**Project: Increasing the Integrity of Public Procurement in Moldova**

**External Independent Final Evaluation of the Project**

**CALL FOR PROPOSALS TO SELECT EXTERNAL EVALUATORS**

(Version: 26 November 2024 – for publication)

**Background and short information about the Project**

The Partnership for Transparency (PTF)[[1]](#footnote-1), Washington DC, USA; and Institute for Development and Social Initiatives (IDIS) “Viitorul”[[2]](#footnote-2), Chisinau, Moldova, have been jointly implementing since September 2020 the above-referenced project (the Project). PTF and IDIS are issuing this Call for Proposals to request proposals (technical and financial) from individual consultants for the execution of an external independent final evaluation (the Evaluation) of the Project.

The goal of the Project is to support public procurement reforms in Moldova which will increase the transparency and fairness of public procurement by empowering citizens to hold relevant institutions accountable. A description of the Project can be found in Annex 1.

The Evaluation will assess how effective and efficient the Project was at achieving the stated objectives. It will also provide insights regarding the project’s sustainability. Detailed Terms of Reference for this assignment are attached as Annex 2.

**Selection Process**

The selection is for either one individual evaluator (the Evaluator, Option A) or a team of two evaluators (one Lead Evaluator supported by a Support Evaluator, Option B). Interested individual consultants shall submit a Proposal either for Option A (with one Evaluator), or for Option B (with one Lead Evaluator and a Support Evaluator). Proposals shall contain a technical and a financial proposal. Proposals shall not exceed a total of **twelve (12)** pages. The content of the technical proposal and the financial proposal are outlined below.

The selection will be carried out by a committee comprising an odd number of evaluators using the selection criteria set forth below. Under Option A, only one Evaluator will be selected. Under Option B, a team of two evaluators (a Lead Evaluator and a Support Evaluator) will be selected.

The selected Evaluator (Option A) or Evaluators (Option B) will be contracted by the US-based PTF .

**General**

Under both options the expected total level of effort is estimated at no more than thirty (30) workdays, including if the evaluator(s) are not based in Moldova one (1) field mission for data collection and interviews. The Evaluators shall be granted access to all relevant Project information including, but not limited to, legal documents, training materials, surveys, Quarterly Reports, Monitoring Reports, minutes of meetings of the Coalition of Monitors and of the National Public Procurement Platform (NPPP), technical notes produced by the Coalition of Monitors, reports and recommendations produced by the NPPP, as well as any other document pertinent to the assignment. These documents are in English or in Romanian. All deliverables produced by the selected Evaluator(s) shall be in English, including the virtual workshop. The interviews will be conducted in English or Romanian, depending on the case. No translation will be provided, and the Evaluator(s) shall be fluent in both languages.

**Content of the Proposal**

Proposals shall contain a technical proposal, and a financial proposal as described below for each option. Only complete Proposals will be accepted.

**1. Technical proposal**

Option A (one Evaluator)

1. A methodology (not to exceed five (5) pages) describing how the Evaluator proposes to carry out the assignment, explaining the documents she/he will review, the interviews she/he will conduct, showing a sample of the questions she/he will use, and a work plan with a chart showing the different tasks to be accomplished, the sequence of such tasks, and the timeline for the execution of the entire Evaluation; and
2. The CV of the proposed Evaluator in accordance with the format at the end of this Call for Proposals document (not to exceed three (3) pages).

Option B (one Lead Evaluator and one Support Evaluator)

1. A methodology (not to exceed five (5) pages) describing how the two Evaluators propose to carry out the assignment, explaining the documents they will review, the interviews they will conduct, showing a sample of the questions they will use, and a work plan with a chart showing the proposed division of tasks between the two Evaluators, the sequence of their interventions, and the timeline for the execution of the entire Evaluation and;
2. CVs of the two proposed Evaluators (each CV not to exceed three (3) pages).

**2. Financial proposal**

Option A (one Evaluator)

All amounts to be expressed in USD with the following breakdown:

1. Daily professional rate for the Evaluator;
2. Estimated number of days to be spent on the assignment and total professional fees to be charged by the Evaluator;
3. Travel cost if any (with a breakdown between hotel, transportation, meals, other costs);
4. Any other expenses (i.e., report production, communications, other costs);
5. Total price for the Evaluation (items 1 to 4) separating any applicable taxes if applicable.

Option B (one Lead Evaluator and one Support Evaluator)

All amounts to be expressed in USD with the following breakdown:

1. Daily professional rate for each Evaluator;
2. Estimated number of days to be spent on the assignment for each Evaluator and total professional fees to be charged for each Evaluator;
3. Travel cost if any (with a breakdown between hotel, transportation, meals, other costs);
4. Any other expenses (i.e., report production, communications, other costs);
5. Total price for the Evaluation (items 1 to 4), separating any applicable taxes if applicable.

**Submission deadline**

Proposals shall be submitted **no later than 9 December 2024 at 10:00 Moldova time** via email to gfrezza@ptfund.org, indicating in the subject line: “submission for the performance of an independent final project evaluation”. Confirmation of receipt will be provided via email.

**Questions**

Participants should send clarification questions **no later than 01 December 2024 at 18:00 Moldova time** via email to gfrezza@ptfund.org, indicating in the subject line: “QUESTION RE: Final Project Evaluation”.The answers to all questions will be published on **03 December 2024** on <https://pulsachizitii.md/>.

**Evaluation process**

**1. Administrative verification**

The following aspects will be examined in the administrative verification process:

* Whether the Proposal was submitted on time;
* Whether the Proposal includes a technical and a financial proposal with the required documents and information;

If any of the required information is missing or incorrect, the proposal might be rejected. Proposals that pass the administrative verification will be accepted for the next stage of evaluation.

**2. Technical evaluation**

Evaluation of the technical proposals will be carried out by the Evaluation Committee on the basis of the following selection criteria:

Option A (proposals with one Evaluator)

1. Adequacy of the proposed technical approach, methodology and work plan in responding to the Terms of Reference ***[40 points]***
2. Evaluator’s qualifications and competence for the assignment:
* Evaluator ***[60 points]***

To score criterion (ii), the following three (3) sub-criteria shall be used:

* 1. General qualifications: The Evaluator must hold a degree either in economics, law, procurement, public sector management, or similar specialty *[10 points]*
	2. Adequacy for the assignment: The Evaluator must have
		1. a good understanding of procurement and of international development projects as demonstrated by previous experience in her/his CVs *[20 points]* and
		2. experience with project evaluations as demonstrated by previous projects of a similar nature identified in her/his CV. Minimum experience of three (3) projects of at least $300,000 each *[20 points].*
	3. Experience in the region *[10 points]*
	4. Fluency of the Evaluator in both English and Romanian is a requirement of a valid proposal *[no points attributed, but If the Evaluator does not meet this requirement, her/his Proposal will be disqualified.]*

Total points for the two criteria: ***[100 points]***

**Minimum technical qualifying score:** The minimum technical qualifying score required to pass the technical evaluation is ***[80 points].***

Only if a technical proposal reaches or exceeds the minimum technical qualifying score will the corresponding financial proposal be considered and evaluated.

Option B (Proposal submitted with a Lead Evaluator and a Support Evaluator)

1. Adequacy of the proposed technical approach, methodology and work plan in responding to the Terms of Reference ***[40 points]***
2. Evaluators’ qualifications and competence for the assignment:
	* Lead Evaluator***[40 points]***
	* Support Evaluator***[20 points]***

To score criterion (ii), the following three (3) sub-criteria shall be used:

1. General qualifications: The Lead Evaluator and the Support Evaluator must hold degrees either in economics, law, procurement, public sector management, or similar specialty *[6 points for the Lead Evaluator, 4 Points for the Support Evaluator]*
2. Adequacy for the assignment: The Lead Evaluator and the Support Evaluator must have
	* 1. a good understanding of procurement and of international development projects as demonstrated by their previous experience in their respective CVs. *[14 points for the Lead Evaluator, 6 points for the Support Evaluator]* and
		2. experience with project evaluations as demonstrated by previous projects of a similar nature identified in their respective CVs. Minimum experience of three (3) projects of at least $300,000 each (Lead Evaluator) and 3 projects of at least $200,000 each (Support Evaluator) *[14 points for the Lead Evaluator, 6 points for the Support Evaluator]*
3. Experience in the region *[6 points for the Lead Evaluator, 4 points for the Support Evaluator]*
4. Fluency of the Lead Evaluator and the Support Evaluator in both English and Romanian is a requirement of a valid proposal *[no points attributed, but if the Lead Evaluator and the Support Evaluator do not meet this requirement, their Proposal will be disqualified.]*

Total points for the two criteria: ***[100 points]***

**Minimum technical qualifying score:** The minimum technical qualifying score required to pass the technical evaluation is ***[80 points].***

Only if a technical proposal reaches or exceeds the minimum technical qualifying score will the corresponding financial proposal be considered and evaluated.

**3. Financial Evaluation**

All Proposals with a technical proposal achieving the minimum technical qualifying score of **eighty (80) points** shall have their corresponding financial proposal considered to ensure they contain the required information. Upon consideration of the qualifying financial proposals, the evaluation committee shall select the financial proposal with the lowest price as the winner.

**Communication of results**

The name of the selected Evaluator (if Option A applies) or the names of the selected Evaluators (if Option B applies) shall be published on <https://pulsachizitii.md/> on or about **16 December 2024**.

**Signature of contract**

Under Option A, the winning Evaluator shall sign the contract. Under Option B, both selected Evaluators shall sign the contract.

*This Call for Proposals is issued by the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF) under the project "Increasing Integrity in Public Procurement". It is published on 22 October 2024 on the following websites:*

* [www.pulsachizitii.md](http://www.pulsachizitii.md)
* [www.ptfund.org](http://www.ptfund.org)
* www.viitorul.org

**Template: CURRICULUM VITAE (CV)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Position Title** | Under Option A: Evaluator Under Option B: Lead Evaluator or Support Evaluator |
| **Name of Expert:**  | {Insert full name} |
| **Date of Birth:** | {day/month/year} |
| **Country of Citizenship and Residence** | {country of citizenship, county of Residence} |
| **Contact information:**  | {e-mail, phone} |

**Education:** {List college/university or other specialized education, giving names of educational institutions, dates attended, degree(s)/diploma(s) obtained}

**Employment record relevant to the assignment:** {Starting with present position, list in reverse order. Please provide dates, name of employing organization, titles of positions held, types of activities performed and location of the assignment, and contact information of previous clients and employing organization(s) who can be contacted for references. Past employment that is not relevant to the assignment does not need to be included.}

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Period** | **Employing organization and your title/position. Contact information for references** | **Country** | **Summary of activities performed relevant to the Assignment** |
| [e.g., May 2005-present] | [e.g., Ministry of ……, advisor/consultant to…For references: Tel…………/e-mail……; Mr./Ms. deputy minister] |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Membership in Professional Associations and Publications: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Language Skills (indicate only languages in which you can work): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Adequacy for the Assignment:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Detailed Tasks assigned for the Evaluation** | **Reference to prior work/assignments that best illustrate capability to handle the assigned tasks** |
| List all deliverables/tasks in which the individual Evaluator (under Option A), will be involved, orLead Evaluator or Support Evaluator (under Option B) will be involved)  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Certification:**

I, the undersigned, certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief, this CV correctly describes myself, my qualifications, and my experience, and I am available, as and when necessary, to undertake the assignment in case of an award. I understand that any misstatement or misrepresentation described herein may lead to my disqualification or dismissal.

 {day/month/year}

Name of Evaluator Signature Date

**Annex 1: Project Flyer**



**Annex 2: Terms of Reference**

**“Increasing the Integrity of Public Procurement in Moldova”**

**Terms of Reference for an External Independent Final Evaluation of the Project:**

1. **Background information on the project to be evaluated**
	1. In September 2020, the project partners, Partnership for Transparency (PTF), Washington DC, USA; and Institute for Development and Social Initiatives (IDIS) “Viitorul”[[3]](#footnote-3), Chisinau, Moldova embarked on aproject (the Project), initially designed to last just over two years and funded by the State Department of the United States, to enhance the capacity of civil society organizations (CSOs) and investigative journalists in Moldova to en­gage in informed and responsible monitoring of public procurement processes. An extension to the original Project was granted in September 2022, extending the life of the Project to June 30, 2025. The goal of the Project is to support procurement reforms that increase the transparency and fairness of public procurement in Moldova by empowering citizens to hold relevant institutions accountable and catalyze integrity across the procurement ecosystem.
	2. The overall Project goal is to achieve:

Increased public procurement transparency through citizen/Civil Society Organizations’ monitoring and reporting, to hold stakeholders involved in public procurement processes accountable, inducing them to operate with integrity to perform their duties more effectively.

To achieve this objective, the Project’s specific **objectives** are:

Objective 1: Moldovan CSOs and journalists are sufficiently equipped to conduct a meaningful monitoring of procurement processes.

Objective 2: Procurement procedures and practices are appropriately monitored by Moldovan CSOs and journalists, making use of the e-procurement system and other sources of information.

Objective 3: Findings and recommendations resulting from credible and professional CSOs’ monitoring are taken seriously and acted upon by contracting entities, contractors, government and law enforcement entities, including the National Anti-Corruption Center.

1.3 The Project is implemented in four phases described in detail with their corresponding outputs and major achievements thus far. The Project pamphlet is attached to the Call for Proposals as Annex 1.

1. **Objectives of the external independent final evaluation**
	1. The external independent final evaluation of the Project (hereinafter referred to as the Project Evaluation or the Evaluation) will be conducted in accordance with these Terms of Reference (TORs). It will be carried out either by one external Evaluator (Option A); or alternatively by a team of two external Evaluators (one Lead Evaluator), supported by a second team member (Support Evaluator), selected in accordance with the criteria set forth in the Call for Proposals. The project evaluation will assess how effective and efficient the Project was at achieving the stated objectives. It will also provide insights regarding the Project’s sustainability.
2. **Scope of Services**
	1. In line with the Project’s objectives, the Project Evaluation will answer questions such as:
3. **Effectiveness – Outputs:** *To what extent has the Project produced the intended outputs as originally planned (or as modified to cater for changes in the environment)?*
4. **Effectiveness – Objectives:** *To what extent has the Project achieved the intended objectives as originally planned (or as modified to cater for changes in the environment)?*
	1. **Are Moldovan CSOs and journalists better equipped to conduct meaningful monitoring of procurement processes?** Has the Project contributed to increasing the capacity of CSOs to monitor public procurement? Are CSOs that monitor public procurement doing so more effectively, e.g. have their techniques improved because of the training and coaching they received, do they collaborate more effectively, e.g. through participation of CSOs in the Coalition of Monitors, etc.?
	2. **Are procurement procedures and practices monitored effectively by Moldovan CSOs and journalists?** Has the Project contributed to increasing the number and/or improving the quality of findings and recommendations resulting from monitoring public procurement], e.g., has the quantity of monitoring increased (i.e., are there additional CSOs that started engaging in public procurement monitoring as a result of the training or other project activities – or that existing CSOs have increased their activities?)
	3. **Are findings and recommendations resulting from credible and professional CSO monitoring taken seriously and acted upon by relevant public bodies?** Has the Project contributed to increasing the number and/or improving the quality of findings and recommendations resulting from monitoring public procurement as follows: i) *on a case level:* have the findings produced with support from the Project led to results? ii) *on the systemic level:* has the Project contributed to an improvement in the framework of public procurement in Moldova, increasing its transparency, efficiency, integrity, and accountability by ensuring findings and recommendations of monitoring activities lead to systemic changes, e.g. by ensuring input from CSOs based on their monitoring findings produce meaningful input into the legal and regulatory framework and/or procedures of public procurement through papers, discussion, and recommendations via the activities and structures of the project, including the subgrants program, the Coalition of Monitors, and the National Public Procurement Platform (NPPP)?
	4. Monitoring Data and other information to support the project evaluation: The table below provides an overview of the evaluation approach, including sources of information and methods of collecting quantitative and qualitative data being collected during the Project duration that will support answering the evaluation questionslisted under sub-paragraphs (a) to (c) above.

| **Criterion** | **Evaluation question** | **Assessment criteria** | **Sources of information** | **Data collection** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Effectiveness**Achievement of planned Outputs | To what extent have the project outputs been produced as originally planned (or as modified to cater for changes in the environment)? | AC17.1 The outputs are clearly defined.AC17.2 The outputs were implemented as originally planned. | Project proposal, Project reporting,data collection through interviews | Desk Review: Quarterly Reporting to DRL; Interviews with project team, grantees, training participants |
| **Effectiveness**Achievement of intended objectives | To what extent has the project achieved the intended objectives as originally planned (or as modified to cater for changes in the environment)? | AC16.1 The project achieved the objectives.  | Project proposal, project reporting | Desk review: Monitoring data, Quarterly Reporting to DRL; Interviews with project team and stakeholders (e.g., members of NPPP, Monitoring Coalition, etc.)  |

1. **Key Activities**

4.1 Whether it is conducted under Option A (one Evaluator), or under Option B (one Lead Evaluator and one Support Evaluator), the Project Evaluation shall include the following activities:

1. Review of progress achieved during the execution of the Project based on the Project’s monitoring and evaluation (M&E) data and indicators as well as its quarterly reporting.
2. Review of key outputs produced during the four implementation phases of the Project:

Phase 1: Inception

Phase 2: Training

Phase 3: Monitoring

Phase 4: Policy dialogue

1. Collection of own data through interviews, surveys and potentially other methods (such as focus group discussions, etc.) of selected stakeholders (project team, grantees, beneficiaries, partners, etc.). To credibly assess the criteria laid out above, the Evaluators should review the Project documentation, conduct at least two (2) interviews with the project team covering both organizations, IDIS and PTF, one (1) interview with the Ministry of Finance (MoF) one (1) interview with the Public Procurement Agency (PPA), three (3) interviews with three (3) different grantees that they will choose, one (1) or two (2) interviews with members of the Coalition of Monitors, and two (2) interviews with the members of the National Public Procurement Platform (NPPP).
2. Preparation and submission of reports as outlined below.
3. Organization and holding of a virtual workshop to present and discuss an advanced draft of the project evaluation report.
4. **Expected Final Deliverable**

5.1 The Evaluator under Option A or the Evaluators under Option B will produce a Project Evaluation Report which will answer the questions raised under paragraph 3 above. The Report will include an assessment of the key outputs at each stage of the Project implementation. It will also incorporate an executive summary, a section on specific findings and recommendations.

1. **Project Schedule and Milestones**
	1. After completion of the selection process and signature of the contract, the Project Evaluator (under Option A) or the Project Evaluators (under Option B) shall adhere to the following timeline:
2. **Desk Review and Data Collection**: It shall start no later than January 15, 2025, and be completed by **March 15, 2025**.
3. **Draft Report:** A first draft of the Project Evaluation Report shall be submitted to the project team no later than **April 15, 2025**.
4. **Feedback by the project team**: The project team shall convey its comments to the first draft of the Project Evaluation Report, no later than **April 30, 2025.**
5. **Virtual Workshop**: After incorporating the project team’s comments, the Evaluator (under Option (A) or Evaluators (under Option B) shall present an advanced draft of the Project Evaluation Report to the project team in a virtual workshop, no later than **May 15, 2025**.
6. **Final Report**: Thereafter, the Evaluator (under Option A) or the Evaluators (under Option B) shall have another two weeks to make any required changes to the Report and deliver the final version by **May 31, 2025**. This final deliverable will be approved by the project team within two weeks.
	1. Schedule and milestones at a glance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parties involved** | **Activities** | **Timing** |
| Evaluator(s) | Milestone 1: Submission of workplan including a list of issues encountered which could potentially impact the evaluation to focal person. | Within one week of January 15, 2025 |
| Evaluator(s)  | Desk review and data collection | January 15, 2025, to March 15, 2025 |
| Evaluator(s)  | Milestone 2: Submission of first draft of Project Evaluation Report  | April 15, 2025 |
| Project team | Conveying comments to the first draft of the Project Evaluation Report | April 30, 2025 |
| Evaluator(s) and project team | Milestone 3: Virtual Workshop to present advanced draft of Project Evaluation Report to the project team | May 15, 2025 |
| Evaluator(s) | Milestone 4: Submission of final Project Evaluation Report to the project team | May 31, 2025 |
| Project Director | Approval of final Project Evaluation Report | June 15, 2025 |

1. **Reporting Requirements**
	1. During the execution of the assignment, the Evaluator (under Option A) or the Evaluators (under Option B) shall report to the project team and communicate with the team on a weekly basis. For purposes of this assignment, a focal person for the project team will be nominated by the Project Director at the beginning of the contract. All communications between the Evaluator (under Option A) or the Evaluators (under Option B) and the team shall go through that person. Within one week of starting the evaluation, the Evaluator (under Option A) or the Evaluators (under Option B) shall meet with the focal person to provide a workplan and a list of any encountered issues which might affect the evaluation.
	2. Summary of reporting requirements

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parties involved** | **Type of reporting** | **Timing** |
| Evaluator(s) and focal person | Weekly reporting of the evaluators to focal person in the form of a meeting (face-to-face or virtual). | Weekly from January 15, 2025, to May 31, 2025 |

1. **Acceptance Criteria**
	1. All deliverables (milestones) will be approved in writing (email) by the focal person on behalf of the project team, in accordance with the timetable set forth in paragraphs 6.1 and 6.2 above.
2. **Languages**
	1. Written deliverables are to be submitted in English.
	2. Documents for review will be provided in English or in Romanian.
	3. The virtual workshop will be conducted in English.
	4. Interviews will need to be conducted in English and in Romanian.
	5. The Final Project Evaluation Report shall be in English.
	6. No translation will be provided for documents, interviews, or meetings.
3. **Payment Schedule**
	1. The payment terms for this contract shall be based on the following milestones and deliverables:

|  |
| --- |
| Payment Schedule |
| Deliverables | % |
| 1. Milestone 1: Proposed workplan
 | 10% |
| 1. Milestone 2: First draft of the Project Evaluation Report
 | 20% |
| 1. Milestone 3: Virtual workshop to present advanced draft of Project Evaluation report.
 | 30% |
| 1. Approval of the Final Project Evaluation Report
 | 40% |
| TOTAL | **100%** |

* 1. This payment schedule is based on a lump-sum contract.
1. **Supervision**
	1. The Evaluator(s) shall report to the focal person who will provide any comments and instructions on behalf of the project team.
	2. Formal acceptance of deliverables shall be provided by the project director in writing (by email).
2. **Qualification and experience requirements**
* **Degrees:** Evaluator(s) must hold degrees either in economics, law, procurement, public sector management or similar specialty.
* **International projects:** Evaluator(s) must have a good understanding of procurement and of international development projects as demonstrated by their previous experience in their respective CVs.
* **Minimum experience of external independent project evaluation:** The Evaluators must have experience with project evaluations as demonstrated by previous projects of a similar nature in their respective CVs.
	+ **Under Option A:** The Evaluator must have a minimum project evaluation experience of three (3) projects of at least $300,000 each.

**Under Option B:** The Lead Evaluator must have a minimum project evaluation experience of three (3) projects of at least $300,000 each; and the Support Evaluator must have a minimum project evaluation experience of three (3) projects of at least $200,000 each.

* **Languages:** Evaluator(s) must be fluent in Romanian and English. If this requirement is not met, Proposals will be considered non-responsive and rejected.
1. **Expected level of effort**
	1. Under Option A or Option B, no more than thirty (30) workdays total including one (1) field mission for data collection and interviews if the Evaluator(s) are not based in Moldova.
2. **Assessment criteria**
	1. Proposals shall contain technical and financial proposals.
	2. The technical proposals shall include
		1. CV(s) of the evaluator(s) – in the format provided in the Call for Proposals document.
		2. Proposed methodology
		3. Workplan for the assignment

all in accordance with the requirements stated in the Call for Proposals document.

* 1. The financial proposal shall
		1. detail the budget by activity and
		2. show the total budget needed for the assignment
		3. clearly identify any taxes that the Evaluator (under Option A) or the Evaluators (under Option B) will have to pay considering that the contracting entity will be the US-based PTF,

all in accordance with the Call for Proposals document.

* 1. Evaluation criteria are detailed in the Call for Proposals document.
1. [**Partnership for Transparency (PTF)**](https://ptfund.org/)supports innovative and civil society-led approaches to reduce corruption, increase transparency, strengthen governance, and enhance accountability in low-and middle-income economies and shares the insights gleaned with its wide network of partners. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [**IDIS “Viitorul” (IDIS)**](http://viitorul.org/en)is an independent think tank, established in 1993, as a research and advocacy think tank, incorporated under Moldovan laws as a non-profit NGO. IDIS combines social, political, and economic research with solid advocacy components. It undertakes applied field research and monitors targeted issues in several fields: economics, subsidiarity, social policy, EU policies, regional development, but also security risks, and foreign policy. IDIS is respected for its experience and expertise within Moldova and is one of the entities regularly invited by the authorities, including the Ministry of Finance, to comment on proposed policy, legal, and regulatory changes. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)