

# TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE RECRUITMENT OF CONSULTANTS FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE IYBA-SEED PROGRAMME

**DATE : 04.02.2026**

## GENERAL INFORMATION

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Title of the assignment | <i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the IYBA-SEED Programme</i>  |
| Beneficiary(ies)        | <i>Actors of the Entrepreneurial Ecosystems, very-early stage entrepreneurs, especially youth and women.</i> |
| Country                 | <i>Benin, Kenya, Senegal, South Africa, Togo</i>   |
| Maximum budget          | <i>EUR 70 000</i>  |

## CONTEXT

### *General context*

The programme “IYBA-SEED: Investing in Young Businesses in Africa – Supporting Entrepreneurship Ecosystem Development” is part of the third Building Block of the Team Europe Initiative “Investing in Young Businesses in Africa”, which is made up of three Building Blocks: 1) Increase the financial and technical support for pre-seed stage entrepreneurs and micro and small enterprises, 2) Increase the finance for SMEs and entrepreneurs at seed and early stages, and 3) Supporting the ecosystem, with a special emphasis on women and young people.

It was initiated in recognition of the fact that the entrepreneurial ecosystem in Africa is growing steadily and is a key growth driver for the continent, particularly in terms of decent job creation. However, the flip side of this observation is that this ecosystem of young businesses and their support structures lack the resources and support needed to develop effectively.

Actors of the Entrepreneurial Ecosystems (AoEEs) in Africa are limited in number and capacity, and scarce outside urban centres. Rather than collaborating and specialising, most offer the same services with rather low quality. Also, they rarely apply a gender perspective to their organisations and programs. There is therefore an urgent need to strengthen them so that they can provide the services

needed for the development of the entrepreneurial ecosystem. This includes creating networks and collaborations between them in order to develop and making use of synergies.

IYBA-SEED takes therefore an “Ecosystem Strengthening” approach: it targets the entrepreneurship ecosystem and its actors, in order to reach young businesses (i.e. SEED beneficiaries) which are defined as:

- (Very-)early stage businesses and entrepreneurs (pre-seed and seed)
- Especially led by young entrepreneurs (18-35yo) and/or women entrepreneurs (of all ages).

#### Programme overview

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Title</b>   | Investing in Young Businesses in Africa – Supporting Entrepreneurial Ecosystem Development  |
| <b>Geographic scope</b>                              | <u>Multi-country sub-Saharan Africa</u> : Benin, Kenya, Senegal, South Africa and Togo  |
| <b>Duration and intended start date</b>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total duration: Initial duration of 47 months, i.e. 4 years (01/2023 – 11/2026) + extension of 24 months (12/2026-11/2028)</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Consortium (“Group of implementing partners”)</b> | <p>The implementation of the Action is entrusted by the EU via a Multi-Partner Contribution Agreement (MPCA) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Lead Organisation</u>: Expertise France (EF)</li> <li>• <u>Partners</u>: Enabel, GIZ<sup>1</sup>, and SAIDC<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• <u>Additional implementing partner</u>: SNV (Sub-granted via EF)</li> </ul>                                     |
| <b>Target groups</b>                                 | <u>Actors of the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem (AoEE) and their networks</u>  |
| <b>Beneficiaries</b>                                 | <p><u>Primary beneficiaries</u>, aka “SEED beneficiaries”: Early-stage businesses and entrepreneurs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In particular those led by young entrepreneurs (18-35 years old) and/or women entrepreneurs (of all ages)</li> </ul> <p><u>Final beneficiaries</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Youth (18-35 years old)</li> <li>• Women (of all ages)</li> </ul> |
| <b>Overall objective</b>                             | To contribute to creating decent jobs for women and youth and resilient economies by strengthening entrepreneurship ecosystems in five Sub-Saharan countries (Benin, Kenya, Senegal, South Africa and Togo) to improve access to Business Development Services (both financial and non-financial) for SEED beneficiaries  |

<sup>1</sup> Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit

<sup>2</sup> Slovak Agency for International Development and Cooperation

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Specific objectives</b>   | <p>SO1: To improve access for SEED beneficiaries to Business Development Services (both financial and non-financial) provided by Actors of the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem through strengthened entrepreneurship ecosystems (both nationally and internationally).</p> <p>SO2: To enhance business environment (rules, regulations, and policies) conducive to SEED beneficiaries</p> <p>SO3: To promote an inclusive entrepreneurial culture that empowers women and youth to create and grow their businesses.</p> <p>SO4: To improve access for Actors of the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem, SEED beneficiaries and other stakeholders to information about Entrepreneurship Ecosystems and approaches to Entrepreneurship Ecosystem Strengthening</p>   |
| <b>Expected results</b>      | <p>Result 1.1. "CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT": Actors of the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem are supported to strengthen their BDS (both financial and non-financial) for SEED beneficiaries</p> <p>Result 1.2. "NETWORKS": Actors of the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem are connected (both nationally and internationally)</p> <p>Result 2.1. "BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT": Conducive policies, laws and/or regulations targeting SEED beneficiaries are supported</p> <p>Result 2.2. "DIALOGUE": Public-private dialogue processes and consultations are strengthened to advocate for the creation and growth of SEED beneficiaries</p> <p>Result 2.3. "Capacity building for institutional actors and advocacy groups"</p> <p>Result 3.1. "ENTREPRENEURIAL CULTURE": Products are created or improved to promote youth and women entrepreneurship</p> <p>Result 3.2. "Institutional support and partnerships are created to increase the reach and foster the application of curricula promoting entrepreneurship skills.</p> <p>Result 4.1 "ECOSYSTEM MAPPING": Entrepreneurial ecosystem diagnostics are produced and disseminated</p> <p>Result 4.2 "KNOWLEDGE": Best practices and lessons learned for Entrepreneurship Ecosystem Strengthening are produced, compiled, and shared</p> |
| <b>Indicative activities</b> | See annexed theory of change  |

For more information on the intervention logic of the programme, please refer to the theory of change and logframe of the programme in annex (annex 1 and 2).

Implementation of the MEAL strategy and country MEAL plans aim at enabling Implementing Partners to review the progress of the programme with the objective to steer the activities on a strategic and operational level, in particular during the Programme Steering Committee meetings. IYBA-SEED annual reports and mid-year summary reports present the progress of the indicators, based on data collected by Country Teams (CTs) and aggregated by the Programme Management Unit (PMU). In this regard, outcome indicators are collected and reported on a yearly basis, and output indicators are reported on a half-yearly basis.

In addition, evaluations (mid-term and final) are to be carried out by external contractors, with proven experience in evaluating multi-country and multi-partner cooperation programmes. Recommendations are expected to be elaborated collectively by the different stakeholders of targeted countries, with the organisation of co-construction workshops. Budget for external consultancy is estimated to 70, 000 euros per evaluation, including fees of international expert and national experts, transportation and mission costs to the five IYBA-SEED countries. An online restitution of the evaluation reports is also planned to present the main findings to the programme partners and stakeholders, for learning and accountability purposes.

## OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS PURSUED

### *Objectives of the mission*

#### Rationale and objectives of the evaluation

In view of the 6-year duration of the programme, its multi-stakeholder dimension and in accordance with the recommendations of the MEAL strategy adopted for the programme, the IYBA-SEED team wishes to conduct an external mid-term evaluation.

This evaluation takes place after 3 years and 4 months of implementation (including 12 months of inception phase) to inform the decision on the extension phase of the programme (2027–2028), enhance accountability to donors, implementing agencies and beneficiaries, and extract lessons to improve ongoing implementation and sustainability.

#### Objectives of the Evaluation and Expectations related to the Consultancy

The main objective of this evaluation is to provide Actors of the Entrepreneurial Ecosystems (AoEEs), implementing agencies (programme teams and headquarters) and donors with:

- a comprehensive and independent analysis of the performance of the IYBA-SEED programme, paying particular attention to its outcomes results, measured against the defined objectives ;
- strategic and operational recommendations, so as to improve, where necessary, future actions to be implemented during the extension phase of the IYBA-SEED programme and beyond.

In particular, this evaluation will be used to:

- assess progress against DAC evaluation criteria, especially measuring results related to the 3 first years of the programme on the ecosystems and analyse the sustainability of induced changes for impact creation;

- assess the coherence of the regional approach of IYBA-SEED programme based on the 3 first years of the programme;
- co-construct actionable recommendations for the elaboration of country and regional action plans of the extension phase;
- based on the first 3 years of implementation, assess the efficiency of the administrative set up including PMU and country offices, and that of total General means costs (both for PMU and country level) versus national activities.
- generate key learnings on “Ecosystem Strengthening” as an alternative approach to “Entrepreneurship Development”.

The evaluator must provide evidence to explain the analyses and cause-and-effect relationships and attempt to identify the factors driving or hindering progress. Their work must encourage accountability, decision-making, and learning.

#### Scope of the evaluation

- **Period Covered:** January 2023 – May 2026
- **Geographical Scope:** All five target countries
- **Components Covered:** All four components of the programme
- **Stakeholders to include:** Direct beneficiaries (AoEEs, SEED beneficiaries (when relevant), institutional partners, Country teams and PMU members, donors

## EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY QUESTIONS

The evaluation will be guided by the criteria defined by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) - including relevance, coherence, and efficiency – but will place special emphasis on effectiveness, sustainability and additional questions identified as key lenses for assessing outcomes and long-term results. The evaluation questions detailed below will be reviewed by the evaluator at the start of the evaluation phase in order to propose a final version in the methodological note to be validated by the Evaluation Steering Group.

| Evaluation criteria | Key questions  |
|---------------------|--|
| Relevance           | To what extent does the programme address the needs of (very-) early-stage entrepreneurs, especially youth and women? Are those needs in line with the needs expressed by the AoEEs supported by the programme?  |
| Coherence           | What is the level of synergies between components, implementing partners and with other interventions, especially related to the Team Europe Initiative IYBA? To what extent is the regional approach of the programme connected with the regional integration lenses (i.e. existing regional structures such as COMESA, ECOWAS, etc.)?  |
| Effectiveness       | <b>For each country, which activities are the most successful in terms of results related access to BDS, business environment, entrepreneurial culture and access to knowledge? What contextual or implementation factors (country, partner model, sequencing of activities, resources) explain the differences in effectiveness across countries and components? How have the capacity, practices and interactions of AoEEs evolved as a result of the project? To what extent have AoEEs better targeted (very-) early-stage entrepreneurs, especially youth and women? What adjustments are needed to maximise impact of the extension?</b> |
| Efficiency          | To what extent did the programme design, methodological choices and implementation of activities enable optimal use of technical, human and  |

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
|                             | financial resources? This includes : i) efficiency of the administrative set up including PMU and country offices; ii) efficiency of activity costs versus general means and indirect costs - for the PMU and the country offices.  |
| <b>Sustainability</b>       | <b>Which actors are the most likely to sustain/scale approaches and tools introduced by the programme? For which interventions / activities is there a high risk of discontinuation or rupture without continued involvement and financing from the programme? What are practical, ready-to-implement recommendations that could mitigate these risks in the extension phase?</b>   |
| <b>Additional questions</b> | <p><b>To what extent is the “Ecosystem Strengthening” approach pursued by IYBA-SEED an effective, sustainable and scalable alternative to “Entrepreneurship Development”<sup>3</sup>?</b></p> <p><b>To what extent does the programme results contribute to changing practices, attitudes and frameworks related to gender equality? Were any negative effects on women and men or gender relations identified during implementation?</b></p> <p><b>What has been the EU added value to the IYBA-SEED programme during the first years of implementation?</b></p> |

Consultants must provide a value judgment on each of the evaluation questions raised by the review of the criteria. As part of this analysis, consultants will ensure that the judgments made for each of the evaluation criteria cover all the key stages of the programme cycle and all countries (whenever possible).

The will pay specific attention to evaluation questions linked to effectiveness, sustainability and additional questions, with in-depth analysis and recommendations for activities to be carried out during the extensions phase, based on their findings.

Consultants must also verify whether gender equality has been taken into account in the identification/formulation of the documents and to what extent they have been reflected in the implementation and supervision of the Action.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE MISSION

### *Expected Methodology*

The evaluation will adopt a mixed-method approach, combining both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis techniques to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the programme’s performance and outcomes. It is up to the consultant to propose specific methodological approaches that they see fit for the evaluation. If considered relevant by evaluators, the Social Network Analysis (SNA) could be used to map and analyse the structure and evolution of relationships within the entrepreneurial ecosystems supported by the programme.

---

<sup>3</sup> “Entrepreneurship development and strengthening ecosystems are not exclusive approaches, but they are focused on different targets. For example, the entrepreneurs are the primary and sometimes direct beneficiaries in entrepreneur support programmes [...] However, in ecosystem programmes, the focus is on the system itself, on its different elements and on improving its overall functioning as a system. Here, entrepreneurs are the secondary beneficiaries since they profit from a healthier ecosystem, but in both cases, it is the entrepreneurs who benefit”, Guide on Strengthening Entrepreneurial Ecosystems, GIZ, 2025.

All data collection activities will be conducted in full compliance with ethical standards, including the informed consent of participants, anonymization of personal data, and adherence to the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) where applicable.

### Coordination

Consultants are asked to work closely with Expertise France, namely the MEAL officer of the programme and the Department MEAL coordinator, and the Evaluation Steering Group in developing their reasoning. In particular, findings and initial analysis must be shared at the end of the missions, with an interim report.

### Inception phase

During this preparatory phase, consultants must:

- gather and consult all information and documents relating to the programme to be evaluated (narrative reports, data visualisation dashboards, strategies, DoA, lessons learning reports, etc.) to understanding its context. The documents to be consulted will be available from the dedicated Teams channel created for the consultancy.
- identify all programme stakeholders;
- reconstruct the programme's intervention logic by studying its logical framework and theory of change in order to: (i) clarify the objectives of the intervention and translate them into a hierarchy of expected changes, and (ii) help assess the internal consistency of the intervention, and (iii) identify the initial assumptions (or postulates, often implicit) that guided the design of the programme a priori, and evaluate their validity a posteriori;
- Carry out a simple evaluation readiness assessment for each country to adapt the methodology and timeline to be proposed for the evaluation accordingly;
- Deepen the evaluation framework based on the terms of reference, the documents collected, the reconstructed intervention logic and evaluation readiness assessment. More specifically, this will involve: (i) specifying the main questions that will be used to focus the evaluation work on a limited number of key points; (ii) establishing the steps in the reasoning that will enable the questions to be answered (judgment criteria); (iii) specify the indicators to be used to answer the questions and the corresponding sources of information (documentation, interviews, focus groups, surveys, etc.).

Based on this methodological work, the consultant will propose a methodological note (see template in Annex 3) including:

- A detailed description of the objectives and issues of the evaluation
- A detailed description of the scope of the evaluation: temporal, geographical, actions constituting the programme being evaluated
- An analysis of the stakeholders
- A summary of the programme's theory of change
- A reformulation of the evaluation questions...

- ... associated with success criteria, indices and indicators, and the data collection tools that the evaluation team plans to deploy to provide answers in the form of an evaluation matrix
- A detailed description of the methodological approach chosen and the data collection tools used
- An updated timetable for the evaluation mission
- In annex: an evaluation matrix (see template in annex 4), a first draft of the data collection protocols (interview guides, observation grid, workshop facilitation guide, etc.) including sampling methods.

This framework will be presented to the evaluation steering group and will provide an opportunity to discuss with the consultants about how they intend to structure the evaluation process and to verify its feasibility.

When the intervention logic is reconstituted, it is important to ensure that the objectives redefined by the evaluator are shared by the programme team and the programme director.

This preparatory phase is key and will enable the methodology proposed by the consultants to be validated.

## Data Collection Phase

During this stage, the consultant(s) will continue to analyse secondary data through further documentary analysis. They will also collect primary data.

This collection will be carried out both remotely and through field missions by the consultant(s) in the intervention countries, either through locally based staff or specific field missions, scheduled between June and July 2026. The schedule for this mission must be described in a programme shared with the PMU and the country teams, which will support and facilitate its organization.

Data collection will include the use of at least three complementary qualitative and quantitative collection methods such as:

- Field visits to the various implementation sites, including, for example, observations of practices
- Questionnaire surveys
- Focus groups
- Individual interviews
- Case studies
- Workshops bringing together programme stakeholders
- Etc.

A meeting to present the preliminary results by the evaluators at the end of the data collection phase in each country must be held with the country team, EU Delegations (EUDs) and potentially key selected stakeholders in the field.



## Reporting phase

### 1) An interim report

At the end of the data collection phase, consultants will produce an interim report presenting the data collected for each of the data collection tools deployed by the evaluation team.

This document, which may take the lighter form of a slide show, must enable the initial data collected to be shared and ensure the traceability of the assessment findings and conclusions from the data collected.

It serves as a basis for an interim online meeting between the consultants and the evaluation steering group. The main purposes of this meeting are:

- » Share a common level of knowledge of the data collected;
- » Collectively outline the main points of analysis;
- » Identify any gaps in the data collection that require additional remote collection.

### 2) A provisional final report

A provisional final report, which must not exceed 50 pages excluding annexes (see proposed outline in Annex 5 and quality control grid in Annex 6), will be produced at the end of the additional analysis and quality control work carried out by the consultants, together with a PowerPoint presentation.

This provisional final report will serve as the basis for an online meeting between the evaluators and the evaluation steering group. The main purpose of this meeting is to:

- » Share and discuss the provisional conclusions on the evaluation questions;
- » Ensure that these conclusions are sufficiently substantiated and identify any gaps in the analysis that would require further analysis;
- » Adjust their wording to arrive at a collective set of final conclusions;
- » Jointly develop first recommendations resulting from the evaluation.

Consultants will be required to formulate specific conclusions and recommendations on gender mainstreaming in operations. Recommendations are also expected whenever gender issues are identified during programme implementation, particularly if the programme has negative effects on gender equality.

The report will then be presented to Actors of the Entrepreneurial Ecosystems (AoEEs) during co-construction workshops for each of the five countries to validate findings, develop country-specific recommendations and suggest concrete activities to be carried out during the extension phase.

### 3) Final report and summary

A final report, incorporating the observations of the evaluation steering group and recommendations/activities identified by Actors of the Entrepreneurial Ecosystems (AoEEs), as well as

a two-page summary for the overall programme and for each country (see template in annex 7), will then be produced by the consultants. A final steering committee meeting may be held to officially validate the report if relevant.

If the comments made express differences of opinion not shared by the consultants, these may be appended to the final report and commented on by the consultants.

## Feedback and Dissemination phase

Once the report has been approved, the consultants will lead a feedback workshop to present the main results of the evaluation and disseminate the lessons identified and documented during the evaluation. This workshop will be primarily intended for similar programme leaders, implementing agency headquarters staff and partners. It will be organized remotely.

### Expected deliverables

Deliverables must be submitted by email in Word format to the recipients who will be indicated to the evaluation team during the inception phase.

| Deliverables  | # pages max. | Date of delivery |
|---|--------------|------------------|
| Item 1- Methodological note (incl. Evaluation matrix)   | 15           | T0 + 3 weeks     |
| Item 2- Interim report  | 30           | T0 + 14 weeks    |
| Item 3- Final report (provisional then final) including executive summary of approx. 4-6 pages* | 50           | T0 + 17 weeks    |
| Item 4- Summary sheet according EF format for the overall programme and for each country*       | 4            | T0 + 18 weeks    |
| Item 5- Presentation of the feedback workshop (format ppt)                                      | 15           | T0 + 20 weeks    |

*\*Final report and summary sheet to be translated in French by evaluators after final approval.*

In addition, a slide show presentation must be produced for each Evaluation Steering Group meeting as well as for the co-construction workshops to be held for each country.

Deliverables must be written in English and/or French depending on the target audience.

## ORGANISATION OF THE CONSULTANCY

### *Steering of the evaluation and programme governance*

The evaluation is managed by Expertise France with the assistance of an evaluation steering committee which may be composed of donors including EUDs, representatives of implementing agencies, PMU members and the EF MEAL coordinator. Members of the evaluation steering committee will be confirmed at the beginning of the consultancy.

The main functions of the members of the evaluation steering group are to:

- Advise and guide choices relating to the evaluation;
- Propose decisions on adjustments to be made in the conduct of the evaluation;
- Validate the deliverables submitted by the evaluators.

Committee meetings are planned during the course of this evaluation:

1. During the inception phase, to validate the general implementation methodology, the data collection plan, and the expected presentation of deliverables, and to validate the methodological note.
2. During an interim review to respond to the initial analyses and findings, once the data collection phase has been completed (validation of the interim report).
3. During the finalization phase, to participate in the formulation of conclusions and the co-construction of recommendations.
4. To validate the final report based on the scope of the points remaining to be decided, otherwise by email.

### *Coordination procedures*

Consultants are asked to closely involve Expertise France in the development of their reasoning, through regular contact throughout the assignment, from the methodological note to the meeting to present the provisional report. In particular, findings and initial analysis must be shared at the end of the assignment, before the interim report is drafted.

Services and meetings will be performed both remotely and in person in the 5 target countries. If venue cannot be provided by country teams or stakeholders, consultants will need to provide an adequate venue with the necessary setting and equipment. Consultants will also be responsible for the provision of necessary technical collaboration tools such as video conferencing, cloud, data collection tools, facilitation kit, stationary, etc.

### *Organisation of field work/missions*

Although programme teams will provide contact information and relevant documentation to prepare the different activities, it is the responsibility of the evaluators to take care of the logistics of the field

work and related missions (if any) such as organization and facilitation of interviews/workshops/meetings, feedback session, travel, accommodation, local transportation, small equipment, photocopying, etc.

Expenditures relating to field missions shall be budgeted in the financial offer as part of the proposed experts' fees.

Cost relating to the organization of Workshops (especially those relating to the co-construction of recommendations workshops) shall be budgeted in the financial under a specific budget line as a lump sum amount. As pricing is fixed, it should include all costs relating to the corresponding service provision and/or delivery of supplies and no additional reimbursable cost are foreseen.

Consultants will work in English, and French (when relevant).

### Timeline

The total duration of the assignment is estimated at 87 person-days, between April and September 2026, as detailed below for reference:

| Activities   | Location   | Duration               | Pers./days estimated |
|--|--|------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Inception phase   | Remotely   | Approximately 3 weeks  | 15                   |
| 2. Data collection phase   | Benin, Kenya, Senegal, South Africa, Togo + remotely | Approximately 2 months | 45                   |
| 3. Reporting phase (incl. findings of co-construction workshops) | Benin, Kenya, Senegal, South Africa, Togo + remotely | Approximately 4 weeks  | 25                   |
| 4. Dissemination phase   | Remotely   | Approximately 3 weeks  | 2                    |

The selected evaluation team must include in its proposal a **detailed work plan**, specifying the number of working days by activity and by member of the evaluation team, along with indicative dates and locations. This work plan will be discussed and validated during the inception meeting.

## EXPECTED TEAM STRUCTURE

The team should include 3 key experts whose CVs shall be included in the technical proposal and accordance with the requested profiles indicated below. They may be supported by additional staff proposed by the Consultancy organization. In addition to CVs of key experts and short presentation of support staff, the technical proposal must include a clear distribution of roles and responsibilities

throughout the evaluation process between the different team members. This distribution will be discussed and validated during the inception meeting.

### *Requested profile(s)*

The proposed configuration for conducting the evaluation is a team of consultants, preferably regional (from 1 of the 5 IYBA-SEED countries) and international, women and men. A quality control manager for the entire service must be identified within the team.

The team's profiles should cover the following areas:

#### **Qualifications and Experience**

- Holder of a postgraduate degree in a field relevant to the assignment, such as public administration and management, financial and administrative management, information systems, economics, social sciences, international cooperation, evaluation, business or equivalent experience.
- Strong professional experience in defining and implementing private sector programmes or policies, particularly in the development of entrepreneurship in sub-Saharan Africa.
- Strong command and experience of evaluation methods, quantitative and qualitative approaches, and results-based management;
- Proven experience in evaluating development projects and technical assistance;
- Experience in similar projects or knowledge of project management would be highly appreciated.
- Proven experience in dealing with gender-related issues, especially related to women entrepreneurship;
- Significant experience in targeted countries and excellent knowledge of the IYBA-SEED countries entrepreneurial ecosystems will be a strong asset.

#### **Technical Skills**

- Solid understanding of monitoring and evaluation systems for development programs and projects;
- Design of evaluation systems;
- Design and management of databases;
- Facilitation of workshops and focus groups, leading group work/meetings for the production of collective knowledge and intelligence (e.g., feedback) using interactive and/or digital tools;
- Proficiency in network analysis and stakeholder mapping methods, such as SNA would be a strong asset;
- Proficiency in data and results visualization tools would be an asset (Power BI, etc.)

#### **Administrative Skills**

- Excellent command of office software (MS Office: Word, Excel, PowerPoint or their LibreOffice equivalents) and internet tools;
- Strong communication and organizational skills.

#### **Language Skills**

- Excellent command of English and/or French, both written and spoken (good writing, synthesis, and analytical skills);
- Proficiency in local languages would be an asset.

**NOTE: CVs must highlight the above-listed elements to enable the evaluation of bids (number of years of experience and number of assignments/interventions in the areas of expertise covered by this evaluation).**

**NOTE: The technical proposal is expected to suggest a team size that is relevant and consistent with the methodologies and work envisaged.**

## SELECTION PROCESS

### *Proposal Content*

Proposals must include:

- **Technical offer:** understanding and comments on the terms of reference, methodology, composition of the evaluation team, CVs of key experts and relevant experience, as well as all items mentioned in these terms of reference (detailed work plan, division of roles and responsibilities);
- **Financial offer:** overall evaluation budget including the following cost elements: daily rate for each expert; breakdown of working time by expert and by stage; workshop expenditures and additional costs (VAT if applicable).

### *Proposal Evaluation Criteria*

Expertise France will select the proposal that receives the highest score based on the following evaluation grid:

| Evaluation criteria  | Maximum points |
|--|----------------|
| <b>Financial offer</b>   | <b>20</b>      |
| <b>Technical offer including the sub-criteria below :</b>  | <b>80</b>      |
| 2.1. Understanding of the terms of reference and objectives of the services to be provided   | 10             |
| 2.2. Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, relevance of the tools proposed, and assessment of the difficulties and challenges encountered | 20             |
| 2.3. Organization of tasks and time  | 10             |
| 2.4. Proposed team of experts  | 40             |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   | <b>100</b>     |

## ANNEXES

1. IYBA-SEED Theory of Change
2. IYBA-SEED logframe
3. Template of methodological note
4. Template for evaluation matrix
5. Quality control grid for methodological note and reports
6. Outline of evaluation report
7. EF template of two-page summary