



ANNEX I TO THE INVITATION TO TENDER

ELARG.A2/18/2014

Under framework contract DG COMM PO/2012-3/A3, lot 1

Terms of reference

*Evaluation of information and communication activities towards the EU Member States in the area of
EU Enlargement*

**(Reopening of competition under the Framework contract PO/2012-03/A3— LOT 1
of DG COMM)**

KAW

Table of Contents

Terms of reference	1
1 Purpose	3
1.1 Context	3
1.2 Scope	4
1.3 End user of the evaluation.....	5
2 Tasks to be performed by the contractor.....	5
2.1 Tasks in general	6
2.2 Evaluation questions	7
3 Methodology	8
4 Deliverables	9
4.1 Inception report.....	9
4.2 Final report	9
5 Organisation of the work.....	11
5.1 Overall management of the contract	11
5.2 Timetable	11
6 The amount of the contract	12
7 Presentation of the proposal.....	12
7.1 Technical dossier	12
7.2 Financial Offer – Total Price.....	13
8 Award of the contract.....	13
8.1 Evaluation of tenders – award criteria	13
8.2 Contract award	14
9 Quality assessment.....	14

1 Purpose

1.1 Context

Enlargement is an important policy of the EU. The present enlargement agenda covers the Western Balkans, Turkey and Iceland, which have been given the perspective of becoming EU members once they fulfil the necessary conditions. The progress of the aspiring countries towards EU membership depends on the pace at which they meet the necessary conditions.

The December 2006 European Council stated that broad public support is essential in order to sustain the enlargement process. It endorsed the Commission's recommendation that better communication with the public should be one of the cornerstones of the EU's enlargement policy. The Commission has acknowledged the importance of listening to citizens' concerns and of addressing their questions. It is committed to providing factual information on past and future enlargements and to cooperating with strategic partners and multipliers to communicate with the public on enlargement.

DG Enlargement's mission¹ is to manage the process of whereby countries join the European Union, under the guidance of the Commissioner responsible for Enlargement. Within its mission, the Directorate Generale in charge of enlargement policy is responsible to communicate on the enlargement policy in the Member States towards the EU citizens.

The communication work on the enlargement is a challenge, given the communication environment, whereby not only the EU as a whole has a rather limited support, but the enlargement policy as well. According to Standard Eurobarometer 80 (fieldwork: November 2013), an absolute majority of Europeans continue to oppose further enlargement of the EU to include other countries in the coming years (52%, -1 percentage point), while 37% (unchanged since spring 2013) support it and 11% (+1) expressed no opinion.

A recent qualitative survey's results also revealed that there is a lack of knowledge on the countries participating in the process and mixed views on future enlargement with a common understanding that time and efforts are needed for consolidation before new countries can or should be admitted.

Within the countries of the European Union, DG Enlargement is the hub of communication activities on the enlargement policy and on the participating countries in the process. Under the PRINCE programme, A2 Information and communication Unit in DG Enlargement manage an average budget of EUR 5 million per year for information and communication programme on EU enlargement policy and strategy towards EU citizens in the Member States.

DG Enlargement information and communication programmes towards EU Member States have been implemented through a series of communication campaigns targeting various target groups

¹ The name of the Directorate General will change under the new Commission, but activities to communicate on enlargement will continue.

and using a series of communication tools. Since 2010, DG Enlargement A2 Information and Communication Unit has launched 8 communication campaigns, 5 are fully completed, 3 are ongoing, for a global amount of EUR 10 million.

The main focus area of this evaluation exercise concerns information and communication activities towards the EU Member States in the area of Enlargement. The primary objective of the evaluation will be to provide findings and recommendations to assist DG Enlargement in improving the planning and implementation of information and communication campaigns towards the EU Member States in the area of EU Enlargement, based on the past experience and lessons learned.

1.2 Aim and Scope

A thematic evaluation of PRINCE funded information and communication activities towards EU Member States in the area of EU Enlargement, covering activities implemented during the period January 2007 - June 2010 was finalised in July 2011.

This evaluation exercise will undertake a performance evaluation on the results and impacts of the communication campaigns (funded by PRINCE), launched and/or implemented during the period July 2011 – December 2014, towards EU Member States, in the area of EU Enlargement.

The main purpose of this evaluation is learning to improve the quality of DG Enlargement information and communication campaigns and its impact by

- Generating knowledge about what works and what does not and under what conditions;
- Facilitating evidence based decision making, notably at the programming stage;
- Improving information and communication activities, from design stage to implementation, monitoring and evaluation stages.

The evaluation will take into account the 8 following campaigns:

1. Audiovisual campaign in the area of future enlargement of the EU (completed);
2. Online and social media campaign (completed);
3. "Welcome Croatia" information campaign about the accession of Croatia to the EU (completed);
4. Information and communication campaigns for the visibility of EU-pre-accession funds (2) (the first one IPA visibility is completed; the follow-up campaign is ongoing);
5. Awareness-raising campaign on EU Enlargement and the countries in the process (2) (the first one is completed; the follow-up campaign is ongoing);
6. Stakeholder campaign on EU enlargement (ongoing).

As an indication, Terms of reference and projects overview of some of these campaigns are attached to the terms of reference.

The main objectives of PRINCE funded information and communication activities, developed by DG Enlargement, through eight campaigns, since 2010, were:

- To raise public awareness of the EU citizens about the participating countries and the enlargement process;

- To underline the shared values and interests between the EU Member States and the enlargement countries;
- To promote an informed debate and dialogue on enlargement;
- To increase exposure of EU citizens, in particular young people, to enlargement issues;
- To encourage reporting on the EU enlargement.

Each specific campaign has a set of messages and target groups with specific communication objectives and information and communication tools.

This evaluation has three main specific objectives:

- 1. To assess the performance – efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, impact, sustainability and EU added value – of the 5 completed information and communication campaigns**

The evaluation shall assess

- the effectiveness of the campaigns;
- the efficiency of the campaigns;
- their impact;
- their sustainability;
- their EU added value;
- the relevance and quality of the monitoring and performance framework.

- 2. To assess the intervention logic (logical framework) of completed and on-going information and communication campaigns (8)**

The evaluation shall assess the

- relevance of the actions;
- relevance and quality of the monitoring and performance framework.

- 3. To provide recommendations on the lessons learned from the completed and on-going information and communication campaigns.**

The recommendations should be operational and focused to the planning, implementation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation aspects of the DG Enlargement's information and communication campaigns.

1.3 End user of the evaluation

The Commission's Directorate-General for Enlargement is the commissioning body for this evaluation, which will be used by DG Enlargement, and in particular A2 Information and communication Unit, to improve the planning and implementation of future information and communication campaigns towards EU Member States in the area of enlargement policy.

2 Tasks to be performed by the contractor

In order to address the work to be performed, the evaluators will provide an answer, based on sound, evidence-based analysis, to the evaluation questions below.

When answering each evaluation question, and on the basis of the judgment criteria for each of them, the evaluators will

- produce conclusions on the current situation;

- provide precise, practical recommendations for future work.

2.1 Tasks in general

REQUESTED SERVICES

- Judgement on the performance (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, impact, sustainability and EU added value) of the 5 completed communication campaigns
For each of the 5 completed communication campaigns, the evaluation will assess the main activities implemented, on a sample basis.
- Assessment of logical framework of the 8 communication campaigns launched, its efficiency in setting up objectives, indicators at output and outcome impact level, milestones and targets. Assessment of the monitoring and reporting systems to review the progress made towards delivering expected results.
- Providing recommendations for the programming and design of the future communication campaigns. On the basis of lessons learned and good practices, the evaluation will provide feasible and concrete recommendations for future programming and designing of communication campaigns, in addressing deficiencies or problems identified.
In particular, the evaluation will make specific proposals regarding:
 - actions selected
 - target to whom they should be addressed
 - defined, clear, transparent and measurable indicators at impact, outcome and output levels,
 - monitoring, performance and evaluation frameworks.

To obtain the expected results, the contractor is required to :

COLLECT INFORMATION

- make an inventory of the information available
- collect all information available
- draft plan for interviews, questionnaires

SELECT ACTIVITIES

The contractor will select, **in each implemented campaign**, the main activities of the campaign for in depth case studies. The selection should take into account the following criteria:

- Financial importance of activities covered
- Target group of the activities
- Type of activity

ANALYSE THE DATA COLLECTED

The analysis must refer to the evaluation method used. The drafting of the replies to the evaluation question must describe the reasoning followed in the analysis, indicating among other things the underlying the hypotheses of the reasoning and the validity limits of that reasoning.

REPORT

The contractor will formulate findings, draw conclusions and submit recommendations following a logical cause-effect linkage and, where appropriate, explained associated risks. When formulating findings and drawing conclusions, the evaluator should present the factual information collected, the reasoned assessment of this information (judgement criteria) and how this leads to the key findings. The evaluator should ensure that conclusions are coherently and logically linked to evaluation findings through sound judgement criteria. Recommendations should stem logically from conclusions and clearly address the weaknesses identified and reported. They should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible.

2.2 Evaluation questions

Replying to the evaluation questions is the core element of the evaluation work, and the replies will also be a major part of the final deliverable.

For each of the questions, the evaluator will define a number of judgment criteria and indicators. A judgement criterion specifies an aspect of the intervention that will allow its merits or worth to be assessed in order to answer the evaluation question. Indicators considered for each criterion help in measuring it.

The evaluation questions concern the performance of the campaigns implemented and the logical framework of completed and on going campaigns.

2.2.1. PERFORMANCE OF THE CAMPAIGNS

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CAMPAIGNS	
To what extent were the communication activities effective in achieving the objectives of the campaign?	
Content of the question	The question aims at exploring whether the activities reached the target audiences, the messages were relevant to the objectives of the campaigns, the information and communication provided was relevant to the audience's needs., the activities produced the expected effects in the target audiences in terms of knowledge and/or perception.
EFFICIENCY OF THE CAMPAIGNS	
How efficient were the communication campaigns in order to convey the messages and achieve the expected results	
Content of the question	The question aims at exploring how efficient was the combination of activities in order to achieve the expected results and whether the outputs and results were achieved at a reasonable costs, whether the same results could have been achieved with less funding.
IMPACT, SUSTAINABILITY, EU ADDED VALUE OF THE CAMPAIGNS	
What is the impact of the campaigns, are these impacts sustainable and what is the EU added value in implementing these information and communication campaigns?	

EM

Content of the question	<p>The question aims at exploring whether the outputs and results delivered were translated into the desired and expected impacts, whether these impacts can be sufficiently identified and quantified, whether there are any additional impacts.</p> <p>The question should also explore the sustainability of the impacts and whether there are any elements which could hamper the impact and sustainability of the campaigns.</p> <p>What is the added value resulting from the campaigns compared to what could be achieved by the Member States at national or regional levels.</p>
RELEVANCE AND QUALITY OF THE MONITORING AND PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK OF THE CAMPAIGNS	
To what extent is the monitoring and performance framework of the campaigns adequate to measure and monitor the performance of the campaigns?	
Content of the question	<p>The question aims at exploring whether the monitoring and performance framework set up is adequate to measure and monitor the performance of the campaigns and to identify the drawbacks in the existing one and how they could be overcome.</p>

2.2.2. LOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF COMPLETED AND ON GOING CAMPAIGNS

RELEVANCE OF THE ACTIVITIES PLANNED AND RELEVANCE AND QUALITY OF THE MONITORING AND PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK OF THE CAMPAIGNS	
To what extent is the monitoring and performance framework of the campaigns adequate to measure and monitor the performance of the campaigns? To what extent are the activities planned relevant to the needs?	
Content of the question	<p>The question aims at exploring whether the campaigns are well designed to reach their objectives, whether the tools are selected according to the needs of the target audiences, and whether the monitoring and performance framework is adequate to effectively measure and monitor the performance of the campaigns.</p>

3 Methodology

DG ELARG's Evaluation guide and Secretariat General evaluation guidelines provide guidance on good practices concerning conducting and evaluation. These guidelines are available at the following links

http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial_assistance/phare/evaluation/2013/annex3_consolidated_evaluation_guide.pdf

http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/20131111_guidelines_pc_part_i_ii_clean.pdf

KAN

In their proposal, tenderers should describe the methodologies, data collection and analysis tools that they intend to use for addressing the evaluation questions and sub-questions.

Drafting a logic model of the intervention will be part of the assignment in the inception phase of the work.

Sources of information

The evaluator will use the following sources of information (non exhaustive list):

- enlargement strategy;
- PRINCE financing decisions;
- Tender and framework contracts documents, on the base of which the campaigns are implemented;
- Reports by contractors regarding the implementation of the campaigns;
- Evaluation of activities implemented by participants or target audiences;

The evaluator will complement these sources of information with

- stakeholders consultation and interviews;
- phone interviews, on-line questionnaires and other appropriate tools.

4 Deliverables

4.1 Inception report

The inception report will present, following discussions with the Commission during the inception meeting, the intervention logic, the draft final version of the methodological tools proposed by the contractor in its tender. In the report, the contractor will outline the work plan and calendar for each of the methodological tools.

Moreover, the contractor will provide a detailed explanation of how it intends to address each of the evaluation questions (judgement criteria proposed, data and indicators to be collected).

4.2 Interim report

This report will, at the least, provide information concerning the first results derived from the data collection and analysis activities carried out during the first phase of the evaluation (judgement on the performance of the 5 completed campaigns and assessment of logical framework of the 8 communication campaigns launched). The interim report will present the preliminary findings and results of the evaluation.

Special attention should be paid to developments not previously identified, potential new lines for research and preliminary conclusions or any difficulties encountered together with solutions.

4.3 Final report

The final report will present the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation. It will be made up of:

- an overview;
- an executive summary;
- the main section, the report itself;
- conclusions and recommendations;
- technical annexes, including the technical details and data used for the evaluation;
- a Power Point presentation of the work done, its conclusions and recommendations.

The report should include at least a description of:

- the purpose of the evaluation
- the scope of the evaluation
- the design and conduct of the evaluation
- the evidence found
- the analysis carried out
- the conclusions drawn, in the form of answers to each of the evaluation questions
- the recommendations made, linked to the relevant evaluation questions.

The final report should specifically answer each of the evaluation questions and address the defined scope.

The contractor should provide an abstract of no more than 200 words and, as a separate document, an executive summary of maximum 6 pages; both in English and French. The purpose of the abstract is to act as a reference tool helping the reader to quickly ascertain the evaluation's subject. An executive summary is an overview, which shall provide information on the (i) purpose of the assignment, (ii) methodology / procedure / approach, (iii) results / findings and (iv) conclusion and recommendations.

The final report should be usable for publication. The final report (except the slide presentation, which will be made available only in electronic format) must be submitted in five copies including one 'master' for reproduction and in an electronic format compatible with the Commission's computer facilities.

The final report and the executive summary will include

- the following standard disclaimer:

"The information and views set out in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this study. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission's behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein."

- specific identifiers, provided by the Contracting Authority, which shall be incorporated on the cover page.

5 Organisation of the work

5.1 Overall management of the contract

Close cooperation with DG Enlargeemmnt will be needed with a view to discussing any problem encountered during the evaluation process.

The evaluator must take into account the Commission's comments and recommendations. They will keep the Commission informed on the progress of work when asked to do so.

The contractor will be required to attend **five meetings** with DG Enlargement, at the designated Commission offices, in Brussels, in accordance with the timetable set out in section 5.3 below.

5.2 Steering Group

A Steering Group will follow the work for this evaluation. The Steering Group will assist the evaluators, contribute to the definition of the evaluation work, follow-up the evaluators' work and make remarks on the deliverables received. The Steering Group will participate in the meetings foreseen.

The contractor shall take into account the Steering Group's comments and recommendations and keep it informed on the progress of work when asked to do so while keeping his independence in judgement.

5.3 Timetable and deliverables

The work will have to be completed within 10 months from the signature of the contract. The contract is expected to be signed by mid December 2014. The contractor is expected to start the work immediately after signature of the Specific Contract.

Period	Meetings / deliverables
by 14 December 2014	Signature of the specific contract by the last party.

Beginning of January 2015	<p>Kick-off meeting:</p> <p>At this meeting, the Commission will provide any additional information required for implementation of the evaluation.</p> <p>The contractor may raise specific questions or request complementary information on the assignment.</p> <p>The meeting will also be used to discuss in detail the working plan, to explain and clarify the tasks and the approach from the start.</p>
End of January 2015	The contractor provides the draft inception report
Mid February 2015	Inception report meeting / minutes of the meeting
Mid February 2015	Inception report finalised and approved
Mid February 2015 – Mid May 2015	Main field work
End of May 2015	<p>Interim report</p> <p>End of field work and presentation of preliminary findings and results meeting</p>
Mid June 2015	Interim report approved
Mid July 2015	Draft final report
End of July 2015	Draft final report meeting
End of September 2015	Final report approved
By Mid October 2015	Debriefing of final report meeting

6 The amount of the contract

The maximum budget attributed to this evaluation is EUR 280,000.

7 Presentation of the proposal

The tender should be submitted in the language of the Framework Contract which is in English.

7.1 Technical dossier

The technical offer must cover all aspects and tasks required in the technical specifications and provide all the information needed to apply the award criteria. Offers deviating from the

requirements or not covering all requirements may be excluded on the basis of non-conformity with the tender specifications and will not be evaluated.

The technical offer must cover the following aspects:

- Description of the services to be performed

Tenderers will describe their approach to the services to be provided and the work necessary to be performed in view of achieving the objectives of the study. The tenderers will describe the envisaged arrangements for ensuring the coverage of the scope of the study.

- Proposed methodology and tools

Tenderers will provide a description of the approaches they intend to use for this evaluation and the methods they intend to follow. This description shall be linked to the different evaluation questions. The work packages envisaged shall be precisely described (including elements such as sources and collection of data and analytical tools employed).

- Team proposed for the assignment

Tenderers shall describe the role of different team members in carrying out the work under the assignment and must clearly spell out the reasons for this work allocation.

- Management and quality control of the work

Tenderers shall provide a complete description of their intended approach to project management. The description shall provide details on the global allocation of time and resources to the project and to each task and the rationale behind the choice of this allocation. Tenderers must describe clearly the control mechanisms that will be put in place to ensure the quality of the work.

7.2 Financial Offer – Total Price

The total price for the specific contract will be presented as a lump-sum on the basis of the number of persons/days and expert prices established according to the Framework Contract.

Please use the table in Annex II to the 'Invitation to tender' to present your financial offer.

8 Award of the contract

8.1 Evaluation of tenders – award criteria

The following award criteria are set to determine the best value for money tender to which the specific contract will be awarded.

Quality criteria

QC.1, max 20 points: Understanding of the services to be performed.

QC.2, max 40 points: Quality and relevance of proposed methodology and tools.

QC.3, max 20 points: Relevance of the team proposed for the assignment.

QC.4, max 20 points: Approach proposed for the management and quality control of the work.

Tenders which do not obtain at least 60 % of the maximum score for each award criteria and at least 70 % of the overall score for all the criteria will not be considered for the next stage of the evaluation procedure.

Financial criteria

Each tender will be assessed in terms of the total price offered, calculated on the basis of the unit prices broken down by staff category as fixed in the Framework Contract.

The scores for the financial criterion will be calculated according to the following formula:

The bid with the lowest price and with sufficient score for the technical part (according to the minimum thresholds set above) receives 100 points. The others are awarded points using the following formula:

Points = (price of the lowest bid / price of the bid in question) x 100

8.2 Contract award

The contract will be awarded to the best value for money tender. This will be determined on the basis of the price and the quality of the tender by weighting technical quality against price on a 40/60 basis. This is done by multiplying:

- the scores awarded for technical quality by 0.40
- the scores awarded for the financial bid by 0.60

The technical and financial scores multiplied by the weighting factors are then added together, and the contracts are awarded to the most economically advantageous bid.

9 Quality assessment

The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed on the basis of the criteria established in the Commission's evaluation quality assessment framework, which can be found in the quality assessment form available at:

http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/evaluation/documents_en.htm

The quality criteria will concern relevant scope, appropriate methods, reliable data, sound analysis, credible results, valuable conclusions and clarity of the deliverables.

ANNEXES (as an indication)

Terms of reference of two campaigns

Project overview of three campaigns