

## Call for Tender: Evaluation of the BIG Programme



The service FVI of **ENSV-FVI** is inviting tenders for the evaluation of the **BIG Programme** (Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and the Philippines) funded by the **MEAE** and **STDF**. This evaluation aims to assess the achievements, effectiveness, and outcomes of the programme, as well as identify key learnings and recommendations for future projects.

This call for tender is directed at qualified consultants or consultancy firms with expertise in programme evaluation, particularly in the fields of livestock governance, capacity building, and international development.

### Tender Deadline:

The deadline for submission of tenders is **5pm (GMT+1), 27 January 2025**. Late submissions will not be considered.

### Tender Submission:

All tenders must be submitted via email to the following address: [fvi@vetagro-sup.fr](mailto:fvi@vetagro-sup.fr)

## How to apply

Tenderers are invited to submit their bids via email no later than 5:00 PM (GMT+1) on 27 January 2025 to the following address: [fvi@vetagro-sup.fr](mailto:fvi@vetagro-sup.fr). **The bid must be written in English.**

The tender must include the following documents:

- **A technical proposal / methodology** (maximum 15 pages) which should include the bidders' understanding of the **terms of reference** (refer to APPENDIX 1), and a specific proposal for implementation, including a provisional timetable, and a detailed budget. It should be noted that the concise methodology should not consist of copying and pasting the information contained in the present terms of reference. The format for the technical proposal / methodology is free.
- A provisional breakdown of the number of days per phase, using the attached **financial form** (provided in Annex A);
- The **Curriculum vitae** of the consultants involved in the work, with justification of the expert's qualifications (see below)

## Evaluator's profile and qualifications

Independent project evaluations are carried out by consultants with the necessary expertise and experience to deliver on the terms of reference for the evaluation. The profile and qualifications of the senior expert are as follows:

- Qualifications and skills:
  - University degree in economics, agriculture/rural development/food safety and/or programme evaluation/management;
  - In-depth knowledge of the principles and working methods of project cycle management;
  - In-depth knowledge of monitoring and evaluation principles (logical framework approach, results-based management, etc.) as well as evaluation and monitoring tools and methodologies;
  - Knowledge of the country's institutional context in the field of agriculture/rural development/food safety would be an asset;
  - Knowledge of the agri-food sector in other countries in the region would be an asset;
  - Ability to work under pressure, and to meet deadlines.
- Professional experience:
  - Extensive and wide-ranging experience in the management of development and cooperation projects, with a minimum of 10 years of professional experience in the field of agriculture/rural development/risk-based food safety in developing countries;
  - At least 10 years of field experience in developing countries, preferably in the project's region;
  - Extensive and wide-ranging experience in the evaluation and monitoring of development and cooperation projects (minimum of three experiences), funded by different types of donors/institutions (e.g., the EU, bilateral donors like AFD/ENABEL, and/or multilateral institutions) in the field of agriculture/rural development/food safety;

- In-depth experience on sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) issues and their implications for developing countries.
- Language skills
  - Extensive knowledge of English and French;
  - Excellent report-writing skills in English or French.

\*\*\*

\*

**Annex A – Financial form**

**Appendix – Terms of Reference for the evaluation of the BIG Programme**

## ANNEX A – FINANCIAL FORM

### Financial offer: Breakdown of the total and lump-sum price

Name of the company		Manager	
---------------------	--	---------	--

	Name Expert 1	Name Expert 2	Name Expert 3		
Amount per day					

1- Evaluation framework phase	Nb of days					Total Nb of days	Amount excluding tax
<b>Sub-total (1)</b>							

2 – Data collection and analysis phase	Nb of days					Total Nb of days	Amount excluding tax
<b>Sub-total (2)</b>							

3 - Finalisation	Nb of days					Total Nb of days	Amount excluding tax

4- Other expenses						Amount excluding tax


Total Nb of days

Total cost (ST 1 + 2 + 3 + 4) excl. tax

Total cost with tax

# Appendix

## Evaluation of the BIG Programme

### Terms of Reference

---

### Table of content

<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3. KEY EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4. MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>5. METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5.1 GENERALITIES.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5.2 THE EVALUATION APPROACH/PROCESS.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5.2.1 INITIAL PHASE AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5.2.2 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS PHASE.....</b>	<b>17</b>
- <b>THE DESK PHASE.....</b>	<b>17</b>
- <b>THE FIELD PHASE.....</b>	<b>18</b>
- <b>THE SYNTHESIS PHASE / FINALIZATION.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>5.2.3 LOCATION, DOCUMENTATION AVAILABLE AND POSSIBLE INTERVIEWS.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>6. PROVISIONAL TIMETABLE.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>7. BUDGET.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>ANNEX I: TEMPLATE FOR EVALUATION FRAMEWORK (COMMON).....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>ANNEX II: TEMPLATE FOR PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT (PROJECT STDF) .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>ANNEX III: TEMPLATE FOR PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT (PROJECT FSPI) .....</b>	<b>26</b>

## List of acronymes

AVSF : Agronomes et Vétérinaires sans Frontières  
BAI: Bureau of Animal Industry (Philippines)  
BIG: Biosecurity in pIG production  
CGAAER: Conseil Général de l'Alimentation, de l'Agriculture et des espaces ruraux  
CIRAD: Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement  
COFIL: comité de pilotage / steering committee  
DAH: Department of Animal Health (Vietnam)  
DLF: Directorate of Live and Fisheries (Laos)  
ENSV-FVI : École Nationale des Services Vétérinaires - France Vétérinaire International  
FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization  
GDAH: General Directorate of Animal Health and Production (Cambodia)  
FSPI: Fonds de solidarité pour les projets innovants, les sociétés civiles, la francophonie et le développement humain  
MASAF: Ministère de l'agriculture, de la souveraineté alimentaire et de la forêt  
MEAE: Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires Étrangères  
STDF: Standards and Trade Development Facility  
WOAH: World Organisation for Animal Health

## 1. Introduction

### a) Rapid presentation of the Programme under evaluation

This section provides a brief overview of the Programme under evaluation. All relevant programme information and documentation will be made available to the selected evaluators. For a detailed list of available documents, please refer to the list provided in **section 5.2.3**. Additional resources can also be accessed on the [Big Programme website](#).

**Programme Context** - The BIG programme operates in the context of African Swine Fever (ASF), a highly resistant viral disease that affects domestic and wild pigs, causing mortality rates of up to 90-100%. Although vaccine solutions are being developed, improved biosecurity remains the most effective measure against the spread of the virus. ASF, which first emerged in China in August 2018, rapidly spread to Southeast Asia, with significant impacts on Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and the Philippines. The disease poses a severe threat to the region's pork industry and raises concerns about food and nutritional security. In response, each affected country developed a national action plan, supported by the Global Framework for the Progressive Control of Transboundary Animal Diseases (GF-TAD), led by WOA and FAO.

However, the effective and coordinated implementation of recognised biosecurity measures remains a critical need for these countries, requiring sustained support and resources.

**Programme design** - The BIG Programme combines two **distinct projects**, each supported by a different donor:

- The **FSPI Project No. 2022-87**, titled "Reinforcing Biosecurity Measures in the Pork Sector in Cambodia, Laos, the Philippines, and Vietnam to Combat the Spread of African Swine Fever (ASF)," was funded by the *Fonds de solidarité pour les projets innovants, les sociétés civiles, la francophonie et le développement humain* (FSPI) under the Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs (MEAE). The FSPI contributed **€806,372** to the BIG Programme, primarily supporting field surveys. This funding covered the period from April 25, 2022, to November 30, 2024, including a six-month extension.

- **The STDF Project (PG/978)**, titled "Improving Pig Biosecurity and African Swine Fever (ASF) Control in Four ASEAN Countries: Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and the Philippines," was financed by the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF). The **global partnership of the Standards and Trade Development Facility**<sup>1</sup> (hereafter referred to as STDF), which drives catalytic SPS improvements in developing countries that facilitate safe trade, contributing to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) related to sustainable economic growth, poverty reduction and food security. STDF programmes/projects convene and connect public, private and other stakeholders at global, regional and country level to pilot innovative and collaborative approaches, leverage expertise and resources, and deliver results in developing and least developing countries.

The STDF contributed **\$900,178** to the BIG Programme, primarily financing training-oriented activities. This funding spanned from January 2022 to January 2025.

**Programme objectives** - The BIG programme overall aims to enhance the prevention and control of African swine fever (ASF) in South-East Asia, with a particular focus on strengthening biosecurity measures on farms.

More specifically,

- The **FSPI project** aims to disseminate best practices aimed at improving farm biosecurity, based on field studies that identify areas requiring improvement. These studies, led by Cirad and AVSF, were intended to guide subsequent actions to be implemented through national authorities and public services, as well as rural stakeholders (producers, professional organizations, and village

<sup>1</sup> See: <https://www.standardsfacility.org/fr>.



communities). These actions include feedback sessions in working groups, workshops, and training programs.

- The **STDF Project** aims to secure trade in pork and pork products in the context of the spread of ASF in 4 ASEAN countries by training official veterinarians (SPS measures), farmers and pig operators (means of competitiveness and biosecurity) and laboratory staffs (diagnoses of ASF and other transboundary animal diseases) in order to facilitate trade which is a vector of economic growth for these countries and a guarantee of food security of the population that relies mainly on pork in their diet and as a means of subsistence.

The two projects complement each other under the BIG programme banner, sharing the same main immediate objective: to improve the implementation of biosecurity measures for the prevention and control of ASF. Their activities are interconnected and reinforce each other; in particular, the outputs from the FSPI project (study results) were used to design the training courses within the STDF programme.

**Programme beneficiaries** - The programme targeted five main types of beneficiaries (similar for the 2 projects):

- Pig farmers: This includes both commercial farmers and owners of smaller, subsistence family farms.
- Veterinary Services: These services from the four beneficiary countries were engaged at both the central level, through the designated national contact points and Chief Veterinary Officers (CVOs), as well as at the local level, through agents working in provinces or districts.
- Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs): As veterinary para-professionals, CAHWs play a crucial role in rural areas, where public and private veterinary services may be limited. They provide first aid, conduct epidemiological surveillance (early warning), communicate with villagers, and monitor biosecurity measures. The project focused on enhancing their technical training and worked with national authorities to explore ways to institutionalize and solidify their role in supporting, rather than competing with, existing veterinary services.
- Professional Representatives: This group includes veterinary associations, cooperatives, drug sellers, and others who provide advisory services to livestock farmers.
- Universities and Training Centres: Primarily veterinary institutions, these were key for disseminating training tools developed during the project, ensuring their adoption and continuation beyond the project's duration.

**Programme implementing partners** - The BIG programme was carried out with the active participation of four main partners:

- **CIRAD**: Specialized in agricultural research and development, particularly in the tropical and subtropical regions, focusing on improving agricultural systems and food security.
- **AVSF** (Agronomes et Vétérinaires Sans Frontières): Aimed to improve the livelihoods of rural communities, with a focus on sustainable agriculture, veterinary services, and food security in developing countries.
- **IFIP** (Institut Français du Porc): Dedicated to research and development in the pig farming sector, with a focus on improving animal health, welfare, and the efficiency of pork production systems.
- **ENSV-FVI**: France Vétérinaire International department (FVI) is a cooperation body in the field of veterinary public health for the French Ministry of Agriculture (MASAF), but ENSV is also the national school for initial and continuous training of official veterinarians, and WOAHC collaborating centre.

**Programme Governance** - FVI, responsible for coordinating international veterinary projects and ensuring the effective implementation of strategies to improve animal health and food security worldwide, oversaw the leadership and supervision of the BIG programme, in alignment with the MASAF strategy for Europe and International.

FVI appointed Mr. Loïc Evain as the BIG Programme Leader. Mr. Evain is the Inspector General of Veterinary Public Health at the High Council for Food, Agriculture, and Rural Areas (CGAAER), and a former Chief Veterinary Officer and WOAHC Delegate of France at the French Ministry of Agriculture, Food Sovereignty, and Forestry (MASAF). He worked closely with Mr. Cyril Pietruszewski, FVI Chargé de Projet, who was in charge of the BIG programme.

Additionally, the two French Agricultural Advisors (CAAs), Mrs. Marion Chaminade and Mr. Philippe Lintanf, based at the French Embassies in Hanoi (covering Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia) and Singapore (covering the Philippines), respectively, played a key role in facilitating communication between project stakeholders and the relevant authorities in the beneficiary countries.

From the beneficiary countries, national programme coordinators were appointed to support the implementation of various programme activities, in accordance with the decisions of their Chief Veterinary Officers (CVOs).

Regarding the **Programme management**, a joint Steering Committee (COPIL) for both projects under the BIG programme was established, to jointly and mutually oversee the implementation of the two operational frameworks. The COPIL provided a platform for coordination, decision-making, and ensuring alignment across both projects. The COPIL met:

- At the kick-off meeting in June 2022 in France (presentations and meeting minutes are available).
- During a face-to-face COPIL meeting in Hanoi in April 2024, which involved representatives from all four beneficiary countries (meeting minutes are available).

Additional **steering meetings** were held under both projects, including:

- Bilateral videoconference meetings with the Chief Veterinary Officers (CVOs) and technical coordinators, notably in January and February 2023, when operational action plans were presented.
- A dedicated steering committee for the French component, which met monthly. For instance, the 25th COPIL for the French part was held in September 2025. This committee included the four main partners of the project team (ENSV-FVI, CIRAD, AVSF, and IFIP) as well as the project leader. Donors were invited to these meetings, but their attendance was not always consistent.

**Programme activities** –The BIG programme embodies an integrated and sequenced approach combining exploratory missions, field studies, collaborative workshops, and training sessions to strengthen stakeholder capacities in the fight against African Swine Fever (ASF). The table below provides a summary of the activities carried out under both the STDF and FSPI projects (for which full logical framework are available), with the respective implementing partners listed in parentheses. This breakdown highlights the key actions undertaken within each project, illustrating how the contributions of each partner align with the overall objectives of the BIG programme.

FSPI project	STDF project
Output 1: Improving the knowledge on ASF impact and other pig diseases and identification	Output 1: Develop the skills of official veterinarians in SPS and trade in a context of ASF prevalence
Activity 1.1: Co-development of political and socio-economical actions (financial incentives, trainings, etc) likely to guarantee the acceptance of surveillance and biosecurity measures at national level	Activity 1.1: Adaptation of French training content on SPS and trade for the 4 partner target audiences
Sub-activity 1.1.1 (CIRAD et AVSF): Identification and detailed description of the stakeholders and existing institutional arrangements (4 countries) through cartography and analysis of stakeholder's strategies	Sub-activity 1.1.1 (CIRAD / AVSF): Needs mapping based on a pilot project (AVSF CIRAD) implemented in Laos mid 2021
Sub-activity 1.1.2 (CIRAD et AVSF): Global analysis of ASF economic impact in the 4 countries through a literature review and narrative reports for micro-analysis	Sub-activity 1.1.2 (ENSV-FVI / CIRAD): Development of face-to-face training content (pedagogical engineering) and associated training plan in agreement with partner ministries / translation
Sub-activity 1.1.3 (CIRAD): Elaboration, with all stakeholders, of strategies to improve surveillance and control of pig diseases (Laos and Cambodia)	
Activity 1.2: Describe the relative importance of pig diseases and analyse the ASF	Activity 1.2: Dissemination of training modules for the implementation and enforcement of SPS in trade (face-to-face trainings of trainers)
Sub-activity 1.2.1 (AVSF): Estimate the relative incidence and the socio-economic impact of ASF and other pig diseases (Laos and Cambodia)	Sub-activity 1.2.1 to 1.2.4 (ENSV-FVI): Training of official veterinarians in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Philippines
Sub-activity 1.2.2 (AVSF): Characterization of knowledge, attitude and practices in pig farms (Laos and Cambodia)	

FSPI project	STDF project
Sub-activity 1.2.3 (AVSF): Identification of 'biosecure' systems adapted to the local context and success stories (Laos and Cambodia)	
	Activity 1.3: Long-term sustainability of the training through a continue distance learning program and Residential Courses (ENSV-FVI)
Output 2: Development, diffusion and experimentation of operational tools to control ASF	Output 2: Develop the skills of farm managers and pig operators in strengthening the management of pig farms and the implementation of biosecurity measures
Activity 2.1: the good practices in terms of biosecurity are applied, documented and largely spread among farmers, the stakeholders of the pig sector and the local and regional authorities	Activity 2.1: Mapping of needs for the design of modern pig farming modules and support to its implementation for the reinforcement of biosecurity measures in pig farming
Sub-activity 2.1.1 (CIRAD): Reinforcement of monitoring and evaluation tools (4 countries)	Sub-activities 2.1.1 to 2.1.4 (IFIP): Experts' mission to each of the 4 countries, assessment of the situation, collection of needs and creation of contextual digital teaching materials
Sub-activity 2.1.2 (AVSF): Reinforcement of communication tools	
Sub-activity 2.1.3 (AVSF): Share innovations and good practices through existing networks and platforms	
	Activity 2.2: Design and adaptation of modern pig farming modules and support to its deployment to reinforce biosecurity measures in pig farming
	Sub-activity 2.2.1: development of the content of the e-learning modules (pedagogical engineering) and exchanges/validation/translation with local partners
	Sub-activities 2.2.2 to 2.2.5: Design, adaptation and translation of swine management and biosecurity implementation modules in each of the 4 countries
	Activity 2.3: Dissemination and face-to-face training in modern pig farming modules and support for its implementation to strengthen biosecurity measures in pig farming
	Sub-activity 2.3.1: Implementation of e-learning modules: hosting on an LMS platform, training of professionals and future trainers to the modules of pig farming and implementation of biosecurity measures in the 4 partner countries
Output 3: Provide a training adapted to the different stakeholders to better control ASF	Output 3: Develop the skills of central animal health laboratories for better identification of ASF and other transboundary animal diseases
Activity 3.1: Capacity building of official veterinarians and pig farmers on ASF control and surveillance	Activity 3.1: Identification of capacity building needs of central animal health laboratories
Sub-activity 3.1.1 (implemented as part of STDF co-financing): Strengthen training schemes for official veterinarians and pig farmers on sanitary regulations and norms (focusing on biosecurity)	Sub-activity 3.1.1: Mapping needs to adapt technical support and capacity building for central analysis laboratories (animal health)
Sub-activity 3.1.2 (ENSV-FVI): Support the development of continuous training units in the veterinary services of the 4 countries	
Activity 3.2: Capacity building of the official veterinary services active on the field and VVWs on ASF surveillance and control through adapted continuous training modules and tools	Activity 3.2: Technical and operational support for central laboratories, face-to-face training of laboratory operators and professionals related to laboratory
Sub-activity 3.2.1 (ENSV-FVI): Create a pedagogical kit related to surveillance and control programs and share it among the 4 countries	Sub-activity 3.2.1: Training central laboratory staff in animal health
Sub-activity 3.2.2 (ENSV-FVI): Share the pedagogical kit through a restitution workshop in each of the 4 countries (veterinary services and, if relevant, VVWs)	

*NB: there is no parallel between the chapter/activity numbers of the two projects*

**Programme Specificities** – The BIG Programme promotes an innovative approach through the following key elements:

- Adoption of an integrated approach: The programme combines exploratory missions, field studies, collaborative workshops, and training sessions to enhance the capacities of stakeholders.
- Emphasis on social and human sciences (SHS): In addition to the technical approach, the programme highlights the importance of social and human sciences to address behavioural and community dynamics, ensuring a holistic solution.
- Public-private partnership: The programme fosters collaboration between the public, private, and academic sectors. This PPP approach was favoured throughout the project, both at the French implementing partners level and in the beneficiary countries.

## b) The BIG Programme final evaluation

The evaluation of the BIG programme is a contractual obligation as stated in the 2 projects Agreements (with dedicated funding line for the evaluation):

- **FSPI**: this final evaluation is provided for in the agreement of 25 April 2022 and its addendum of 16 November 2023 extending the implementation of the activities until 30 November 2024.
- **STDF**, article 6.1 states that “an independent end-of-project evaluation shall be submitted no later than three (3) months after the completion of the Project”.

### Rationale for a Single Evaluation of the BIG Programme

Although the BIG programme comprises two distinct projects—FSPI and STDF—with different funding sources and operational frameworks, these projects share a unified objective: improving biosecurity measures to prevent and control African Swine Fever (ASF) in South-East Asia. The projects are highly complementary and interdependent, with overlapping activities and common beneficiaries. Evaluating both projects together through a single evaluation will:

- Provide a holistic and accurate understanding of the programme’s overall effectiveness and impact, capturing the synergy between both projects.
- Offer deep insights into how the activities of each project have reinforced and maximized the impact of the other. For example, the outputs from the FSPI project directly informed the training and capacity-building components of the STDF project, strengthening their combined outcomes.
- Enable a comprehensive assessment of how the programme has supported its beneficiaries across both projects. Since the same groups of beneficiaries are involved in both, a single evaluation will provide a clear picture of the cumulative impact.
- Facilitate clearer conclusions about the programme’s success and identify areas for improvement, by consolidating findings from both projects into one unified assessment.
- Ensure consistency in evaluation methodology and reporting, which is crucial for producing coherent and comparable results. This consistency is particularly important when the projects are so closely aligned in both objectives and activities.
- Streamline the evaluation process, reducing administrative burden and avoiding duplication of efforts. This will lead to a more efficient allocation of resources for both the evaluation and the management of the programme. Additionally, conducting one evaluation will minimize potential inconsistencies that could arise from having separate evaluations for each project.

**These Terms of Reference serve as the foundation for the call for tenders, providing clear guidance on how interested tenderers should apply if interested and, if selected, how they should conduct the evaluation.**

## 2. Objectives of the evaluation

The evaluation of the BIG programme encompasses two complementary dimensions: a **retrospective analysis and a forward-looking perspective.**

### 1. Retrospective Objectives: Reporting on Projects and Financial Utilization [relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness of the Programme]

The retrospective dimension focuses on providing a detailed account of the activities conducted, the results achieved, and the use of allocated funding for the FSPI and STDF projects.

The evaluation will:

- Develop a comprehensive assessment of activities undertaken under both projects
- Analyze whether the objectives and results outlined during the projects' conception have been attained, guided by evaluation questions outlined in paragraph 3.2. This involves comparing expected outcomes, as defined in the project presentation reports, against actual results using both qualitative and quantitative indicators
- Examine any gaps between forecasted and realized outcomes, providing explanations for these variances
- Potential impact of the programme on the volume of pig and porc-products traded (export market and local market) as a result of the intervention on capacity building aimed at compliance with SPS issues and market requirements, as relevant.

### 2. Forward-Looking Objectives: Learning Lessons for the Future [sustainability and impact of the programme]

The forward-looking component aims to derive insights and recommendations that will ensure the sustainability and scalability of the programme's achievements. It includes:

- **Recommendations for Sustainability:** Based on evaluation findings, propose strategies to consolidate the observed results, particularly focusing on strengthening beneficiary capacities to prevent African Swine Fever (ASF).
- **Guidance for Future Initiatives:** Identify potential partners and opportunities to extend or replicate the initiatives launched during the projects to maximize long-term impact and benefit.
- **Best practices:** Identify best practices and success stories that can be replicated or expanded at the national or regional level.

## 3. Key evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation process should be guided by the **OECD standard evaluation criteria:** *relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and lessons learnt.*

### 1. General instructions to the evaluators:

The evaluators are tasked with conducting a factual and independent assessment of the performance of the entire programme, and notably:

- a) Develop an **integrated evaluation of activities** conducted under both the FSPI and STDF projects. This should account for how the two projects have complemented each other to achieve shared objectives.
- b) Respond to the **core evaluation questions** provided in section 3.2 while incorporating additional sub-questions tailored to the specifics of the projects. The questions should enable a robust analysis of each OECD criterion.
- c) Formulate a **comprehensive evaluation of the projects' overall performance**, with recommendations for improvement and strategies to ensure the sustainability of results.
- d) Deliver **findings in a final report** that adheres to the structure and requirements outlined in Annexes II and III.

### 2. Illustrative but Flexible Evaluation Framework

The project evaluation should be organized around the standard OECD evaluation criteria<sup>2</sup> of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and lessons learnt.

**Key evaluation questions under each criterion should be complemented with additional sub-questions focused and adapted to the specificity of the 2 projects (for instance, the SPS-oriented STDF project),** ensuring a thorough and nuanced analysis.

The list of evaluation questions provided below is intended to be illustrative as opposed to exhaustive.

**(i) Relevance: did the project do the right things?**

Assessing relevance involves examining the differences and trade-offs between different priorities or needs. It requires analysing any changes in context to assess the extent to which the project can be (or has been) adjusted to remain relevant.

- To what extent did the objectives and design of the project respond to the SPS-related needs, policies and priorities of the beneficiaries, as well as other stakeholders involved (public and/or private sector, regional, international partners, etc.)?
- To what extent were there differences and/or trade-offs between different priorities or needs?
- How were local contexts, ownership, processes and stakeholders taken into account in the design and implementation of the project?
- To what extent did the project remain relevant, even if the circumstances changed over the course of implementation?

**(ii) Coherence: how well did the project fit?**

Assessing coherence covers both internal and external coherence. Internal coherence refers to the synergies and linkages between the project and other interventions carried out by the implementing agency (past and present), as well as the coherence of the intervention with the relevant international norms and standards to which that institution/Government adheres. External coherence refer to the coherence of the project with the interventions of other actors in the same context. This includes complementarity, harmonization and coordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention adds value while avoiding duplication of efforts.

- How well did the project fit vis-a-vis other interventions in the particular context (country/region, sector, etc.)?
- To what extent did other interventions (including policies) support or undermine the project, and vice versa?
- What were the synergies and interlinkages between the project and other interventions carried out by the same institution/government?
- To what extent was the project complementary to and/or coordinated with relevant interventions supported by other actors in the same context, including how did it add value while avoiding duplication of effort?

**(iii) Effectiveness: did the project achieve its objectives?**

---

<sup>2</sup> OECD/DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation ([Quality Standards for Development Evaluation | DAC Guidelines and Reference Series | OECD iLibrary \(oecd-ilibrary.org\)](#)).

- To what extent were the project objectives achieved or are likely to be achieved (based on the indicators for expected outputs and outcomes identified in the project's logframe) including any differential results across groups?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project objectives, outcomes and outputs?
- To what extent were horizontal issues (particularly related to gender and environment) adequately addressed in the project?

**(iv) Efficiency: how well were resources used?**

Efficiency refers to the efficient use of available resources and aims to analyse whether the objectives have been achieved at the lowest (financial, human and organisational) cost.

- To what extent did the project deliver results in an economic and timely way,<sup>3</sup> based on the project document?
- What changes and risks, if any, occurred during project implementation, and how was the project able to adapt to these changes and manage risks?
- Was the project a cost-effective contribution to addressing the needs of the beneficiary?
- How well was the project managed?

**(v) Impact: what difference did the project make?**

Impact refers to the ultimate meaning and potentially transformative effects of the intervention. It involves identifying the social, environmental and economic effects of the intervention that are longer term or broader than those already considered in the effectiveness criterion. This criterion seeks to capture the indirect and potential consequences of the programme beyond the immediate outcomes.

- To what extent did the project generate, or is expected to generate, significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects? (These may cover an improved domestic and/or regional SPS situation, measurable impact on trade, contribution to sustainable economic growth, poverty reduction and food security, etc.)
- What real difference (expected and/or unexpected) has the project made, or is likely to have, on the final beneficiaries including on people's well-being, gender equality and the environment?
- How did the project catalyse any other action or change, for instance raising awareness on SPS challenges and/or mobilizing additional resources for SPS capacity development?

**(vi) Sustainability/durability: will the benefits last?**

Assessing sustainability involves examining the financial, economic, social, environmental and institutional capacities of the systems needed to maintain net benefits over time, as well as analysing resilience, risks and potential trade-offs. Depending on the timing of the assessment, it may involve analysing the actual flow of net profits or estimating the likelihood of net profits continuing in the medium to long term.

---

<sup>3</sup> The OECD describes "economic" as the conversion of inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) into outputs, outcomes and impacts in the most cost-effective way possible, compared to feasible alternatives in the context. "Timely" delivery is defined as delivery within the intended time frame, or a time frame reasonably adjusted to the demands of the evolving context.

- To what extent are the benefits of the project continuing, or are likely to continue over the longer term, after the end of STDF funding?
- To what extent was sustainability addressed at the design stage and during the project, and what are the major factors (including risks) influencing sustainability?
- Are the necessary capacities and systems (financial, social, institutional, etc.) in place to sustain the project results over time?
- What follow-up activities, if any, are planned and/or required to sustain these results over time?

#### (vii) Lessons learnt

- What lessons can be learned from the project regarding the process of project design and implementation?
- What lessons can be learned from the project, which may be of importance to the broader donor community and which should be disseminated more widely?
- What actions have been taken by the beneficiary or others to disseminate, learn and follow-up on the outcomes of the project?

## 4. Management and steering of the evaluation

The service FVI of **ENSV-FVI**, represented by Mr Cyril Pietruszewski, as the commissioning service, serves as the **primary point of contact** for the evaluators throughout the evaluation process. Their key roles and responsibilities include:

#### Facilitation and Support

- **Organisational Assistance:** Ensuring smooth execution of the evaluation by providing access to relevant contacts and project information.
- **Insights and Feedback:** Offering valuable insights into the projects and providing constructive comments on interim and final reports.

#### Administrative Oversight

- **Report Validation:** Coordinating the validation process for reports, which is required for funding disbursement. This includes:
  - Reviewing and incorporating feedback from ENSV-FVI and the **MEAE and STDF**, while maintaining the independence of the evaluation team.
  - Ensuring that the final report aligns with the expected standards as indicated in those ToRs.

#### Meetings and Communication

To ensure alignment and quality assurance, key meetings involving the consultants, project leaders (ENSV-FVI), and relevant stakeholders (such as MEAE, STDF, or other French project team members) will take place:

- **Kick off Meeting:** At the start of the evaluation, an **initial meeting** between FVI and the (selected) evaluators will be conducted to discuss the evaluation objectives, scope, and methodology, and provide the evaluators with all available documentation and initial contact details for interviews across different phases.
- **Provisional Report Meeting:** Upon submission of the provisional report to provide feedback and discuss preliminary findings, under the guidance of the French COPIL.
- **Final Report Meeting:** During the submission of the final report present the main conclusions and preliminary recommendations of the evaluation



## 5. Methodology

### 5.1 Generalities

The evaluators are invited to propose an appropriate participatory evaluation methodology that is consistent with the objective, scope and the guiding principles of the evaluation. When designing the evaluation methodology, the evaluators will ensure that:

- Existing resources, such as the logical framework, semi-annual progress reports and semi-annual programming, are used.
- The views and opinions of various stakeholders are taken into account.
- A combination of quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods, such as surveys, interviews, group discussions, or more participatory techniques, such as mapping, diagrams or self-evaluations, are used. Case studies may also provide more in-depth information.
- Evaluation results are sorted and validated.
- Decisions concerning sampling are recorded in the evaluation report and justified.

### 5.2 The evaluation approach/process

The evaluation approach should be developed and implemented as presented below, in three phases as described below. See Section 5.2.4 for practical arrangements regarding location and timetable.

#### 5.2.1 Initial phase and evaluation framework development

The **initial phase** of the evaluation aims to establish a clear foundation for the process by addressing the following key objectives:

- **Clarification of Expectations:** Ensuring alignment on the client's objectives, scope, and priorities for the evaluation.
- **Methodological Finalisation:** Refining the approach, evaluation criteria, and tools needed to address the evaluation questions.
- **Framework Consolidation:** Preparing a **detailed evaluation framework** to guide the subsequent phases. It will set out the parameters for a systematic and objective evaluation of the project, based on the project document and its logical framework with indicators to measure progress at different results-levels (goal, outcomes, outputs). A template for the evaluation framework is provided in Annex I.

**The evaluation framework will be sent to FVI for comment and validation.**

#### 5.2.2 Data collection and analysis phase

##### - The Desk phase

During the first part of the desk phase, the evaluators must examine the relevant documents and gather information in order to: describe the context of the assignment, comment on the restructured logical framework and progress reports, formulate evaluation questions with justifications, propose a work plan and confirm the timetable for the field phase. An initial exchange with FVI will validate these questions.

At the end of the desk phase, tasks include: reviewing documents, interviewing stakeholders, finalising evaluation questions with partial answers and analysis methods, identifying tools for the field phase, listing preparations made, and submitting a detailed work plan (interviews, surveys, itinerary). This plan must remain flexible, and any risk of major deviation must be discussed with

the evaluation manager. A second exchange will be used to validate the activities planned in the field with the implementing agency.

#### - The Field phase

The evaluators implement their work plan for data collection, applying the specified techniques (interviews, questionnaires, discussion groups, case studies, etc.) and testing the hypotheses. The evaluators should:

- Ensure adequate contact and consultation with the various stakeholders, as well as their participation; work closely with the relevant government authorities, agencies, organizations, enterprises and farmers throughout their mission.
- Use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information and harmonize the data from various sources to facilitate interpretation thereof.
- Summarize his/her field assessment work at the end of the field phase, discuss the reliability and coverage of the data collection, and present his/her preliminary findings at a debriefing meeting with the implementing agency (audio/video conference).

At the conclusion of the field missions, the service provider will submit the **provisional reports**, which will be presented and discussed during a technical meeting with FVI. These reports will include factual data on the mission conducted, the results of the information collected, and the limitations of the investigations carried out.

Given the resources available for the evaluation, the number of field missions will be left to the discretion of the evaluators. However, it is expected that at least one field mission will be proposed. For logistical reasons and geographical proximity, priority may be given to a mission in Vietnam and one of the following countries: Laos or Cambodia, which are the only two countries where AVSF activities were implemented.

The ENSV-FVI will facilitate the scheduling of appointments with the targeted stakeholders for interviews during these missions.

**For countries not included in a field mission, proposals must detail the investigation methods that the evaluators plan to deploy.**

#### - The Synthesis phase / finalization

The outcome of this phase will be **two separate final evaluation reports, produced in English**: one dedicated to the STDF project and the other to the FSPI project. The respective templates are provided in Annexes II and III.

Producing two distinct reports is essential to ensure the confidentiality of certain evaluation findings specific to each project. This approach allows for targeted and secure reporting while respecting the operational and financial frameworks unique to each project.

The evaluators draft their evaluation reports, which includes the findings and conclusions in response to the questions asked, as well as an overall assessment. The report also includes recommendations, which are grouped and prioritized. The evaluator will ensure that:

- Their evaluation remarks are objective and balanced, their statements are precise and verifiable, and their recommendations are realistic in light of the available resources.
- The evaluators will present the draft final report at a meeting with FVI (audio/video conference and/or on site – to be determined). Based on the presentation of the draft report,

the objective of the meeting is to ask for final comments from key stakeholders, determine the factual basis of the evaluation, and discuss in depth the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations for possible further action.

- On the basis of the comments expressed by the participants at the meeting, the evaluator will draft the final version of the evaluation report.

### Guidelines for producing the final reports:

The information obtained in response to the questions in the evaluation framework will provide a basis on which to analyse and report on the project's performance, results and experiences and draw evidence-based conclusions and recommendations.

The evaluation report should present the findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons separately and with a clear logical distinction between them. The findings should flow logically from the analysis of the data and information, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions should be supported by the findings and analysis. Recommendations and any lessons should follow logically from the conclusions. Any assumptions underlying the analysis should be made explicit.

The evaluation report should be clear, concise and reader-friendly. The main body of the report (excluding the executive summary and annexes) should be approximately 20 pages. It should normally be written in the same language as the project documents. Additional information, for instance on the evaluation framework or the stakeholders consulted, should be included as annexes. A template for the final evaluation reports is provided in Annex II / III.

Key partners involved in the project, including the relevant government agencies in the country/region and the project implementing organization, should be given the opportunity to comment on an advanced draft of the evaluation report before it is finalized. The final evaluation report should reflect comments received (if and when considered appropriate by the evaluator) and acknowledge any substantive differences of opinion. Where there are different views on facts that can be verified, the evaluator should investigate and change the draft where necessary.

The conclusions, recommendations and lessons drawn in the evaluation report should be clear, relevant, targeted and actionable so that the evaluation can be used to achieve its intended learning and accountability objectives.

### 5.2.3 Location, documentation available and possible interviews

#### Location

The **desk phase** can be conducted remotely, allowing the evaluator to connect virtually with a range of stakeholders across several countries. This ensures flexibility while maintaining engagement with relevant parties.

For the **field phase**, the evaluation of the BIG programme will require at least one on-site mission (refer to § 6.2.2). This mission will provide the opportunity for direct interaction with beneficiaries and key stakeholders to gather in-depth insights and contextual understanding.

During the **synthesis phase**, a workshop will be held either remotely or in person. This workshop will involve beneficiaries, partners, and donors, with the final list of participants determined collaboratively by the evaluator, the project stakeholders, and the implementing agency. This ensures an inclusive and comprehensive discussion of the evaluation's findings and recommendations.

#### Documentation available

At the kick off meeting, FVI will provide the evaluators with the following available documentation:

- **Project proposal and design documents:** Detailed descriptions of the FSPI and STDF projects, including their objectives, activities, and expected outcomes.
- **Progress reports:** Semi-annual and annual reports detailing the implementation of project activities, achievements, and challenges encountered.
- **Financial reports:** Records of the financial resources allocated and utilized for both projects.
- **Logical frameworks:** Restructured versions of the FSPI and STDF project frameworks, outlining objectives, indicators, and targets.
- **Minutes of COPIL meetings:** Notes from project steering committee meetings, including the kick-off meeting in June 2022 and the April 2024 meeting in Hanoi, as well as relevant bilateral meetings.
- **Mission reports:** Documentation of exploratory and field missions carried out as part of the projects.
- **Training materials:** Pedagogical kits, workshop content, and other materials developed for capacity-building initiatives under the BIG programme.
- **Communication tools:** Examples of communication materials and dissemination strategies used to engage stakeholders and beneficiaries.
- **Key stakeholder lists:** Contact details and roles of individuals and organizations involved in the projects, including beneficiaries, partners, and other relevant entities.

This list not exhaustive and can be completed, notably upon the evaluators' request.

## Interviews with partners, beneficiaries

By way of example, but not limitation, the evaluation may draw upon the following sources:

- **Interviews with key stakeholders in the projects' management and oversight:**
  - Representatives from the MEAE FSPI unit.
  - The STDF project manager.
  - The ENSV-FVI project manager.
  - The CGAAER (MASAF) project manager.
- **Interviews with implementing partners:**
  - Representatives from AVSF, CIRAD, and IFIP, involved in executing project activities.
- **Interviews with beneficiaries:**
  - Stakeholders in Vietnam (DAH), Laos (DLF), Cambodia (GDAH), and the Philippines (BAI) who benefited from the programme's activities.
- **Interviews with participants in training sessions:**
  - Individuals who took part in the training sessions organized under the projects. Email contact lists for online surveys can be provided to the evaluators for this purpose.

The evaluators are encouraged to propose additional methodological approaches or elements they consider necessary to enhance the evaluation's comprehensiveness and relevance.

## 6. Provisional timetable

**The evaluation mission is expected to start in January 2025 and must be completed by the end of May 2025.** This timetable outlines the major milestones for the evaluation, and the actual timeline will be further detailed by the evaluator in their bid. The evaluator will propose the phases,

activities, expected outcomes, and format (remote or in-person) along with the required number of days in their bid.

Steps	Schedule
<i>Deadline for submission of tenders</i>	<i>27/01/2025 - 17h (GMT+1)</i>
<i>Evaluators selection</i>	<i>Week 4</i>
<i>Kick off meeting - Upstream discussions with the consultant</i>	<i>Week 5</i>
<i>Submission of the evaluation framework</i>	<i>Week 7</i>
<i>Validation of the evaluation framework</i>	<i>Week 8</i>
<i>Submission of provisional report</i>	<i>Week 17</i>
<i>Exchanges on the provisional report</i>	<i>Week 18</i>
<i>Submission of the final report</i>	<i>Week 21</i>

## 7. Budget

The maximum budget available for this evaluation is €23,000 inclusive of taxes.

*Nota bene:* Only the following costs may be included in the contractor's financial bid as reimbursable costs: costs related to travel to the field to meet with the project's partners and beneficiaries and/or members of the implementing agency's team (transport and subsistence allowances).

## Annex I: Template for evaluation framework (common)

The following template is provided to guide and structure the evaluation framework to be developed.

### 1. Introduction

Provide an overview of the project being evaluated, including a description of the project's intervention logic. This should include details on the time frame of the project (including extensions, if any), funds spent, geographical area, target groups, organisational set-up, implementation arrangements and any other dimensions to be covered by the evaluation. Any known discrepancies between the planned and actual implementation of the project should be identified, as well as any known factors that may affect the feasibility of the evaluation.

### 2. Key evaluation questions

Identify detailed questions to be asked to different types of stakeholders as part of the evaluation process. The broad evaluation questions above, focused on relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness and, if possible, impact, sustainability and lessons learnt, should be used to frame the evaluation. Additional, specific evaluation questions related to the particular project to be evaluated should be elaborated and included in the evaluation framework, as well as questions related to cross-cutting issues.

A range of different types of questions should be asked, including:

- descriptive questions (e.g. what happened? what was delivered? what changed?)
- causal questions (e.g. what caused or contributed to the results? what were the outcomes and impacts? what other factors contributed?)
- synthesis questions (e.g. how could the project have been improved? what were its strengths and weaknesses?)
- action questions (e.g. what are the recommendations for follow-up for different types of stakeholders, what are the opportunities for scaling-up?)

### 3. Data collection methods and sources

Explain the methods to be used to conduct the evaluation and gather credible evidence, including the techniques and tools to be used for data collection and analysis. Identify all the information collection methods to be used such as literature reviews, survey questionnaires and/or interviews with relevant project stakeholders (beneficiaries, implementing organization(s), other collaborating or relevant organizations). Other methods such as case studies or cost-effectiveness analyses may also be applied, depending *inter alia* on the size and complexity of the project. Describe desk analysis and field visit, if applicable.

The evaluation should seek diverse views and insights. Available information sources should be clearly identified by the Evaluator by including a detailed list of:

- project documents (progress and final reports, and end-of-project assessments if existing),
- other relevant documents produced under the project and any other information (e.g. training resources, news stories, media articles, video clips, etc.)
- key stakeholders involved in the project (including beneficiaries, implementing partners, any other relevant public/private sector organizations), as well as other organizations that are potentially relevant.

The key evaluation questions, relevant indicators and data collection methods and sources may be set out in the form of a table or matrix that is tailored to the particular project (see example below). As appropriate, more detailed surveys or questionnaires targeted at particular groups of stakeholders involved in the project may be elaborated separately and included in the evaluation framework.

<b>Example of Evaluation Criteria Effectiveness</b>		
<b>Example of key evaluation question and sub-questions</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Data collection methods and sources</b>
1. To what extent were the project objectives achieved or are likely to be achieved, including any differential results across groups? 2. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project objectives, outcomes and outputs? 3. To what extent were horizontal issues (particularly related to gender and environment) adequately addressed in the project? Additional sub-questions should be formulated by the evaluator and included here, based on the specific TORs for the evaluation.	Identify the relevant qualitative and/or quantitative indicators from the project's logical framework that correspond to the evaluation question and sub-questions	Identify the data collection methods to collect the required data and information for each question. Different methods (e.g. surveys, key informant interviews, desk review, etc.) may be used for each question. Identify where the required data and information will be found, including primary and secondary data sources.

#### 4. Work plan and timetable for the evaluation

Provide a work plan and timetable for the evaluation that includes the expected timing of mission travel (if any), as well as key milestones and deadlines for deliverables.

## Annex II: Template for project evaluation report (Project STDF)

### 1. Executive summary (2 pages)

- Overview of the report, which highlights the main conclusions, recommendations and key lessons learnt.

### 2. Introduction (2 pages)

- Objective of the evaluation.
- Description of the policy context and institutional environment within which the project was implemented, including the role of the implementing organization, other donors and project partners as well as the private sector, consumer organizations and NGOs, as relevant.
- Summary of the project including its objectives, activities, inputs (budget), outputs and outcomes.
- Indication of the evaluator's independence to carry out the project evaluation, addressing previous collaboration (if any) with the STDF, project partners and/or beneficiaries, including a description of conflicts of interest, if any.

### 3. Methodology (2 pages)

Based on the evaluation framework:

- Explanation of the method(s) and techniques used for data and information collection, analysis and processing, the validity, reliability and limitations (if any) of these method(s).
- Description of the sources of information (documents, respondents, administrative data, literature, etc.).
- Description of the key stakeholders consulted, their relevance to the project, the criteria for their selection, as well as limitations (if any) in access to key project stakeholders.
- Explanation on the selection of any case studies or particular countries selected within regional projects (if any) for mission travel or more in-depth assessment.
- Recognition of any constraints encountered and, if so, how these affected the evaluation, including its independence and impartiality as appropriate.

### 4. Findings and analysis (10 pages)

- Description and assessment of the project's intervention logic and theory of change, including an analysis of the rationale for the project at the design stage, and any key assumptions made.
- Detailed description and analysis of the responses to all the evaluation questions, covering the project's relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, that clearly refers to the available evidence. Where it is not possible to answer some questions, explanations should be provided. This analysis should cross-validate the information sources, and critically assess the validity and reliability of the data obtained. It should address key evaluation questions under the following points:
  - Relevance** to needs and overall context, including the extent to which the project met the needs, priorities and policies of the target groups, and continues to do so if circumstances changed.
  - Coherence** in terms of the fit and compatibility of the project with other interventions in the country/region, sector or institution.
  - Effectiveness** in terms of the extent to which the project achieved its expected objectives and results, including any differential results across groups.
  - Efficiency** in terms of the extent to which the project delivered results in an economic and timely way, including how the available resources (funding, staff, regulatory, administrative, time, other resources, etc.) contributed to or hindered the achievement of results.
  - Impact** in terms of the extent to which the project generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.
  - Sustainability** related to whether the results and net benefits of the project have been, or are likely to be, maintained over time without STDF funding or other donor support. This should address the capacities (e.g., financial, economic, human, institutional) capacities needed to sustain the results and benefits over time, as well as risks and potential trade-offs involved.
  - Cross-cutting issues** in terms of how the project contributed to cross-cutting objectives, including on gender equality and the environment.



- **Risk management** in terms of the risks that were faced during project implementation and the extent to which they were approximately managed.
- Overall analysis and judgement on the performance and results of the project. In assessing the project's outcomes and impacts, attribution and/or contribution to results should be clearly explained.

#### 5. **Conclusions and recommendations (4 pages)**

- Main conclusions based on the findings and analysis of the evaluation.<sup>4</sup>
- Clear and actionable recommendations targeted at relevant stakeholders in the specific country/region (including government authorities, the private sector, regional economic communities, etc.), the project implementing organization, any other project stakeholders, and/or the wider community of donors and development partners.

#### 6. **Lessons learnt (2 pages)**

- Key lessons learnt which are of relevance for wider use and future programme development, both on process and substance.

#### 7. **Annexes**

- Evaluation framework.
- Final list of all the persons consulted during the evaluation (to the extent that this does not conflict with confidentiality).
- List of documents and/or other information sources consulted.
- Any additional annexes, as relevant, based on the scope of the project evaluated.

---

---

<sup>4</sup> Conclusions and recommendations should be clearly based on the findings and analysis included in the previous section of the report.

## Annex III: Template for project evaluation report (Project FSPI)

**Front page:** mention of authors and date of evaluation, FSPI name and number

### Contents

**Evaluation objectives and methodology:** after stating the objectives, a brief description of how the evaluation was carried out (types of investigations carried out and sources used, evaluation governance body....) and the limitations of the exercise (difficulties encountered which may have reduced the scope of the results, precautions regarding results considered fragile).

**Presentation of the project and the consolidated balance sheet:** a reminder of the objectives of the project evaluated and the main elements of the consolidated balance sheet (activities carried out, predefined indicators, financial execution, explanation of qualitative and quantitative differences with the forecast, difficulties encountered, readjustments ....).

**Analyses and conclusions:** substantiated answers to the evaluation questions and the resulting conclusions for the FSPI project.

**Recommendations:** recommendations with details of how they were defined and to whom they are addressed.

**Appendices:** list of sources used, members of the evaluation body, people interviewed for the evaluation.