

International Media Support (IMS)

Terms of Reference

Midterm Review of IMS' 2024-2028 strategy implementation

1. Background

International Media Support (IMS) is a global Danish-registered non-profit organisation established in 2001. IMS works to support and promote free, independent and professional media in countries experiencing armed conflict, human insecurity, political transition, authoritarian rule and shrinking civic space. IMS is headquartered in Copenhagen and works through country, regional and thematic programmes across multiple regions. By the end of 2025, IMS worked with more than 230 strategic and activity partners across 25 country programmes, four regional programmes and several thematic interventions. IMS' annual turnover in 2025 was approximately DKK 318 million, equivalent to approximately EUR 42.6 million.

[IMS' 2024–2028 Global Strategy](#) sets out the organisation's overall intended impact as follows: *Public interest journalists, content producers and media provide targeted audiences - including marginalised and underserved communities - with access to reliable information and inclusive public debate that allow audiences to act, participate in public life and claim their rights by holding those with power to account*

The strategy is structured around three strategic outcome areas:

1. **Public interest content and business viability**
Public interest journalists, content producers and media produce and distribute fact-based public interest content, understand and engage with their audiences, are viable and are guided by ethical standards.
2. **Safety and protection of journalists, content producers and media**
Public interest journalists, content producers and media are safe to work freely.
3. **Policy, laws, regulations and public interest infrastructure**
Public interest journalists, content producers and media benefit from legislative and policy frameworks, practices, algorithms and other digital measures that are conducive to media viability and free expression.

The three strategic outcome areas are mutually reinforcing and reflect IMS' comprehensive approach to media development. Rather than focusing solely on individual media outlets and content production, IMS works to strengthen the broader media and information ecosystem in which media operate. The implementation of IMS' strategy is guided by strong contextual understanding, with the relative emphasis and relevance of each strategic outcome area determined by specific needs, opportunities and the roles of other actors in each context.

IMS' strategy and interventions are grounded in internationally recognised frameworks, including the UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity¹ and the OECD Principles for Relevant and Effective Support to Media and Information Environments², ensuring coherence, coordination, and alignment with global good practice with a strong view on the practical implications of these frameworks as well as partner's participation. Consistent with this long-standing approach, IMS is actively contributing to the strategic development of the Media20

¹ [UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of](#)

² [Development Co-operation Principles for Relevant and Effective Support to Media and the Information Environment \(EN\)](#)

(M20)³ initiative, advocating for the recognition of media development as a critical enabler of progress across sectors, including economic development, security, democracy, governance, and transparency.

The strategy reinforces IMS' focus on equal rights, justice and opportunities as a critical priority at the core of IMS' vision, supporting IMS and partners in addressing systemic and structural barriers to pluralism, diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) across the three strategic outcome areas. This is reflected through mainstreamed cross-cutting approaches to human rights and DEI, particularly from a gender transformative lens.

IMS receives core institutional support from Sida for implementation of the global strategy. Sida's core support is of particular importance to IMS' ability to work flexibly, adaptively and strategically across programmes, respond to emerging needs, support innovation, strengthen organisational expertise and back programmes facing particular funding or contextual constraints.

In line with the agreement with Sida, IMS will commission this midterm review to assess implementation of the Global Strategy during the period 2024–2026 and provide recommendations for strategic prioritisation, programme adaptation and future institutional support.

2. Context and rationale for the review

IMS is implementing its global strategy in a rapidly changing operating environment. Democratic backsliding, armed conflict, geopolitical polarisation, digital repression, information manipulation, attacks on journalists, anti-gender and rights backlash deeply interconnected with rising authoritarianism, declining civic space and shifting donor priorities are affecting the conditions for public interest media globally. At the same time, the international development and media support sectors are facing increased funding uncertainty and pressure to demonstrate results, added value, efficiency and sustainability.

Responding to these challenges, IMS has undertaken internal organisational change through its **Future Fit** process. Initiated in late 2023, Future Fit aims to strengthen IMS' strategic, programmatic and operational effectiveness by simplifying structures, clarifying roles and responsibilities, strengthening financial management and bringing decision-making closer to programme level and partners. Key milestones were reached in 2025 with decentralisation and localisation of financial roles and the reorganisation of headquarters into four cross-cutting institutional support units.

Since it was formed IMS has worked with a **collaborative and partner focused approach**, acting as a catalyst to support partners in building robust organisations and local, regional and international coalitions that can further the media development agenda. From the outset IMS has paid strong attention to partnerships and localisation/local leadership grounded in long-term, trust-based collaboration with local media actors as primary drivers of sustainable media development and ecosystemic change. IMS understands partnerships and local leadership as context-driven processes where partners increasingly shape strategies, lead implementation, and drive change on their own terms, individually and through collective action at ecosystem level. Rather than focusing on individual organisations alone, IMS adopts a holistic media ecosystem approach to ensure lasting impact and local ownership. IMS sees localisation as a systemic process that goes beyond funding and capacity development, emphasising co-creation, joint strategising, and alignment with locally identified priorities. This goes alongside commitment to progressively shifting decision-making power, resources, and influence towards local partners.

IMS recently initiated a core narrative formulation process to clarify and strengthen how it communicates its purpose, role, and **added value** in a rapidly changing and increasingly complex information environment. The process and corresponding formulation of solutions aims to respond

³ [Home - Media20](#)

to a need for greater coherence, sharper positioning, and a clearer articulation of how IMS contributes to systemic change in media ecosystems with a focus on solutions. IMS' added value is structured around three core areas: strategic funding and core support; expert input and capacity development; and coalition building and coordination, implemented through diverse, context-specific approaches at programme level.

The review will assess not only what results IMS has contributed to, but also whether IMS' current strategic choices, thematic architecture and ways of working, with a view on partnerships, and IMS added value, remain fit for purpose in the current and emerging contexts, including in high-risk, restrictive/shrinking civic space contexts and areas affected by conflict, surveillance, political pressure, legal restrictions, and threats to journalists and CSOs.

3. Purpose and intended use

The midterm review will serve both accountability and learning purposes.

The review will provide Sida, IMS' Executive Management, IMS' Board, programme teams, thematic staff and selected partners with an independent assessment of the implementation of IMS' Global Strategy during the period 2024–2026 with a view on future implementation.

The findings and recommendations will be used to:

- inform strategic adjustments for the remaining strategy period, 2027–2028;
- support prioritisation and further design of IMS' country programmes and global thematic programmes;
- clarify the relationship, synergies and added value between global thematic work and country/regional programming;
- identify opportunities to strengthen local leadership, gender transformative and HRBA approaches across the organisation;
- further clarify and sharpen IMS' ways of adding value to partners and media ecosystems;
- strengthen IMS' evidence base for learning, decision-making and accountability;
- inform the development of IMS' next global strategy

4. Overall objective

The overall objective of the midterm review is to assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of IMS' implementation of its 2024-2028 Global Strategy, with particular attention to:

- results achieved;
- IMS' current and future added value and comparative advantages as an international media support organisation;
- mainstreaming of gender equality, DEI and HRBA across global thematic and country programmes;
- localisation and local leadership;
- strategic priorities for the remaining period of the current strategy and for future Sida institutional support.

5. Scope of the review

5.1 Time period

The review will cover the implementation period January 2024 to mid-2026, while taking relevant earlier reviews and evaluations, strategic decisions and organisational change processes into account where needed.

5.2 Organisational scope

The review will focus on IMS' global strategy implementation, including:

- selected country programme(s);
- selected global thematic interventions;
- the relationship between country and thematic programming;
- IMS' partnership, localisation and gender/DEI approaches;
- IMS' internal organisation, management systems and Future Fit process where relevant to strategy implementation;
- IMS' use of core institutional funding in supporting strategic, flexible and adaptive programming.

5.3 Geographic scope

The review will include desk-review of selected country cases from IMS' country programmes with a particular focus on IMS interventions in Ukraine, Moldova, and broader Eastern Europe and *one in-person country visit to Ethiopia*.

Ethiopia has been pre-selected due to its strategic relevance for IMS and Sida and its representation of a complex operating environment. The decision also reflects the fact that the IMS MENA and Somalia programmes, which would also have been relevant for in-country visits, have recently undergone comprehensive reviews and evaluations. A desk-based meta-review of these existing reviews and evaluations will form part of this review.

The complex operating environment in Ethiopia will influence the methodology. Please refer to the section on methodology for further information.

5.4 Thematic scope

The review will examine the three strategic outcome areas and the cross-cutting priorities of gender equality, DEI, and HRBA. In addition, the review will include one thematic deep dive into IMS' approaches and strategies on access to reliable and trustworthy information to the public, information integrity⁴ and countering disinformation with a focus on IMS' interventions in Ukraine, Moldova, and broader Eastern Europe. The thematic deep dive will be conducted through interviews and one or more remote country cases. This will be further identified and confirmed during the inception phase.

Particular attention will be given to IMS' development and application of innovative approaches to countering disinformation, including prebunking⁵, audience-informed resilience building and media resilience, hereunder also the media viability aspects and approaches to unlocking local capital. Particular consideration will be given to sustainability, replicability, local ownership, scalability and the extent to which these approaches provide lessons for IMS' future strategic direction in the area of information integrity and democratic resilience.

⁴ Information integrity refers to a context in which reliable and accurate information is available to all, that enables people to engage meaningfully in public life, and to make informed decisions and exercise their rights. Information integrity means protecting the right to freedom of expression and access to information, ensuring inclusive access to a range of information sources and enabling people to navigate information spaces safely, with privacy and freedom. It involves building resilient societies that foster trust, knowledge and public empowerment (UN Dept. of Global Communications. From Principles to Practice. Strengthening Information Integrity, Sept. 2025)

⁵ Understood as the practice of anticipating emerging disinformation narratives and equipping audiences with fact-based information and awareness of manipulation tactics before misleading content spreads widely and gains traction

6. Evaluation criteria and questions

The review should be guided by the OECD DAC evaluation criteria. The criteria should be applied in a proportionate and context-sensitive manner, focusing on the intended users' needs and the strategic purpose of the review. Sida's Evaluation Handbook similarly emphasises that evaluations should contribute to learning, accountability and informed decision-making.

The review should take the point of departure in the evaluation questions below, which should be assessed and further prioritised and/or elaborated during the inception phase.

The key focus of the review is on the **relevance** of the IMS strategy and ways of working in specific country contexts, globally and in relations to Sida's priorities and strategy; the **impact** and **effectiveness** with a focus on **added value of IMS** towards partners, the media eco-systems and broader media, human rights, and democracy interventions.

Criteria	Heading	Evaluation questions
Relevance	Does the IMS' global strategy remain relevant in the changing media, geopolitical and funding environment?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent is IMS' 2024–2028 Global Strategy relevant and responsive to the needs of media workers, media organisations, partners and media ecosystems in selected contexts? 2. To what extent do the three strategic outcome areas remain relevant in light of current geopolitical developments, democratic backsliding, conflict, digital repression, information manipulation and funding constraints? 3. To what extent do IMS' cross-cutting priorities and mainstreamed approaches to gender/DEI (including gender transformative approaches), HRBA remain relevant and responsive to programme contexts? 4. How well does IMS' strategy respond to the priorities and expectations of Sida?
Coherence	How well do global thematic programmes, country /regional programmes and organisational capacities fit together internally and externally?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How coherent are IMS' global thematic interventions and country/regional programmes? 2. What synergies exist and can be further enhanced between IMS thematic expertise, global programmes and country-level implementation seen in relation to Sida's global and country engagement?
Effectiveness	To what extent is IMS making progress and adding value related to its strategic outcome areas and global strategy in selected countries and related to selected thematic areas?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What progress has IMS made towards the three strategic outcome areas during 2024–2026? 2. What evidence exists of results achieved at partner, programme, thematic and media ecosystem levels? 3. What factors have enabled or constrained achievement of results? 4. How effective are IMS' approaches to partnerships, local leadership, providing of flexible funding to partners, capacity sharing and capacity development,

		<p>coalition-building and adaptive management?</p> <p>5. How does IMS coordinate and position itself (IMS' added values) in relation to other actors in the media development, freedom of expression, journalist safety and information integrity (countering disinformation) fields?</p>
Efficiency	To what extent does IMS achieve value for money by using its financial, human and organisational resources efficiently to add value to partners and deliver relevant and sustainable results?	<p>1. What adjustments to IMS' ways of working could improve efficiency and value for money while safeguarding IMS' added value, partner relationships and strategic ambition?</p>
Impact	What contribution to impact can plausibly be observed towards media ecosystems, partner resilience, safety, public-interest journalism and enabling environments?	<p>1. What signs of emerging impact and plausible contribution can be identified in relation to public interest journalism, media viability, journalist safety, enabling policy environments, information integrity, partner resilience and media ecosystem change?</p> <p>2. What is IMS' distinctive contribution compared with other international media development organisations?</p> <p>3. What types of results are most clearly associated with IMS' flexible, long-term, partner-led and context-sensitive approaches, including from gendered/DEI perspectives?</p> <p>4. How do partners perceive IMS' added value, responsiveness, flexibility, accountability and contribution to their own priorities?</p>
Sustainability	To what extent are results, partnerships, local leadership approaches and capacities sustainable?	<p>1. To what extent are results, capacities, partnerships, coalitions and locally led approaches likely to be sustained beyond specific funding cycles, including in restrictive environments?</p> <p>2. How can IMS balance global thought leadership, country-level relevance and local leadership in a financially sustainable way?</p>

7. Methodological approach

The consultant/team is expected to propose a robust, feasible and utilisation-focused methodology, with a perspective of participatory approach: ensuring partner involvement, local leadership and DEI also in the review's design and methodology. The review should apply a mixed-method, theory-based and contribution-oriented approach, using IMS' strategy and Theory of Change as the

analytical framework with a focus on assessing IMS' contribution to observed changes based on triangulated evidence.

The methodology should include, at minimum:

- desk review of IMS strategy documents, programme documents, results frameworks, monitoring data, annual reports, financial and organisational documents;
- meta-review of previous evaluations and reviews;
- key informant interviews with IMS staff, management, Sida representatives, partners, collaborators and selected external stakeholders;
- country assessment(s);
- thematic deep dive(s);
- analysis of internal coherence between global thematic programmes and country programmes;
- analysis of localisation, local leadership, gender equality/ DEI and HRBA;
- assessment of organisational efficiency with a view on value for money;
- validation of emerging findings with IMS, Sida and partners.

The review should triangulate evidence across multiple sources and clearly distinguish between findings, conclusions and recommendations.

The consultant/team is expected to prioritise depth of analysis over breadth, and to propose a methodology that balances analytical rigour with feasibility within the available timeframe and budget.

7.1 Meta-review of existing evaluations

The review should build on relevant existing evaluations and reviews, such as reviews of IMS MENA programme, Moldova and regional interventions in Eastern Europe, Afghanistan, Indonesia, Myanmar, Cambodia and Somalia programmes, as well as other recent regional, thematic or country-level reviews and evaluations identified during inception.

The meta-review should identify:

- recurrent findings;
- evidence gaps;
- lessons across regions and themes;
- implications for IMS' global strategy implementation;
- recommendations that remain relevant for the current review.

7.2 Partner engagement

Partner perspectives and participation should be central to the review, as well as ensuring relevance and use of the findings to the partners. The consultant/team should propose methods to ensure meaningful, safe and inclusive partner participation. This should include strong attention to confidentiality and protection of partners and respondents. The design and implementation of the evaluation must be conflict-sensitive and must avoid exacerbating tensions or exposing partners to risk.

Possible methods include:

- Engaging partners during the inception phase to gather input on perspectives, methods, materials and deliverables (case studies and communication materials etc) that would be most useful to them, thus ensuring a utilisation-focused approach for partners. Also, the review team should seek input from partners during inception phase on how they wish to be involved in the review process, thus ensuring meaningful participation.

- Validation workshops or other feedback mechanisms with partners, taking context, security and potential need for confidentiality into account.

7.3 HRBA, gender equality and DEI

The review methodology must integrate HRBA and gender equality/DEI considerations. Sida’s HRBA guidance emphasises participation, links to human rights obligations, accountability, non-discrimination and equality. Sida’s Gender Toolbox provides guidance on operationalising gender equality in Swedish development cooperation.

The consultant/team should ensure that:

- stakeholder sampling reflects diversity of gender, age, geography, role, organisational type, and marginalised perspectives;
- interview methods are gender-sensitive, disability inclusive and apply the principle of *do no harm*;
- findings consider differentiated effects and participation;
- data are sex disaggregated where relevant and feasible;
- analysis includes how gender equality, DEI and HRBA are integrated in IMS’ programming and institutional practice.

7.4 Ethics, safeguarding and data protection, specifically related to country visit

The review must be conducted in accordance with recognised ethical standards for evaluation, including informed consent, confidentiality, data protection, conflict sensitivity, and do-no-harm principles.

The consultant/team must take particular care when engaging journalists, activists, media organisations and partners operating in high-risk or politically sensitive contexts. The inception report should include an ethics, safeguarding and risk management plan, including digital security as well as security and risk mitigation during interviews.

8. Deliverables and timeline

The review is expected to take place between September and December.

The consultant/team will produce the following deliverables:

Deliverable	Content and specifications	Deadline
Inception report	<p>The inception report should be submitted after initial desk review and preliminary interviews. It should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • refined understanding of the assignment; • evaluation matrix; • methodology; • sampling strategy; • workplan; • interview guides and data collection tools; • document review framework; • ethics, safeguarding and risk management plan; 	Mid/end-September 2026

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limitations and mitigation measures; • proposed structure of the final report. 	
Validation workshop(s)	<p>The consultant/team will prepare and facilitate a validation workshop to present emerging findings, test interpretations and discuss preliminary recommendations.</p> <p>The workshop(s) are held with IMS and partners</p>	Late October 2026
Draft evaluation report	<p>The draft report should present preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations. The report should be structured around the evaluation questions and DAC criteria.</p> <p>Suggested length: maximum 35 pages, excluding annexes.</p> <p>The draft report should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • executive summary; • background and evaluation purpose; • methodology and limitations; • cases, quotes and examples; • findings; • conclusions; • recommendations; • annexes. 	Early November 2026
Final evaluation report	<p>The final report should address comments from IMS and Sida while preserving the independence of the review team’s analysis and conclusions.</p> <p>Recommendations should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence-based; • prioritised; • actionable; • realistic; • assigned to relevant actors where possible. <p>Recommendations should also be clearly linked to findings and take into account IMS’ operational realities, resource constraints and strategic priorities.</p>	End November 2026
Management presentation	<p>The consultant/team will prepare a concise presentation of the final findings and recommendations for IMS management, Sida and other relevant stakeholders.</p>	Early December 2026
Communication brief	<p>The consultant/team will prepare a 2–3-page communication brief summarising key findings and messages for external or wider internal audiences. This could preferably entail cases, quotes and examples.</p>	December 2026

	The brief should avoid sensitive information and be suitable for sharing beyond the immediate commissioning group, subject to IMS approval.	
--	---	--

After the contract has been signed, in addition to the above listed activities, a kick-off meeting should be held between the consultant/team and IMS.

Data collection and country/thematic case work is expected to be conducted from end-September to end-October.

9. Governance

IMS will appoint a focal point responsible for managing the review process, facilitating access to documentation and stakeholders, and coordinating comments on deliverables.

Sida will be involved as part of a joint reference mechanism. Sida and IMS will provide consolidated feedback on key deliverables (inception report, draft report). The consultant/team will ensure that feedback is addressed while maintaining independence.

The consultant/team will remain responsible for the independence, quality and integrity of the review findings, conclusions and recommendations.

10. Budget

The maximum available budget for the assignment is **EUR 40,000**. The EUR 40,000 ceiling includes all costs.

The financial proposal should include all costs related to the assignment, including:

- consultant fees;
- travel;
- accommodation;
- per diems;
- local transport;
- interpretation and translation;
- insurance;
- workshop facilitation;
- taxes and administrative costs.

IMS will not reimburse any expenditures incurred for carrying out the assignment.

11. Required consultant/team profile

The consultant/team should combine expertise in strategic evaluation, international development cooperation, media development and organisational analysis.

The team should include the following competencies:

11.1 Team leader / senior evaluation specialist

The team leader should have:

- minimum master's degree in social sciences, journalism, law, economics, international relations, development studies or another relevant field;

- at least 10 years of documented experience conducting evaluations or strategic reviews of development cooperation programmes;
- documented experience applying OECD DAC evaluation criteria or equivalent evaluation frameworks;
- experience with theory-based, contribution-oriented and mixed-methods evaluations;
- experience with Sida, Danida, Norad or comparable institutional donors;
- excellent analytical, facilitation and report-writing skills in English.

11.2 Media development / freedom of expression specialist

The team should include expertise in one or more of the following areas:

- media development;
- public interest journalism;
- journalist safety;
- media viability;
- freedom of expression;
- information integrity;
- digital rights and technology;
- media policy and enabling environments;
- coalition-building and advocacy.

11.3 Organisational effectiveness / efficiency specialist

The team should include competence in efficiency and value for money with relevance to international NGOs or development organisations.

11.4 Gender, DEI, HRBA and localisation competence

The team should demonstrate experience integrating gender equality, DEI, HRBA, localisation and local leadership into evaluation design and analysis.

11.5 Regional and contextual expertise

The team should demonstrate contextual experience from one or more regions where IMS works. Inclusion of regional or local consultants/researchers is encouraged, particularly where country case studies are included.

11.6 Team composition

The team should be gender-balanced and should include representation or substantive expertise from one or more regions where IMS operates.

12. Proposal requirements

The consultant/team should combine expertise related to the areas outlined above.

Bidders should submit:

1. **Technical proposal**, including:
 - understanding of the assignment;
 - proposed methodology;
 - preliminary evaluation matrix;
 - approach to country and thematic case selection;
 - approach to partner engagement;
 - approach to gender, DEI, HRBA, ethics and safeguarding;
 - workplan and timeline;

- quality assurance arrangements;
 - risk assessment and mitigation measures.
2. **Team composition**, including:
 - roles and level of effort;
 - CVs of proposed team members;
 - explanation of how the team meets the required competencies.
 3. **Relevant experience**, including:
 - examples of similar evaluations or reviews;
 - experience with institutional donors;
 - experience in media development, freedom of expression, localisation, gender-sensitive evaluation or assessments.
 4. **Financial proposal**, including:
 - daily rates;
 - number of days per team member;
 - travel and other direct costs;
 - total price;
 - assumptions and exclusions.
 5. **Availability statement**, confirming that the proposed team is available during the assignment period.

Bidders are expected to propose a team composition and level of effort that is appropriate and feasible within the available budget and timeframe.

13. Evaluation and award criteria

A combined technical and financial scoring method will be used.

The **technical proposal** will be weighted at **75%** and the **financial proposal** at **25%**.

Only proposals reaching a minimum technical score of 55 out of 75 points will proceed to financial evaluation.

Award criteria	Weight	Score
Technical criteria	75%	75
1. Understanding of assignment and context (15 points) <i>Assessment will consider the bidder's understanding of:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IMS' global strategy and operating context; • the purpose of a strategic midterm review; • media development, civic space, public interest media and donor context; • the balance between accountability, learning and future strategic adaptation. 		
2. Methodology and feasibility (25 points)		

<p><i>Assessment will consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality and appropriateness of the proposed evaluation design; • use of OECD DAC criteria in a context-sensitive manner; • proposed evaluation matrix; • approach to triangulation and evidence quality; • feasibility within the timeframe and budget; • approach to country/thematic case selection; • integration of gender, DEI, HRBA, ethics and safeguarding; • approach to partner engagement. 		
<p>3. Team composition and expertise (25 points)</p> <p><i>Assessment will consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluation expertise; • media development and freedom of expression expertise; • organisational effectiveness and efficiency expertise; • gender, DEI, HRBA and localisation expertise; • relevant regional/contextual experience; • team balance and complementarity; • quality of proposed roles and level of effort. 		
<p>4. Relevant organisational experience and quality assurance (10 points)</p> <p><i>Assessment will consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • experience with Sida, Danida, Norad, EU or comparable donors; • experience with global or multi-country evaluations; • quality assurance systems; • examples of relevant previous assignments. 		
Financial criteria	25%	25
<p>The lowest priced technically compliant proposal will receive the maximum financial score of 25 points. Other financial proposals will be scored proportionally according to the following formula:</p> <p>Financial score = lowest proposed price / bidder's proposed price × 25</p>		
TOTAL		100

15. Quality standards

The review should meet recognised standards for development evaluation, including:

- independence and impartiality;
- transparent methodology;
- evidence-based findings;
- clear distinction between findings, conclusions and recommendations;
- triangulation of evidence;
- attention to limitations;
- ethical, conflict and gender-sensitive data collection;
- practical and actionable recommendations.

16. Key documents to be made available

IMS will provide relevant documentation to the selected consultant/team, which may include:

- IMS Global Strategy 2024–2028 and Theory of Change;
- Sida core support agreement and related reporting;
- annual reports;
- programme documents and results frameworks;
- monitoring data;
- organisational charts and Future Fit documentation;
- budgets and financial summaries relevant to the review;
- previous evaluations and reviews, including relevant country, regional and thematic evaluations;
- localisation/local leadership approach documents;
- gender/DEI-related documents (gender strategy, PCM mainstreaming tools, internal policies)
- relevant Board or management documents where appropriate.

17. Confidentiality and ownership

All documents, data and information provided to the consultant/team must be treated as confidential unless otherwise agreed with IMS.

The final report and related deliverables will become the property of IMS. Publication or external sharing of the report will be decided by IMS in consultation with Sida, subject to confidentiality and security considerations.

The consultant/team may not use or share sensitive information obtained during the assignment without prior written approval from IMS.

18. Submission instructions

Bidders should submit their technical and financial proposals by **14 August** to procurement@mediasupport.org

Questions regarding the tender may be submitted by 29th July. Answers will be shared with all invited bidders by 5th August.

The proposal should be valid for 30 days from the submission deadline.

Interviews with shortlisted bidders may be held during **24-26 August**. The assignment is expected to start in **early September 2026**.