

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Final Evaluation of CSO-LA/2019/410-363 – “Game Over? Do not let climate change end the game!”

Contracting Authority: CEEweb for Biodiversity

BACKGROUND 3

1.1 RELEVANT CONTEXT BACKGROUND 3

1.2 THE INTERVENTION TO BE EVALUATED 3

1.3 STAKEHOLDERS OF THE INTERVENTION..... 5

1.4 CONTRIBUTION TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS (SDG) 6

DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT 6

1.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION 6

1.6 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED 7

1.7 PHASES OF THE EVALUATION AND REQUIRED OUTPUTS..... 8

1.8 MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION 10

1.9 LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT 10

EXPERTISE REQUIRED..... 10

1.10 NUMBER OF EVALUATORS AND OF WORKING DAYS PER CATEGORY 10

1.11 EXPERTISE REQUIRED 10

LOCATION AND DURATION..... 11

1.12 LOCATION(S) OF ASSIGNMENT 11

1.13 FORESEEN DURATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT IN CALENDAR MONTHS..... 11

1.14 STARTING PERIOD AND PLANNING..... 11

REPORTING..... 11

1.15 CONTENT, TIMING AND SUBMISSION 11

1.16 COMMENTS ON THE OUTPUTS 12

1.17 LANGUAGE 12

1.18 FORMATTING OF REPORTS AND NUMBER OF REPORT COPIES 12

CONTENT OF THE OFFERS 12

1.19 TECHNICAL OFFER..... 12

1.20 FINANCIAL OFFER 13

BUDGET OF THE PRESENT EVALUATION..... 13

DEADLINE FOR THE SUBMISSION OF QUESTIONS 13

SUBMISSION OF THE OFFERS AND THEIR ASSESSMENT 13

1.21 DEADLINE FOR THE SUBMISSION OF THE OFFERS 13

1.22 MODALITIES FOR THE SUBMISSION OF THE OFFERS 13

1.23 ASSESSMENT OF THE OFFERS 13

INVOICING AND PAYMENTS..... 13

ANNEX I: CRITERIA TO ASSESS THE OFFERS..... 14

ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM..... 15

ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 16

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE 18

ANNEX V: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED INTERVENTION(S), WITH RESULTS UP TO 31 OCTOBER 2022..... 19

ANNEX VI: FINANCIAL OFFER TEMPLATE..... 47

BACKGROUND

1.1 Relevant context background

Climate change is undoubtedly one of the most serious global challenges today, which will increasingly impact the younger generation in the coming decades. However, climate change does not only impact us, humans, but all other species and ecosystems on the planet, interacting with the various other ecosystem services, like the provision of water, food, regulating pests and diseases or provision of medicines. These interlinkages also impact the mitigation and adaptation efforts to climate change, although this aspect is still insufficiently addressed today (e.g. the carbon storage of wetlands or permafrost, the protective role of forests in heavy rainfall, agrobiodiversity in adapting to changing climate, etc.).

As a result of these interlinkages, climate change is one of the main reasons behind biodiversity loss and ecosystem decline, on the one hand, while ecosystem decline is also an aggravating factor behind climate change, on the other.

The ‘Game Over?’ project takes a broad approach to how climate change impacts all life on Earth — in Europe and in the Global South, and vice versa — and how our choices affect the ecosystems in order to capitalize on the strong synergies in an emotional, life-centred communication campaign. **It, moreover, has ‘gamification’ at its central approach to raise awareness, with an emphasis on a youth target audience, to both work collaboratively, as well as to inform as to the actions and needs that all individuals can commence.**

The project is implemented in eight (8) EU countries: Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania. The project’s consortium consists of 10 partners: one national Civil Society Organisation/NGO in each of the eight countries as national implementers; one communications agency as Communications Leader and located in Hungary; and one NGO as Lead Project Coordinator, located in Hungary.

The project has conducted two omnibus survey and focus groups campaigns on 2021 and 2023, with comparative results of the general mood and knowledge of the climate change crisis in each of the countries where the project was set to implement its activities. The survey campaign focused on youth audiences for the focus groups, and had a mix set of respondents for the omnibus surveys.

1.2 The intervention to be evaluated

| | |
|---|--|
| Title of the intervention to be evaluated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CSO-LA/2019/410-363 – Game Over? Do not let climate change end the game! |
| Budget of the intervention to be evaluated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 346 865 EUR |
| Dates of the intervention to be evaluated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Start: 1/11/2019 End: 31/10/2023 |

The CSO-LA/2019/410-363 – Game Over? Do not let climate change end the game! project, branded during its implementation as “**Game On! Don’t let climate change end the game!**”, is a 4-year-long initiative of a consortium of 10 partners from 8 Central and Eastern European countries to activate the global youth and react to the existential threat climate change represents for the future of humankind through a gamification approach. The project has been made possible thanks to the co-financing of the Development Education and Awareness Raising (DEAR) mechanism.

The project has sought to shed light on the impact and responsibility of the EU in the world and the critical role that EU institutions, programs and policies play in shaping development in countries of the Global

South. EU policies — not just in relation to climate change and the environment, but also in trade, economy, agriculture and finances — impact and shape the developing world: good policymaking contributes to the EU's role as a global norm-setter, while flawed policies may cause damage well beyond EU borders. At the same time, EU citizens, through consumption and life-style choices, have an influence on production in the Global South and the well-being of its citizens. **The project, through its consortium partners, has sought to bring these crucial interactions to the spotlight, foster critical thinking among the youth, and highlight how well-implemented EU development programmes, climate change actions and individual changes can make a positive and forward-looking change in the world.**

The project has focused on having an impact on the youth in the partner countries (aged 15-35), with actions that have been often gamified — specially targeted at this age group — while older adults (35+) have also been reached, thus increasing their understanding and capacities for actions. Youth ambassadors and other multipliers — like journalists and social media influencers — have been targeted to use their potential in the communication actions. An increased understanding of the youth has been sought through awareness raising actions in order to be 'activated' to address climate change through individual and collective level changes. National and EU decision makers have also been addressed with the involvement of the youth, pushing for collective level changes, while research and lobby meetings were done to increase their technical knowledge and understanding of the complex interlinkages among EU policies, climate change and development in the South.

Youth and citizens in the eight partner countries have been targeted with the upscaled actions on climate change that are to be achieved both on the individual level — by the youth — and on the collective level — by the decision makers. Communities in developing countries that are affected by climate change and the degradation of their ecosystem services — especially marginalised communities, such as women and children — have been sought to be positively affected by the more coherent EU policies on climate change, development, agriculture, trade and energy which directly or indirectly impact their lives and livelihood.

With the conclusion of the project, a detailed external evaluation on the basis objectives, activities and results of the project, and the objectively verifiable indicators included in the logical framework, will be carried out. For this purpose, a comprehensive evaluation of the sources and means for indicator monitoring will be carried out. Based on the result-orientated indicators, the evaluation will clearly verify the successes and failures of the project in its execution.

Following the intervention logic, the project aimed as an Overall Objective "To bolster up the commitment of the citizens in the eight target countries (BG, CZ, DE, HU, LT, LV, RO & SK) to adopt more sustainable lifestyles and reduce their carbon footprint". To do so, it focused on achieving the following Specific Objectives (i.e. Outcomes):

- **Outcome 1:** Increased active engagement of young people in eight target countries in fighting climate change and ecosystem degradation in line with European values; and
- **Outcome 2:** Increased scientifically grounded coverage of topics related to climate change, ecosystem degradation and their social impacts by multipliers (Young Ambassadors, social media influencers, journalists, teachers).

To fulfil such outcomes, the project worked with the following outputs in its intervention process:

- **Output 1.1:** Increased awareness of young people in the eight target countries about climate change, its relation to ecosystems and their services, and its impact on people's lives.
- **Output 1.2:** Increased availability of tools and methods for engaging citizens in individual and collective changes to address climate change in an exosystemic approach.
- **Output 1.3:** Opportunities for engagement of citizens in advocacy and lobbying actions for fighting climate change and ecosystem decline expanded.
- **Output 2.1:** Increased capacities of multipliers in raising awareness on climate change, ecosystem degradation and social impacts.

Considering the aforementioned, the intervention's evaluation will focus on the following flagship activities, considering their success/impacts, as well as weaknesses/failures:

- 1. Capacity Building activities:**
 - a. Wilderness camps for young climate activists and young ambassadors
 - b. Non-formal educational materials for teachers, mentors and group leaders
 - c. E-Learning platform on climate change for non-specialised audiences
 - d. Festival Greening Handbook and greening of festivals in each country
- 2. Awareness raising activities:**
 - a. Improv theatre in 4 countries
 - b. Climate comedy in 2 countries
 - c. Fact-Finding missions for Young Ambassadors and journalists/influencers to Kenya, Guatemala and Honduras
 - d. Over-layering of museum exhibitions in 5 countries and of zoos in 2 countries
 - e. Speakers' Tour in 4 EU countries with 3 speakers from the Global South
 - f. Addressing EU and national decision makers with the youth
- 3. Gamification:**
 - a. Mobile app for lifestyle changes
 - b. Board game on resource consumption and development distinctions between the Global South and Global North
 - c. International Geocaching game in 8 countries
- 4. Addressing multipliers:**
 - a. Inclusion of Young Ambassadors
 - b. Addressing journalists and influencers as multipliers

The evaluation team will be **asked to reconstruct the Intervention Logic of the intervention** in order to reflect an updated and shared vision of its intended casual chain. The Intervention Logic described in this chapter of the ToR is based on existing documents and shall be subject to the evaluators' scrutiny and reconstruction during Inception.

The Logical Framework Matrix (i.e. LogFrame) of the intervention can be find in Annex V, including the indicators of performance up until 31 October 2022 — the conclusion of the 3rd year (out of four) of the project.

1.3 Stakeholders of the intervention

1. Consortium partners:
 - Bulgaria: Bulgarian Biodiversity Foundation
 - Czech Republic: Na Mysli
 - Germany: Romero Initiative (CIR)
 - Hungary: CEEweb for Biodiversity (Project Lead), PersonaR (Communications Lead), and National Society of Conservationists – Friends of the Earth Hungary (MTVSZ-FoE HU).
 - Latvia: Latvian Fund for Nature
 - Lithuania: Lithuanian Fund for Nature
 - Romania: Milvus Group
 - Slovakia: BROZ
2. Young Ambassadors involved in capacity building and awareness raising activities.
3. Teachers involved in workshops on non-formal educational materials.
4. Organisers from festivals 'greened' with the intervention's festival greening handbook.

The evaluators will be free to refine and finalise this map during Inception in order to identify the key informants to be interviewed / surveyed.

1.4 Contribution to Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)

The European Union is committed to the achievement of the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development adopted by the UN in September 2015; as a consequence, all interventions co-financed by the European Union should reinforce and make explicit their contributions to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), the core of Agenda 2030.

The intervention to be evaluated is expected to contribute to the following SDG:

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Goal 4 | Quality education |
| Goal 5 | Gender equality |
| Goal 10 | Reduce inequalities |
| Goal 12 | Responsible consumption and production |
| Goal 13 | Climate |
| Goal 15 | Life on land |
| Goal 16 | Peace, justice and strong institutions |
| Goal 17 | Partnership for the goals |

DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Type of evaluation | Final |
| Coverage | The intervention in its entirety |
| Geographic scope | Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, and Slovakia |
| Period to be evaluated | From 1/11/2019 to 31/10/2023 |

1.5 Objectives of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority¹ of the European Commission². The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results**³ of in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDG**.⁴

¹ COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/2000; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

² SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf; COM(2017) 651 final 'Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results', https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf

³ Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external" - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf.

⁴ The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC>

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek to **identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** between: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

In particular, this evaluation will serve **to clearly verify the successes and failures of the project in its execution, by focusing on its flagship activities** so to understand the performance of the intervention, its enabling factors and those hampering a proper delivery of results as to inform the planning of the future interventions.

The main users of this evaluation will be the project's consortium partners, a group and number of the project's Young Ambassadors (defined by the evaluators in collaboration with the project's partners), a group and number of the teachers trained using the project's educational materials, and a group and number of festival organisers who implemented the project's festival greening handbook to help make their festivals more sustainable.

1.6 Evaluation criteria and issues to be addressed

The evaluation will assess the Intervention using the six standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and perspectives of impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess one EU specific evaluation criterion, which is:

- the EU added value (the extent to which the Intervention brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);

The definition of the 6 DAC + 1 EU evaluation criteria is contained for reference in the Annex VII.

The evaluation team shall furthermore consider whether gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed; the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Intervention, its governance and monitoring.

The evaluation team must consider to what extent and how **gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed and addressed by the intervention and the results of this**. It shall furthermore consider whether the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the project, its governance and monitoring.

The **issues to be addressed** as formulated below are indicative. Following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager⁵ and propose in their Inception Note a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Note, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

Issues to be addressed:

1. Success and failures of capacity building activities.
2. Success and failures of awareness raising activities.
3. Success and failures of developed gamified products and activities.

⁵ The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract.

4. Success and failures in engagement with and commitment of addressed multipliers.

1.7 Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in three phases:

- Inception
- Field
- Synthesis

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each of these phases and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the Contracting Authority. The main content of each output is described in Chapter 0.

| Phases of the evaluation | Key activities | Outputs and <i>meetings</i> |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| <u>Inception Phase</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial document/data collection • Document analysis • Inception interviews • Stakeholder analysis • Reconstruction (or as necessary, construction) of the Intervention Logic, and / or description of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews) • Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix • Planning of the Field phase | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Kick-off meeting with Evaluation Manager via remote conference</i> • Inception note • Slide presentation of the Inception note |
| <u>Field Phase</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gathering of primary evidence with the use of interviews, focus groups, and surveys. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slide Presentation of key findings of the field phase • <i>Debriefing with Evaluation Manager via remote conference</i> |
| <u>Synthesis phase</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final analysis of findings • Reporting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Final Report • Final Report • Slide presentation • <i>Final Report Evaluation Manager via remote conference</i> |

1.7.1 Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed.

It will start with initial background study, to be conducted by the evaluators from home. It will then continue with a kick-off via teleconference between the evaluators and the Evaluation Manager. The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed. Further to this, and in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, the evaluators will reconstruct the Intervention Logic / Theory of Change of the intervention to be evaluated.

Based on the Intervention Logic and/or the Theory of Change the evaluators will finalise i) the Evaluation Questions with the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, ii) the evaluation methodology, and iii) the planning of the following phases. The methodological design of the evaluation will be summarised into an evaluation matrix.

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the Inception note. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Inception note**; its content is described in Chapter 0. Please, see also Chapter 1.16.

The evaluation team will then present via teleconference the **Inception Report** to the Evaluation Manager.

1.7.2 Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Inception note by the Evaluation Manager.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation or not respecting the end of the validity of the specific contract, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures undertaken.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; and with the relevant Civil Society Organisations. Throughout the mission the evaluation team will use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the Field Phase the evaluators will prepare a Slide Presentation to inform a debriefing session with the Contracting Authority; its content is described in Chapter 0.

1.7.3 Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of the Final Report, whose structure is described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the early phases to answer the Evaluation Questions and the preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.
- The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in art. 2.1 above.

The evaluation team will deliver to the Evaluation Manager the **Draft Final Report** and, after addressing the comments consolidated by the Evaluation Manager, will finalise the **Final Report** (including the Executive Summary. Please refer to chapter 1.16 for a description of the process.

1.8 Management and Steering of the evaluation

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of the consortium partners.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

- To agree on the focus of the evaluation, including the evaluation questions at Inception Phase.
- To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the external stakeholders.
- To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the intervention.
- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team.
- To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
- To support the development of a proper follow-up plan after completion of the evaluation.

1.9 Language of the Specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be English.

EXPERTISE REQUIRED

1.10 Number of evaluators and of working days per category

The table below indicates the minimum number of evaluators and the minimum number of working days (overall and in the field), per category of experts to be foreseen by the tenderers.

| Category of experts | Minimum number of evaluators | Total minimum number of working days (total) | (Out of which) minimum number of working days on mission |
|---------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| Senior | 1 | 30 | - |
| Medium | - | - | - |
| Junior | 1 | 20 | - |

In particular, the Team Leader (to be identified in the offer) is expected to possess a demonstrable senior evaluation expertise coherent with the requirements of this assignment and not provide less than 30 working days.

1.11 Expertise required

Minimum requirements of the team:

- 3 years of experience in evaluation;
- Sound practice of development interventions in the sector of climate change/climate action/sustainability/environment demonstrated by prior evaluations or management of similar interventions.

Language skills of the team:

- English: at least 1 member of category Senior shall possess a level C1 expertise;

Languages levels are defined for understanding, speaking and writing skills by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages available at <https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr> and shall be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.

Gender balance in the proposed team, at all levels, is highly recommended and should be striven for.

LOCATION AND DURATION

1.12 Location(s) of assignment

The assignment will take place, tentatively, in the project's 8 countries, with prioritisation of field work to be done on an online/teleconference basis, unless the Evaluation Team indicates field visits in the countries of implementation of the project as priority tasks and within their proposed budget.

1.13 Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar months

Maximum duration of the assignment: three calendar months.

This overall duration includes working days, weekends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, and distribution of outputs.

1.14 Starting period and planning

Provisional start of the assignment is beginning of November 2023.

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalised in the Inception note). The 'Indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as '0').

REPORTING

1.15 Content, timing and submission

The evaluation deliverables must match quality standards. The text of the reports should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the area(s) of the intervention is required (to be attached as Annex).

List of outputs:

| | Number of Pages (excluding annexes) | Main Content | Timing for submission |
|---------------------------|--|---|------------------------|
| Inception Note | 8-15 pages | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention logic • Stakeholder map • Methodology for the evaluation, incl.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluation Matrix: Evaluation Questions, with judgement criteria and indicators, and data analysis and collection methods ○ Field visit approach (including the criteria to select the field visits) • Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures • Work plan of the entire evaluation | End of Inception Phase |
| Slide presentation | 8-15 slides | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key, preliminary findings of the field phase to guide the debriefing session | End of Field Phase |

| | Number of Pages (excluding annexes) | Main Content | Timing for submission |
|---------------------------|--|--|---|
| Draft Final Report | 25-35 pages | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</u> | End of Synthesis Phase |
| Final report | 25-35 pages | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted | Two weeks after having received comments to the Draft Final Report. |

1.16 Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments, including those received from the Reference Group, or the approval of the report within three (3) calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments shall be submitted within 10 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

1.17 Language

All reports shall be submitted in the official language of the contract, as indicated in Chapter 1.9.

1.18 Formatting of reports and number of report copies

All reports will be produced using the specific branded publication templates created by the intervention, to be rendered to the Evaluation Team upon contracting. They will be submitted both in Word and PDF formats.

CONTENT OF THE OFFERS

The offers to be submitted for the execution of this contract will include a Technical and a Financial Offer.

1.19 Technical offer

The Technical Offer will compulsorily include:

- An introductory and short chapter detailing the comprehension by tenderers of the assignment and its main challenges.
- A chapter detailing the tentative methodology to conduct the evaluation; this methodology will then be finalised in the Inception Note. The proposed methodology will detail how the evaluation will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference and notably gender equality and the empowerment of women. This will include (if applicable) the communication messages, materials and management structures.
- A short analysis of the main risks and remedy measures of the assignment.
- A chapter detailing the relevance of the team composition and competencies to the work to be undertaken and how the tasks will be organised.
- Annex: the CVs of the proposed expert(s) (max length of each CV: 5 pages).
- Annex: a synoptic table detailing the work to be undertaken by each proposed expert and their role, based on the proposed methodology.

- Annex: the proposed timetable (Gantt chart).

The maximum length of the Technical offer is 15 pages excluding annexes.

1.20 Financial offer

The Financial Offer must respect the format of the attached Annex VI. Offers using a different format will be disqualified.

BUDGET OF THE PRESENT EVALUATION

The maximum budget allowed for the execution of the present contract is 20 000.00 EUR (twenty thousand euro), including VAT. This is inclusive of all fees and costs related to the assignment.

DEADLINE FOR THE SUBMISSION OF QUESTIONS

Questions and requests for clarification are to be submitted (if need will be) by 25 October 2023 at 17:00 CEST, via email at tmorante@ceeweb.org.

The text of the questions received (once anonymised) and the responses will be sent to all tenderers to ensure equal treatment.

SUBMISSION OF THE OFFERS AND THEIR ASSESSMENT

1.21 Deadline for the submission of the offers

The offers for undertaking this assignment must be received by 30 October 2023 at 20:00 hours, local time of Budapest, Hungary. Late submission of offers leads to their disqualification.

1.22 Modalities for the submission of the offers

Via e-mail to tmorante@ceeweb.org and epersovits@ceeweb.org. The Technical Offer and the Financial Offer need to be in different attachments.

1.23 Assessment of the offers

The offers will be assessed as detailed in the Annex I.

INVOICING AND PAYMENTS

Invoices are to be submitted to Mr Thor Morante, Lead Project Coordinator, to tmorante@ceeweb.org, with copy to Mr Gábor Szoboszlai, Chief Financial Officer, at gszoboszlai@ceeweb.org, a Ms Edina Persovits, Project Financial Manager, at epersovits@ceeweb.org.

Within the Financial Offer, the Tenderer must indicate on whether a prepayment for the Task is required, or on whether payments ought to be paid upon the completion of each of the phases, indicating the amounts for each phase.

If the prepayment option is indicated, the maximum allowed proportion for prepayment is of 40% of the total budget, with the remaining percentage to be paid only upon completion of the task.

All invoices are to indicate the Contracting Authority's full organisational name, VAT number and address, as well as a description of the service carried out in relation to the specific invoice and task, including formal code and name of the project for which the service is rendered.

Invoices should include the Contractor's full organisational name, VAT number and address.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: CRITERIA TO ASSESS THE OFFERS

1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price.

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

| Criteria | Maximum |
|---|------------|
| <i>Total score for the approach to work</i> | 50 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided | 10 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges | 25 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualification of tenderer and backstopping | 5 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisation of tasks including timetable | 10 |
| <i>Score for the expertise of the proposed team</i> | 50 |
| OVERALL TOTAL SCORE | 100 |

2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

- Project Profile, as per the Granted Application Profile, pertaining to the Intervention/Project to be evaluated.
- Omnibus Survey and Focus Groups reports, available at <https://climategame.eu/publications.php>.
- Annual progress reports for Years 1, 2 and 3 of the Project, as well as results of Year 4 of the project.
- Access to all products and activities' proof produced by the project.

Note: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the **CSO-LA/2019/410-363 – Game Over? Do not let climate change end the game!** project.

ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The structure of the evaluation report will be as follows.

The cover page of the Final Report shall carry the following text:

"This evaluation is supported and guided by CEEweb for Biodiversity and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of CEEweb for Biodiversity nor of the European Commission, which financed the evaluated 'CSO-LA/2019/410-363 – Game Over? Do not let climate change end the game!' project.

Executive Summary

A tightly-drafted and to-the-point Executive Summary. It should be short, no more than five pages. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations.

1. Introduction

A description of the intervention, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

2. Answers to the Evaluation Questions

A chapter presenting the Evaluation Questions and conclusive answers, together with evidence (findings) and reasoning.

An overall assessment of the intervention is to be added, as well. It shall be based on the detailed response to the Evaluation Questions.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations

3.1 Conclusions

This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

A paragraph or sub-chapter should pick up the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.

The transferable lessons from this evaluation are to be included in this chapter.

3.2 Recommendations

They are intended to improve or reform the intervention in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new one for the next cycle.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels.

Annexes to the report

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs can be attached, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Evaluation methodology including tools utilised, analysis of the limitation of the methodology, remedy and degree of confidence in the conclusions.
- Evaluation Matrix (a table presenting the tools used to respond to each evaluation question as well as the indicators used).
- Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrix of the intervention.
- Relevant geographic map(s) where the intervention took place
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes as relevant (e.g. statistical analyses, matrix of evidence, databases)

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE

This annex must be included by tenderers in their Technical Offer and forms an integral part of it. Tenderers can add as many rows and columns as needed.

The phases of the evaluation shall reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

| | | Indicative Duration in working days ⁶ | | |
|--|----------|--|---------------|------------------|
| Activity | Location | Team Leader | Evaluator ... | Indicative Dates |
| Inception phase: total days | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| Field phase: total days | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| Synthesis phase: total days | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| Dissemination phase: total days | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| TOTAL working days (maximum) | | | | |

⁶ Add one column per each evaluator

ANNEX V: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED INTERVENTION(S), WITH RESULTS UP TO 31 OCTOBER 2022.

| Results chain | | Indicators | Baseline | Current value | Targets (incl. reference year) | | | | Sources and means of verification | Assumptions |
|---------------|---------------------|--|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|----|----------|--|-------------|
| | | | reference year | reference date | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | Y4 | | |
| Impact | (Overall objective) | 1. The number of target countries in which the proportion of respondents (general population) who say they have taken personal action to fight climate change in the past 6 months increased | 0 (2019) | 6 (as of 31 October 2021) | NA | 6 | NA | 8 (2023) | Special Eurobarometer – Climate Change | |
| | | | | | | BG: 38% (2021-19: +6%) CZ: 50% (2021-19: +5%) DE: 79% (2021-19: +8%) HU: 67% (2021-19: +2%) LV: 42% (2021-19: -1%) LT: 48% (2021-19: -6%) RO: 31 (2021-19: +2%) SK: 72% (2021-19: +6%) | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|-----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>2. Average greenhouse gas emissions per capita in the 8 target countries (Tonnes of CO₂ equivalent per capita) (Disaggregated by country)</p> | <p>Average in 8 countries: 7.1 BG: 7.2 CZ: 12.5 DE: 9.8 HU: 6.2 LV: 4.8 LT: 5.5 RO: 4.4 SK: 6.1 (2019)</p> | <p>Average in 8 countries: 5.6 BG: 5.8 CZ: 11.8 DE: 8.8 HU: 5.8 LV: 5.9 LT: 5.3 RO: 4.0 SK: 5.2 (as of 31 December 2020)</p> | <p>Average in 8 countries: 5.6 BG: 5.8 CZ: 11.8 DE: 8.8 HU: 5.8 LV: 5.9 LT: 5.3 RO: 4.0 SK: 5.2</p> | <p>NA</p> | <p>NA</p> | <p>TBD (2023)</p> | <p>Eurostat Data Browser</p> | |
| <p>Outcome(s) (Specific objective(s))</p> | <p><i>Oc 1: Increased active engagement of young people in eight target countries in fighting climate change and ecosystem degradation in line with European values</i></p> | <p>1.1. Percentage of the youth (16-35) in 8 target countries who have taken personal action to fight climate change in the past 6 months (Disaggregated by sex, disability status and country)</p> | <p>96.1% (2021) 97.4% women 94.68% men BG: 96%</p> | <p>96.1% (as of 31 October 2021) 97.4% women 94.68% men BG: 96%</p> | <p>NA</p> | <p>96.1% 97.4% women 94.68% men BG: 96% CZ: 95% DE: 93% HU: 97%</p> | <p>NA</p> | <p>TBD (2023)</p> | <p>Omnibus and focus group baseline and end line surveys in all 8 countries</p> | <p>Security of access to resources and land will have a growing global importance, which will help to highlight the importance of ecosystems and the need for policy</p> |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>CZ: 95% DE: 93% HU: 97% LV: 94% LT: 95% RO: 98% SK: 97%</p> | <p>CZ: 95% DE: 93% HU: 97% LV: 94% LT: 95% RO: 98% SK: 97%</p> | | <p>LV: 94% LT: 95% RO: 98% SK: 97%</p> | | | <p>coherence also with climate change</p> <p>The situation regarding the climate change scepticism/denial will remain stable and will not make it more difficult to communicate on the intervention's campaign related topics</p> <p>People will continue to consider environment as a high priority, where more action should be made</p> |
| | <p>1.2. Percentage of the youth (16-35) in 8 target countries willing to take personal action to fight climate change (Disaggregated by sex, disability status and country)</p> | <p>96.2% (2021) 97.6% women 94.8% men</p> <p>BG: 97% CZ: 95% DE: 93% HU: 97% LV: 94% LT: 94% RO: 98% SK: 99%</p> | <p>96.2% (as of 31 October 2021) 97.6% women 94.8% men</p> <p>BG: 97% CZ: 95% DE: 93% HU: 97% LV: 94% LT: 94% RO: 98% SK: 99%</p> | <p>NA</p> | <p>96.2% 97.6% women 94.8% men</p> <p>BG: 97% CZ: 95% DE: 93% HU: 97% LV: 94% LT: 94% RO: 98% SK: 99%</p> | <p>NA</p> | <p>TBD (2023)</p> | <p>Omnibus and focus group baseline and end line surveys in all 8 countries</p> | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|--------------------------------|--------------|---|--|----------------|---|
| | | SK: 99% | | | | | | |
| | 1.3. Tonnes of CO ₂ saved by the youth targeted by the intervention as a result of the campaign (smartphone app) (disaggregated by sex and country) | 0 (2019) | 0 (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | NA | NA | 7100 (2023) | Smartphone app statistics |
| | 1.4. Number of festivals which applied the festival greening handbook to reduce their carbon footprint with the support of the intervention (disaggregated by country) | 0 (2019) | 0 (as of 31 October 2022) | NA | NA | NA | 8 (2023) | Assessment by the partners based on observation and feedback from the festival organizers |
| <i>Oc 2: Increased scientifically grounded coverage of topics related to climate change, ecosystem degradation and their social impacts by multipliers (YAs, social media influencers, journalists, teachers)</i> | 2.1. Number of YAs and Wilderness Camps participants who continued to be involved in climate change activism beyond the intervention activities (disaggregated by sex, disability status and country) | 0 (2019) | 301 (as of 31 October 2022) | 40 Y1: NA | 250 Total Y2: 81 12 BG (10 f, 2 m) SK: 26 RO: 7 HU: 11 (4 m, 7 f) CZ: 25 | 230 Total Y3: 220 BG: 22 (14 f, 8 m) SK: 49 (17 m, 32 f) DE: 3 (2 m, 1 f) LV: 119 (60 m, 59 f) | 400 | Survey organised by the intervention |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|-----------------------------|---|--|---|-----|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | LT: 6 (4 m, 2 f) RO: 8 (3 m, 5 f) HU: 13 (7 m, 6 f) CZ: N/A |
| | 2.2. Number of media outputs on climate change produced by the targeted journalists (disaggregated by type of media and country) | 0 (2019) | 975 (as of 31 October 2022) | 25 Total Y1: 227 BG: 45 (43 internet, 1 radio, 1 TV) DE: 54 (52 internet, 2 print) HU: 16 (16 internet) | 200 Total Y2: 335 BG: 94 DE: 31 LI: 28 (10 paid articles, 16 unpaid, 1 tv, 1 radio) RO: 8 (online) HU: 174 (17 radio, 5 TV, 145 online, 7 print) | 400 Total Y3: 413 BG: 118 SK: 6 DE: 13 (9 internet, 4 print) CZ: 217 (179 online, 3 radio, 1 podcast, 33 print, 1 TV) LV: 13 (7 online, 3 radio, 3 print) | 800 | Media monitoring by the intervention | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|----------------------------|--|---|--|-----|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>LV: 58 (58 internet)</p> <p>LT: 5 (4 internet, 1 TV & radio)</p> <p>RO: 20 (18 print, 1 radio, 1 TV)</p> <p>SK: 29 (1 radio, 1 TV, 27 internet)</p> | | <p>LT: 15 (6 online, 1 magazine, 8 paid online)</p> <p>RO: 23 (8 radio, TV 3, 10 internet, 2 print)</p> <p>HU: 8 (1 podcast, 7 online)</p> | | |
| | 2.3. Number of teachers who used the teaching material developed by the intervention in their class in the 3 months following the training (disaggregated by sex and country) | 0 (2019) | 11 (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | 0 | 175 HU: 11 | 350 | Survey organised by the intervention |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|---|------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Outputs | <i>Op 1.1: Increased awareness of young people in the eight target countries about climate change, its relation to ecosystems and their services, and its impact on people's lives</i> | 1.1.1 Percentage of the youth (16-35) in 8 target countries who understand what climate change, ecosystem change and social impacts entails in Europe and the South (disaggregated by sex, disability status and country) | 68% (2021) | 68% (as of 31 October 2021) | | 68% | | 78% (10% increase as compared to the baseline) (2023) | Polling company analysis of omnibus and focus group baseline and endline surveys in all 8 countries | Young people have sufficient information (and opportunities) on how to actively engage in fighting the climate change |
| | | 1.1.2 Number of young people activated with high level engagement through intervention's activities (disaggregated by sex, disability status, country and type of engagement ⁷) | 0 (2019) | 8673 (as of 31 October 2022) | 2500 Total Y1: 2971 Volunteers: 25 | 5000 Y2: 501 Mobile app: 192 monthly BG: 20 (12 f, 8 m) | 7500 Total Y3: 5201 BG: 95 Mobile App: 32 Volunteers: 63 (44) | 10 000 | Smartphone App's statistics, partners' activity reports, attendance lists registry of online course | Disinformation campaigns do not offset the intervention's awareness raising campaign Multipliers have willingness, time and resources to disseminate the campaign messages Teachers benefit from an enabling environment in schools to implement activities from the learning package |

⁷ The type of engagement considered as high-level engagement is: using the smartphone app to reduce carbon footprint; participation in organisation of activities as volunteers; participating in theatre plays as actors; participation in online course

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | People acting on the spot: 2946 | SK: 52 DE: 7 (6 f, 1 m) LA: 35 LI: 50 RO: 13 (7 m, 6 f) HU: 65 (32 f, 33 m) CZ: 67 | female, 19 male) SK: 68 Mobile App: 50 Volunteers: 18 (5 female, 13 male) DE: 257 Mobile App: 253 Volunteers: 4 (2 m, 2 f) LV: 140 Mobile App: 19 Volunteers: 121 LT: 274 Mobile App: 34 | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>Theatre plays as actors: 240</p> <p>RO: 154</p> <p>Mobile App: 63 Volunteers: 91 (42 m, 49 f)</p> <p>HU: 2308</p> <p>Mobile App: 233 Volunteers: 2075 (401 m, 445 f, 1229 unknown)</p> <p>CZ: 43</p> <p>Mobile App: 43</p> <p>Other countries: 1862</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | Mobile app: 1862. | | |
| 1.1.3 Number of young people activated with low level engagement through intervention's activities (disaggregated by sex, country and type of engagement ⁸) | 0 (2019) | 1 540 055 (as of 31 October 2022) | 12 500 Total Y1: 4016 Events: 4016 in 32 events (on- and off-line) in all countries | 500 000 Total Y2: 1 180 145 BG: 1000 from websites + 286 954 people between 18 and 35 in social networks. (179 000 f, 107 894 m) SK: 166 370 DE: 142 222 (17 f, 10 m) LA: 537 925 LI: 12 920 | 1 800 000 Total Y3: 355 894 BG: 2363 Climate change/sustainability event: 995 (44 m, 83 f) Contest/competition: 11 (4 m, 7 f) Speakers Tour: 1 f. Playing board game: 1356 (89 m, 147 f). | 2 000 000 | Partners' activity reports, attendance lists, submissions to Geoquest portal, petition portal, website statistics |

⁸ The type of engagement considered as low-level engagement is: participation in an climate change/sustainability event; Geoquest; contests/competitions; download of intervention outputs; speakers' tours; theatre plays/stand-up comedy; signing petition; playing intervention board game

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | RO: 1100 HU: 18 525 CZ: 13 129 | SK: 1769 Climate change/sust ainability event: 504 Geoquest: 348 Contest/com petition: 20 Speakers Tour: 7 (2 m, 5 f) Playing board game: 890 DE: 903 Climate change/sust ainability event: 278 Geoquest: 176 Downloads of | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>intervention outputs: 447</p> <p>Speakers Tour: 2 f</p> <p>LV: 364</p> <p>Climate change/sust ainability event: 209</p> <p>Geoquest: 154</p> <p>Speakers Tour: 1 m</p> <p>LT: 369</p> <p>Climate change/sust ainability event: 78</p> <p>Geoquest: 57</p> <p>Contest/com petition: 100</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>Playing board game: 134</p> <p>RO: 7</p> <p>Geoquest: 7</p> <p>HU: 336 586</p> <p>Climate change/sustainability event: 72 546</p> <p>Speakers Tour: 14</p> <p>Theatre plays/stand-up comedy: 263 999</p> <p>Playing board game: 27</p> <p>CZ: 4848</p> <p>Climate change/sust</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|------------|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | ainability/board game event: 4798 Geoquest: 9 Speakers Tour: 41 Global: 8685 Petition: 8685 | | |
| 1.1.4. Number of citizens (unique visitors) reached by campaign messages through online communication channels | 0 (2019) | 16 920 873 (as of 31 October 2022) | 510 000 Total Y1: Websites: 120 348 SM: 4 294 631 BG: Website: 2147 SM: 665 740 | 6 500 000 On Y2, 6 620 800 people reached through online communication 82 350 unique visitors on the central website and national project | 13 000 000 Total Y3: 5 928 934 BG: 25 885 unique website users; social media reached 571 009 people. SK: 4022 unique website users; social media | 20 000 000 | Website/social media analytics |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>CZ: SM: 630 554</p> <p>DE: Websit e: 298 SM: 18 533</p> <p>HU: Websit es: 74 181</p> <p>LV: Websit e: 29 233 SM: 1 812 251</p> <p>LT: 52 489</p> <p>RO: Websit e: 225 SM: 62 122</p> <p>SK:</p> | <p>websites in total</p> <p>—</p> <p>6 538 292 people reached via social media channels in eight countries in total</p> <p>BG: 9099 unique. (302 057 f, 129 454 m)</p> <p>SK: 165 385</p> <p>DE: 71 434</p> <p>LA: 309 162</p> <p>LI: 639 unique visitors + 133 372 social media</p> <p>RO: 3672 unique visitors,</p> | <p>reached 391 513 people.</p> <p>DE: 4216 unique website users; social media reached 48 882 people</p> <p>LV: 28 331 unique website users; social media reached 79 023 people</p> <p>LT: 717 unique website users; social media reached 144 071 people</p> <p>RO: 5846 unique website users; social</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>Websit e: 13 569 SM: 1 023 871</p> <p>Central channe ls: Websit e: 695 SM: 28 662</p> | <p>414 317 social media</p> <p>HU: 1 794 302</p> <p>CZ: 2438 unique+ 481 745</p> | <p>media reached 1 668 320 people</p> <p>HU: 80 012 unique website users; social media reached 2 222 871 people</p> <p>CZ: 962 unique website users; social media reached 185 124 people</p> <p>International : 31 710 unique central website users; social media reached 436 420 people</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|---|--|--|---|-------------------|---|
| | <p>1.1.5. Potential outreach of the campaign messages disseminated through mass media, dissemination of communication media and general public events (including museum exhibitions)</p> | <p>0 (2019)</p> | <p>66,709,461 (as of 31 October 2022)</p> | <p>2 500 000 Total Y1: 5 698 569 DE: Mass media: 1 001 086 HU: Mass media: 2 478 000 LV: Mass media: 1 810 739 RO: Mass media: 408 744</p> | <p>10 000 000 On Y2, 30 494 232 people BG: 3 216 000 people SK: 2 598 442 DE: 557 056 LV: 3 172 783 LT: 164 262 RO: 1 589 129 HU: 6 731 618 CZ: 12 464 942</p> | <p>45 000 000 Total Y3: 31 307 534 BG: 3 285 118 Overall reach in mass media: 3 285 000 Dissemination number of outputs: 118 SK: 779 624 Visitors to museum exhibitions: 130 000 Overall reach in mass media: 649 585 Dissemination number of outputs: 39</p> | <p>80 000 000</p> | <p>Media and personal outreach monitoring by all partners, dissemination numbers of outputs, visitor numbers for the museum exhibitions</p> |
|--|--|-----------------|---|--|--|---|-------------------|---|

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | DE: 133 614 | | |
| | | | | | | Overall reach in mass media: 133 600 | | |
| | | | | | | Dissemination number of outputs: 14 | | |
| | | | | | | LV: 781 878 | | |
| | | | | | | Overall reach in mass media: 781 874 | | |
| | | | | | | Dissemination number of outputs: 4 | | |
| | | | | | | LT: 947 690 | | |
| | | | | | | Visitors to museum exhibitions: 12 200 | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>Overall reach in mass media: 153 603</p> <p>Dissemination number of outputs: 13</p> <p>RO: 690 522</p> <p>Overall reach in mass media: 690 500</p> <p>Dissemination number of outputs: 22</p> <p>HU: 23 341</p> <p>Visitors to museum exhibitions: 23 341</p> <p>CZ: 24 665 747</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--------|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | Overall reach in mass media: 24 665 474 | | |
| | | | | | | Dissemination number of outputs: 273 | | |
| <i>Op 1.2: Increased availability of tools and methods for engaging citizens in individual and collective changes to address climate change in an exosystemic approach</i> | 1.2.1. Number of festivals/organisers which received the festival greening handbook (disaggregated by country) | 0 (2019) | 0 (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | 0 | 10 Total Y3: 0 | 50 | Activity reports from partners |
| | 1.2.2. Number of users having downloaded the intervention's smartphone app (disaggregated by sex and country) | 0 (2019) | 3 673 (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | 0 On Y2, 1084 Germany: 125, Hungary: 78, Lithuania: 54, Romania: 32, Slovakia: 27, Czech Rep: 14, Latvia: 13, Bulgaria: 11, other countries: 730 | 4000 Total Y3: 2589 DE: 253 HU: 233 LT: 34 RO: 63 SK: 50 CZ: 43 LV: 19 BG: 32 | 10 000 | Statistics of online stores |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|----------|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | Other countries: 1862 | | |
| <i>Op 1.3: Opportunities for engagement of citizens in advocacy and lobbying actions for fighting climate change and ecosystem decline expanded</i> | 1.3.1. Number of policy research reports drafted | 0 (2019) | 4 (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | TBD On Y2, DE: 1 | 2 On Y3: 3 policy reports drafted | 5 (2023) | Activity reports from partners |
| | 1.3.2. Number of advocacy events addressing EU decision makers involving YAs | 0 (2019) | 4 (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | 0 | TBD Belgium: 4 | 4 | Activity reports from partners |
| | 1.3.3. Number of national lobby events involving YAs (disaggregated by country) | 0 (2019) | 5 (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | 1 CZ: 1 | TBD BG: 2 RO: 1 HU: 1 | 8 (2023) | Activity reports from partners |
| <i>Op 2.1: Increased capacities of multipliers in raising awareness on climate change, ecosystem degradation and social impacts</i> | 2.1.1. Number of recruited Youth Ambassadors actively involved in the intervention's activities (disaggregated by sex, disability status and country) | 0 (2019) | 229 (as of 31 October 2022) | 80 On Y1, 125 YAs BG: 35 CZ: 15 | 156 On Y2, 135 YAs active BG: 68 (19 m, 47 f) SK: 10 (9 f, 1 m) | 135 Total Y3: 229 BG: 70 (21 male, 49 female) SK: 11 | 135 | Activity reports from partners |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---|--------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | DE: 5 HU: 5 LV: 56 RO: 8 SK: 1 | DE: 4 (4 f) LA: 2 (1 m, 1 f) LI: 11 (8 f, 3 m) RO: 13 (7 m, 6 f) HU: 17 (4 m, 13 f) CZ: 10 (2 m, 8 f) | (9 female, 2 male) DE: 6 (2 m, 4 f) LV: 11 (2 m, 9 f) LT: 10 (4 m, 6 f) RO: 91 (49 m, 42 f) HU: 14 (3 m, 11 f) CZ: 16 | | |
| | 2.1.2. Number of participants in Wilderness Camps (disaggregated by sex, disability status and country) | 0 (2019) | 974 (as of 31 October 2021522) | 60 On Y1, 107 participants | TBD On Y2, 324 participants in all countries | TBD Total Y3: 543 BG: 56 (24 m, 32 f) SK: 54 (21 m, 33 f) DE: 4 (2 m, 2 f) LV: 112 (60 m, 52 f) | 1040 | Activity reports from partners | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------------------------|---|---|--|------|--------------------------------|
| | | | | HU: 56 (29 m, 27 f) CZ: 109 | LT: 5 (3 m, 2 f) RO: 105 (57 m, 48 f) HU: 94 (23 m, 71 f) CZ: 113 | | |
| 2.1.3. Number of journalists who received the media toolkit on the campaign and on investigative media research (disaggregated by sex and country) | 0 (2019) | 322 (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | TBD BG: 56 (31 f, 25 m) DE: 207 CZ: 59 | TBD | 1000 | Activity reports from partners |
| 2.1.4. Number of journalists who participated in intervention's workshops (disaggregated by sex and country) | 0 (2019) | 153 (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | TBD CZ: 70 | TBD Total Y3: 83 BG: 21 (7 m, 14 f) SK: 30 (11 m, 19 f) CZ: 32 | 500 | Activity reports from partners |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------------------|--|--|---|-----|--------------------------------|
| 2.1.5. Number of journalists who participated in fact finding missions (disaggregated by sex and country) | 0 (2019) | 5 (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | 0 | TBD SK: 1 CZ: 4 | 11 | Activity reports from partners |
| 2.1.6. Number of social media influencers approached by the intervention who published messages on the campaign (disaggregated by sex and country) | 0 (2019) | 199 (as of 31 October 2022) | 8 On Y1, 42: BG: 3 DE: 3 LV: 16 LT: 4 HU: 9 CZ: 0 RO: 3 SK: 4 | 45 On Y2, 92 social media influences approached who published BG: 4 (2m, 2f) DE: 4 LV: 8 LT: 1 (f) HU: 10 (4 f, 6 m) CZ: 65 RO: 0 SK: 0 | 150 Total Y3: 65 BG: 6 (3 m, 3 f) SK: 20 (8 m, 12 f) DE: 3 (1 m, 2 f) LV: 9 (5 m, 4 f) LT: 1 f HU: 5 (1 m, 4 f) CZ: 17 (1 m, 1 f) RO: 4 (2 m, 2 f) | 210 | Activity reports from partners |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------|---|--|--|----|--------------------------------|
| 2.1.7. Number of YAs participating in fact finding missions (disaggregated by sex, disability status, type of multiplier and country) | 0 (2019) | 18 (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | 0 14 YAs participated in preparations to FFM in Central America BG: 2 (1f, 1m) SS 2: 2 females DE: 2 (2f) LV: 2 (1 m, 1 f) LT: 2 (2f) HU: 2 f CZ: 2f | 20 Total Y3: 18 BG: 2 (1f activists, 1 m journalist) SK: 2 female activists DE: 2 female activists LV: 2 young activists (1 male, 1 female) LT: 2 females (1 activists, 1 influencer) HU: 2 female activists CZ: 4 activists (1 m, 3 f) RO: 2 young activists | 18 | Activity reports from partners |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------|---|--|--|----|--------------------------------|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--|---|-----|--|------|--|
| | | | | | (1 m, 1 f) | | |
| 2.1.8. Number of downloads of the learning packages with interactive content (disaggregated by sex and country) | 0 (2019) | 0 (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2000 | Learning packages, dissemination lists |
| 2.1.9. Number of teachers trained in using the learning packages developed by the intervention (disaggregated by sex and country) | 0 (2019) | 206 teachers trained (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | 0 | 175 LT: 165 (5 m, 160 f) HU: 41 (10 m, 31 f) | 350 | Teachers workshop attendance lists |
| 2.1.10. Number of contents generated by YAs with the support of the intervention | 0 (2019) | 790 (as of 31 October 2022) | 0 | 260 | 270 On Y1: 55 contents produced On Y2, 150 contents were generated by YAs Total Y3: 585 BG: 25 SK: 157 DE: 3 LV: 12 LT: 8 RO: 5 | 850 | Activity reports from partners |

| | | | | LT: 2 | | HU: 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|--|-------|--|---------|--|--|--------------------|-----------|----------|---------|--------------|--------|-----------------|--------|--------------------------|-----------|----------|---------|--|-----------|---|---------|--|
| | | | | RO: 3 | | CZ: 358 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Activities | A1.1 Awareness raising campaign | Means: | <p>All, Lead and Co-Applicants, devote the staff necessary for the project (project management and communication capacities, as well as financial and other administrative capacities). Some basic equipment will be procured for communication actions (two cameras, two beamers, stands for public events) and for the 52 youth camps (sleeping bags, mobile huts, solar panels, etc.). The capacities will be increased internally with the help of the Communication Co-applicant, but external communication support for specific activities will be provided by communication agencies, as well, and external advocacy input will be given through six research reports on EU and developing countries. The majority of the costs will be devoted for communication related services, like the omnibus and focus group surveys, the social media listening and monitoring reports, advertisements, creating videos, visuals, working with communication agencies, translation. Some complementary actions are budgeted like three fact finding missions and speakers tours. Third party support will increase the overall capacities to reach out to the youth in all eight countries.</p> <p>Costs</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1. Human resources</td> <td>2 049 630</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 Travel</td> <td>140 730</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Equipment</td> <td>96 270</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Local office</td> <td>98 480</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Other costs, services</td> <td>2 371 460</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. Other</td> <td>240 500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Subtotal direct eligible costs of the Action</td> <td>4 997 070</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total indirect eligible costs of the Action</td> <td>349 795</td> </tr> </table> | | | | | | 1. Human resources | 2 049 630 | 2 Travel | 140 730 | 3. Equipment | 96 270 | 4. Local office | 98 480 | 5. Other costs, services | 2 371 460 | 6. Other | 240 500 | Subtotal direct eligible costs of the Action | 4 997 070 | Total indirect eligible costs of the Action | 349 795 | Unexpectedly higher changes in the overall prices/ staff costs (taxes) during the 4-year implementation might affect the input/output ratio and thus also the outcomes. If that happens, it might require the adjustment of plans. |
| | 1. Human resources | 2 049 630 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 Travel | 140 730 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Equipment | 96 270 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Local office | 98 480 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Other costs, services | 2 371 460 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 6. Other | 240 500 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Subtotal direct eligible costs of the Action | 4 997 070 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total indirect eligible costs of the Action | 349 795 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>A1.1.1 Strategic coordination of the communication actions</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>A1.1.2 Direct communication targeting the youth.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>A1.1.3 Adding another layer to a museum exhibition.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>A1.1.4 International Geoquest game</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>A1.1.5 Improvisation theatre plays.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>A1.1.6 Board game</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>A1.1.7 Online course on climate change</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>A1.1.8 Speakers' tour</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A1.2 Developing tools for engaging citizens | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>A1.2.1 Greening concerts/festivals</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>A1.2.2. Mobile app for lifestyle changes and donation</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A1.3 Advocacy and lobbying | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>A1.3.1 Addressing EU decision makers.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| <p><i>A1.3.2 Addressing national decision makers.</i></p> <p>A2.1 Involving multipliers</p> <p><i>A2.1.1 Involving youth ambassadors.</i></p> <p><i>A2.1.2 Addressing journalists.</i></p> <p><i>A2.1.3 Working with social media influencers.</i></p> <p><i>A2.1.4 Fact finding missions (FFM)</i></p> <p><i>A2.1.5 Education material for teachers</i></p> <p><i>A2.1.6 Wilderness camps</i></p> <p>A3. Overarching actions for coordination, monitoring and reporting</p> <p><i>3.1 Monitoring</i></p> <p><i>3.2 Personal and online coordination meetings</i></p> <p><i>3.3 Participation in Europe Aid Seminar</i></p> <p><i>3.4 Annual external expenditure verification, reporting to donor</i></p> | <p>Total eligible costs</p> | <p>5 346 865</p> | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------|--|

ANNEX VI: FINANCIAL OFFER TEMPLATE

| Cost lines | Estimated number of working days/hours | Unit rate (EUR) | Amount (EUR) |
|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| Fees (including overheads) | | | |
| -Key expert, <other> expert | | | |
| Total fees | | | |
| Travelling fees (if any) | | | |
| Total sum of travelling fees | | | |
| MAXIMUM CONTRACT VALUE | | | |