches and with quality assurance within international development evaluations.

¹² [PRAG Practical Guide June 2022](#)

Breaking the Silence:

Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in Western Balkans and Moldova

Applicants shall be evaluated against the following criteria:

Type of Expert/Criteria	Senior Expert Team Leader	Expert Team member(s)
Education & behavioural competences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Advanced university degree (Master's degree or equivalent) in law, public administration, social sciences, economics, business administration, evaluation or related field and preferably formal training/education in evaluation methodologies and principles. ✓ Excellent communication and writing skills in English. Additionally, other language(s) of the SEE Region would be considered as an advantage. ✓ Display of cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ University degree in law, public administration, social sciences, economics, business administration, evaluation or related field and preferably formal training/education in evaluation methodologies and principles. ✓ Excellent communication and writing skills in English. Additionally, other language(s) of the SEE Region would be considered as an advantage. ✓ Display of cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
Years of experience in evaluation	>10	>5
General work Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Experience in leading evaluations of capacity-building programs or initiatives in the field of development assistance with focus on good governance/ access to justice/ sustainable development/ rule of law/gender/ human rights/international development policies and frameworks; ✓ Demonstrated knowledge of /DAC evaluation quality standards and/or DeGeval Standards. ✓ Hands-on experience in conducting results-oriented formative, summative and meta evaluations; ✓ Substantive knowledge of principles of Results-based management; ✓ Demonstrated experience in gender sensitive evaluation methodologies and analysis, and understanding of human rights and ethical issues related to evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Experience in conducting/ co-leading evaluations of capacity building programs or initiatives in the field of development assistance with focus on good governance/ access to justice/ sustainable development/ rule of law/gender/ human rights; ✓ Demonstrated knowledge of DAC evaluation quality standards and/or DeGeval Standards; ✓ Hands-on experience in conducting formative and summative results-oriented evaluations; ✓ Knowledge of principles of results-based management.
Specific technical competencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Experience in anti-corruption work, partnerships between Governments and Civil Society 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Experience in anti-corruption work, partnerships between Governments and Civil

Breaking the Silence:

Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in Western Balkans and Moldova

	<p>Organizations, policy planning and policy analysis;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ A minimum of 5 projects and programme evaluations conducted using quantitative and qualitative methodology, including and a track record of conducting evaluations in the SEE Region;✓ Experience in conducting external evaluations of EU funded projects and programmes would be considered an advantage.	<p>Society Organizations, policy planning and policy analysis;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ A minimum of 1 project and programme evaluation conducted using quantitative and qualitative methodology, including a track record of conducting evaluations in the SEE Region.
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Interested applicants shall supply the following documents/information when submitting the proposals:

1. Applicant summary details (Composition of the team, names of team members, position in the team, general contact details, etc.);
2. Evidence of evaluation experience on similar matters with references;
3. Information about applicant's capacity and capability and composition of the proposed team (CVs);
4. Technical Proposal outlining methodology, approach and implementation plan in line with tentative deadlines (3 pages max);
5. Availability/Commencement date;
6. Financial proposal in EUR. The financial proposal shall be gross and contain a price breakdown based on outputs/deliverables against which partial payments can be made;
7. Declaration on honour/Certification signed by the team leader or legal entity representative (Annex 1 of this announcement)
8. In case the applicant is a legal entity, the following documents shall be submitted as well:
 - a. Signed Statement of Exclusion (Annex 2 of this announcement)
9. Copy of the registration; In case the applicant is a team of individual consultants, the following document shall also be submitted:
 - a. Certificate of citizenship

The applicants must not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of the intervention which is being evaluated.

9. EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS

RAI Secretariat applies a fair and transparent selection process that considers both the technical qualification as well as the financial proposals submitted in support of the applications.

The contract shall be awarded to the applicant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as: responsive/compliant/ acceptable, and having received the highest score based on technical and financial criteria defined below.

RAI Secretariat will inform applicants about the outcome of the bidding process not later than March 20, 2023.

Criteria:

Technical Evaluation – documents based (85%)

Out of which:

A Technical Proposal outlining methodology, approach and implementation plan in line with tentative deadlines – 35 percentage points;

CVs of the key team members on the assignment – 20 percentage points;

Breaking the Silence:

Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in Western Balkans and Moldova

Expertise of the Applicant – evidence of previous work on similar matters with references – 30 percentage points.

Financial Evaluation (15%)

Evaluation of submitted financial offers will be done based on the following formula:

$$S = F_{\min} / F * 15$$

S - score received on financial evaluation;

F_{min} - the lowest financial offer out of all the submitted offers qualified over the technical evaluation round;

F - financial offer under the consideration.

The lowest evaluated financial bid price shall be awarded 15 points. All other financial bids shall be awarded a number of points according to the following formula:

$$\text{Total price of lowest financial bid} / \text{Total price assessed tender} * 15$$

10. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Potential applicants may send in additional questions. Questions shall be sent in English no later than ten (10) days before the submission deadline to vacancy@rai-see.org. Answers will be provided no later than five (5) days before the deadline for submitting proposals. All questions and answers that may be relevant to other applicants as well will be published on the RAI Secretariat website. Information on senders will not be disclosed.

11. HOW TO APPLY

Full applications with supporting documents shall be sent by midnight of March 1st, 2023 (23:59 CET) by email to RAI Secretariat (vacancy@rai-see.org).

Tender Title needs to be indicated in the email subject line.

Acknowledgment receipt shall be sent for all received applications.

Late and incomplete applications will not be taken into consideration.

RAI Secretariat is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Women-owned legal entities and women-led consortia are encouraged to apply.

All applications will be treated in strictest confidence.

ANNEX 1

Statement of Exclusion

<As part of their application, each legal entity must submit a signed declaration using this format. >

We have examined and accept in full the content of the dossier for <OPEN CALL TITLE>. We hereby accept its provisions in their entirety, without reservation or restriction.

This application is valid for a period of <...> days from the final date for submission of tenders.

We are not in any of the situations excluding us from participating in procurement procedure, namely;

- we are not bankrupt or being wound up, or having our affairs administered by the courts, or are in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided for in national legislation or regulations;
- we have not been convicted of an offence concerning our professional conduct by a judgment of a competent authority;
- we have fulfilled obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions and the payment of taxes
- we have not been the subject of a judgment which has the force of *res judicata* for fraud, corruption, involvement in a criminal organization, money laundering or any other illegal activity

If required, we can provide the proof usual under the law of the country in which we are established that we do not fall into these exclusion situations.

.....
<LEGAL ENTITY AUTHORIZED
REPRESENTATIVE (signature, full
name,function, legal entity stamp)>



This project is funded
by the European Union

Breaking the Silence:

*Enhancing the whistleblowing policies and culture in
the Western Balkans and Moldova*



**REGIONAL
ANTI-CORRUPTION
INITIATIVE**

ANNEX 2

Declaration on Honour/Certification

To be completed and signed by the person legally authorised to sign on behalf of the legal entity.

Hereby, I, the undersigned, certify that

- all information contained in this application is correct to the best of my knowledge and that I am aware of the content of the annexes to the application;
- the applicant/team members are not under formal investigation, nor has been sanctioned by any national authority for engaging or having engaged in proscribed practices, including but not limited to: corruption, fraud, coercion, collusion, obstruction, or any other unethical practice;
- I read the RAI Code of Conduct⁴ and will abide by it during the implementation of the grant;
- understand that if I provide incorrect information or withhold relevant information, I am likely to be suspended from the tender procedure;
- understand and accept to sign the Agreement with RAI Secretariat and accept the responsibility for its implementation.
- the applicant/team members were not involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of the intervention which is being evaluated.

By signing this declaration on honour, I accept all the conditions set out in the Tender Announcement related to the call under which I apply.

Done at:

[CITY]

Date:

Name and position:

Signature:

Stamp of the applicant organization (if applicable)

¹ As prescribed in RAI Office Policies Manual- http://www.rai-see.org/php_sets/uploads/2019/11/20191002-1-Office_Policies_Manual-Adopted-Clean-Version-FINAL.pdf