

## Answers to questions regarding call for tenders

**Subject:** Project's Final Evaluation

**Project:** INSPIRED Moldova

**Q1: I would like to submit a request for clarification regarding a potential conflict of interest in relation to the current evaluation assignment (...) While I was serving as (...), the organisation was awarded a grant from (...) under the INSPIRED Moldova programme (...) Approximately ten days later, my mandate ended, before the implementation process started. The project implementation phase began on (...), and since then I have had no involvement in the project, neither in implementation, nor in reporting, nor in management. Could you please confirm whether this prior formal involvement, limited to signing the contract before the start of implementation and followed by the end of my mandate, would be considered a conflict of interest or an eligibility concern for participation in the tender and evaluation assignment?**

This does not constitute a conflict of interest.

**Q2: There is a reference to any related costs to travel - we would like to know if you expect the team of experts to travel to Moldova for in person meetings / focus groups OR if you expect to have one of the experts based in Rep. of Moldova? From your experience, can we plan the evaluation without being present in the country or is it highly advisable to have experts present there?**

Neither the eligibility requirements nor the evaluation criteria specify any geographic requirement regarding where experts must be located or based. The evaluation criteria are detailed in Annex 1.

**Q3: On the language aspect - how many of the target group NGOs, the ones who are expected to be part of interviews / stakeholders, are Russian speaking only? We do have the English and Romanian capacity in the team. We need to know how important it is to have the Russian speaking capacity.**

We estimate that out of 70 organisations benefiting from FSTP schemes, only 1 of them does not speak Romanian and only Russian.

**Q4: In the description of the project you speak of “tools and resources” to be provided to the Moldovan civil society. How many grants (FSTP) have been awarded during the lifetime of the project so far? Your webpage speaks of the support for 70 Moldovan CSO but this number probably also includes technical support.**

The number of FSTP beneficiaries is 70 overall.

**Q5: What kind of technical support has been provided to the beneficiaries — in addition to the FSTP — directly by the INSPIRED consortium partners or through the third-party providers engaged by them? (The project description mentions “help desks; training programmes on advocacy, policy analysis, and digital tool; and knowledge exchanges on EU policies.” Have there been any other actions?)**

The technical support was provided by the specific expertise of a Consortium member in CSO development. For FSTP beneficiaries, delivered structured capacity development, including baseline needs assessments, tailored training and continuous mentoring throughout implementation. For civil society more generally, they established a national help desk and organised a Training of Trainers and cascade training on digital skills, as well as thematic sessions on several topics related to CSOs development.

**Q5: In ToR you ask the consultants to contribute to substantiation of already harvested outcomes and to add newly identified outcomes to the project database. The latter should be the result of qualitative data collection for the sake of responding to evaluation questions and preparing the case studies. Please confirm that you do not expect consultants to organize an additional full-fledged harvest.**

Indeed, your understanding is correct : only the data collection which will be organised to produce two case studies will provide an opportunity to harvest additional outcomes and/or substantiate existing ones. Nevertheless, it will be expected from the evaluators to thoroughly review the list of collected outcomes before the design of the interview guidelines, in order to maximise the integration of the already harvested outcomes in the final evaluation report.

**Q6: The Case study No. 2 is supposed to address the barriers CSOs are facing regarding their effective participation in the policy making process. As it is suggested that the case study should focus on Outcomes 3 and 4, our current understanding is that the study should emphasize the barriers originating in internal capacities of CSOs and the barriers originating in systemic or international conditions should be mentioned, but not emphasized. Please confirm if this understanding is correct.**

An analysis of the external and internal barriers faced by CSOs in their work promoting democratic governance has already been produced at the inception of the project. Evaluators will be expected to thoroughly review the document ahead of designing the case study n°2.

**Q7: The Commissioner requires the consultants to hand in "transcripts of the interviews and focus groups & raw results of surveys." Please specify whether these transcripts could be anonymized.**

The transcript should be indeed anonymised. A clean summary of the transcripts should suffice.

**Q8: The Annex 2 – Application form has a section on References where the tenderer is asked to provide two references that EPD can contact. Our questions about this are as follows: Is the EPD looking for company or individual references? In other words, should the references be for assignments/work conducted by the bidding organisation, or by the proposed individual evaluators, or both can be accepted? Are there any technical or thematic requirements for the references? For example, do the references need to be for evaluations of similar nature, i.e. evaluations of EU-funded projects, covering democratic processes and CSO support, etc.?**

References may relate either to assignments carried out by the bidding organisation or to work undertaken by the proposed individual evaluator(s). What matters is that the references are relevant to the services being tendered and that EPD is able to contact them if needed. There is no rigid technical template for the references. References linked to similar evaluations, particularly of EU-funded projects and/or projects related to democratic processes, civic participation, or support to civil society, would be especially relevant, but others are accepted of course.