



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Independent Mid-Term Review of the ALSF Medium-Term Strategy 2023–2027

A. THE ALSF

The African Legal Support Facility (ALSF) is an international organization established by the African Development Bank (AfDB) in 2008 to strengthen the legal capacity of African governments. Since commencing operations in 2010, the ALSF has supported more than 52 African countries through its advisory and capacity building support in its priority sectors – natural resources and extractives, energy, infrastructure PPPs, and sovereign finance.

The ALSF's work is often upstream, advisory, enabling and catalytic. Its interventions help governments negotiate fairer, durable, and more sustainable agreements, manage legal and fiscal risks, improve project bankability, strengthen institutional capacity, improve the business environment, and safeguard the public interest. To date, the ALSF has trained more than 12,500 lawyers and public officials, facilitated or contributed to more than USD 20 billion in investments and generated significant savings and value protection for African governments.

The ALSF's Medium-Term Strategy 2023-2027 (MTS) seeks to consolidate these gains and enhance the Facility's responsiveness, operational effectiveness, sustainability, and management for results. Against this background, the mid-term review will assess implementation progress and examine whether the MTS remains relevant, effective, efficient, sustainable, and supported by an adequate results framework to ensure greater and sustainable impact for African countries.

The project portfolio includes 150 projects under various stages of implementation that were approved between 2023 and 2025, while some projects from the previous MTS are still ongoing. Each year, approximately 20 projects are closed, and Project Closing Reports (PCRs) are filed accordingly.

B. THE ASSIGNMENT

The ALSF invites eligible firms to submit proposals to undertake the Mid-Term Review of the ALSF's Medium-Term Strategy 2023–2027.

The objective of the assignment is to provide an independent, evidence-based, and learning-oriented assessment of the implementation of the MTS at midpoint. The review will assess strategic relevance, implementation progress, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, cross-cutting issue integration, and adequacy of the ALSF's managing for results framework. It will generate practical recommendations to guide implementation

during the remaining period of the MTS and inform the design and horizon of the next strategy.

The review will cover ALSF's advisory and capacity building support and managing-for-results activities approved or implemented during the MTS period, including projects approved before 2023 but implemented during the current MTS period.

C. OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW

The specific objectives of the Mid Term Review of MTS 2023-2027 are to:

Objective 1: Assess Strategic Relevance

Assess whether the MTS remains relevant to ALSF's mandate, Regional Member Country needs, donor expectations, and relevant continental priorities, including debt sustainability, infrastructure development, energy transition, climate sustainability, digitalisation, natural resource governance, regional integration, and sustainable development.

Objective 2: Assess Responsiveness

Review the rate of progress in implementing projects during the MTS period, including the timeliness of ALSF's response and advancement of projects from submission to closing – across project scoping, approval, contracting, delivery, reporting, disbursements, and closing.

Objective 3: Assess Efficiency and Operational Performance

Examine whether ALSF's internal processes, staffing, service providers procurement, contracting, financial management, monitoring, reporting, and coordination arrangements are enabling timely and effective delivery.

Objective 4: Assess Effectiveness and Emerging Results

Assess the extent to which ALSF projects are contributing to intended outcomes, including strengthened legal capacity, improved transactions, balanced contracts, enhanced public interest safeguards, reduced legal and fiscal risks, improved project bankability, stronger systems and institutions, improved governance, reduced fragility, improved business environment, increased investment, and increased savings.

Objective 5: Assess Sustainability

Assess whether ALSF-supported outputs and early outcomes – including legal and transaction facilitation tools, capacity-building initiatives, frameworks, knowledge products, institutional support, and advisory results – are likely to be used, institutionalized, adapted, or sustained by beneficiary institutions.

Objective 6: Assess Cross-Cutting Issues Integration

Review how the cross-cutting issues – ESG, climate sustainability, gender, youth, illicit financial flows, and digitalisation, are being integrated into project design, implementation, reporting, and learning.

Objective 7: Strengthen Managing for Results

Assess the adequacy of the MTS results framework, project-level PMFs, data systems, MIS, reporting tools, and learning mechanisms for capturing the unique results of legal advisory and capacity-building work.

Objective 8: Contribute Inputs for the 2028 Strategy

Propose how the findings, lessons, and emerging evidence from the implementation of the MTS 2023–2027 can inform the design, strategic priorities, results framework, operational model, and resource requirements of the next ALSF Strategy, including its appropriate strategic horizon.

D. ELIGIBLE RESPONDENTS

Only proposals submitted by firms that meet the submission requirements in Section **H** and demonstrate experience in the areas listed below will be evaluated.

1. Strategy and institutional evaluations.
2. Portfolio and project performance reviews.
3. Theory-based evaluation.
4. Contribution analysis and outcome harvesting.
5. Development finance, legal advisory, infrastructure, PPPs, sovereign finance, extractives, or energy.
6. Results measurement and MEL systems.
7. Evaluation of African regional or public sector institutions.

E. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

1. Technical Proposal

The Technical Proposal shall comprise the requirements indicated below. Only firms scoring a minimum of 70 points in the Technical Proposal evaluation will have their Financial Proposals evaluated.

Technical Requirement	What Will Be Assessed	Score
a. Understanding of the Assignment and ALSF Context (15)		
i. Understanding ALSF's mandate, MTS, and operating model	Demonstrates an understanding of ALSF's mandate, MTS objectives, advisory and capacity-building model, managing-for-results framework, RMC needs, donor expectations, and challenges of assessing legal advisory and capacity building work.	15
b. Evaluation Methodology and Evidence Framework (45)		
ii. Overall evaluation methodology	Proposes a clear, coherent, and practical methodology covering strategic relevance, implementation progress, effectiveness,	20

	efficiency, sustainability, cross-cutting issues, managing for results, and lessons learned. The methodology should include an evaluation matrix linking review questions, indicators, evidence sources, and analytical methods, and may include relevant or innovative approaches to contribution analysis, outcome harvesting, case studies, portfolio analysis, dashboards, transaction outcome assessment, learning-oriented methods, or systems improvement analysis suited to ALSF's work.	
iii. Approach to capturing ALSF's contribution and catalytic results	Demonstrates how the review will assess ALSF's direct outputs and contribution to outcomes, including strengthened legal capacity, improved transaction structuring, balanced contracts, fiscal and legal risk management, public interest protection, governance, institutional capacity, investment facilitation, savings, and value protection.	10
iv. Data collection, sampling, and stakeholder consultation plan	Provides a credible approach to document review, portfolio sampling stakeholder interviews, surveys, case studies, and consultations with ALSF staff, RMCs, donors, partners, law firms, and other relevant stakeholders.	10
v. Data analysis, triangulation, and quality assurance	Explains how evidence will be analysed, validated, triangulated, and quality-assured to produce reliable findings, conclusions, and recommendations.	5
c. Team composition and Relevant Experience (20)		
vi. Team composition, qualifications, and relevant experience	Demonstrates that the team has appropriate experience in strategy evaluation, MEL, institutional review, African public or development institutions, and relevant ALSF sectors.	20
d. Implementation, Deliverables, and Usefulness of Outputs (20)		
vii. Work plan, deliverables, feasibility, and effort	Presents a realistic work plan, timeline, deliverables, allocation of responsibilities, and level of effort consistent with the scope and duration of the assignment.	8
viii. Limitations, risks, and mitigation measures	Identifies likely methodological, operational, access, data, and stakeholder risks, and proposes practical mitigation measures.	5
ix. Structure and clarity of final report	Proposes a clear report structure that will present findings, evidence, conclusions, recommendations, and implementation actions in a usable format.	4
x. Strategic value	Explains how the review will generate lessons and recommendations that can inform implementation of the remaining MTS period and the design, strategic horizon, results framework, operational model, and resource requirements of the next ALSF Strategy.	3
Total score		100

Important Guidance: ALSF's work is not conventional project implementation. It is typically upstream, legal, advisory, confidential, mostly enabling and often catalytic. The review must therefore capture direct outputs as well as attribute outcomes (including post closure) credibly and meaningfully, including any improvement or progress in legal capacity, bankability, contract negotiation, balanced contracts, legal and fiscal risk management, public interest protection, governance, institutional capacity, use of African legal and technical expertise, application of knowledge acquired through training, and governments capacity to manage complex transactions. Proposals that present a credible

methodology for capturing these results will be assessed favorably under the relevant technical evaluation criteria.

2. Financial Proposal Requirements

The Financial Proposal must be submitted as a separate document, quoted in United States dollars (USD), and should include sufficient detail on cost components and assumptions.

The Financial Proposal shall include:

- Person-days by experts.
- Travel and accommodation, if applicable.
- Data collection costs.
- Administrative and reimbursable costs.
- Taxes, where applicable.
- Total cost.

Selection will be quality-and cost-based and will be determined by the highest combined technical and financial score. The final score will be calculated on the basis of 80% technical score and 20% financial score. The contract will be awarded to the firm with the highest combined technical and financial score, subject to successful negotiations.

F. DURATION OF ASSIGNMENT: Up to 5 months from execution of contract.

G. DELIVERABLES

1. Inception report with methodology, sampling plan, stakeholder map, evaluation matrix, and work plan.
2. Portfolio review and preliminary data analysis report.
3. Case study briefs for selected projects.
4. Draft MTR report.
5. Validation presentation/workshop.
6. Final MTR report, including recommendations and implementation matrix.
7. Data annex/evidence matrix.

H. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Interested applicants must submit:

1. Firm profile.
2. Statement of relevant experience.
3. Summary of similar assignments completed.
4. Proposed team composition.
5. CVs of key experts.
6. Brief note on understanding of the assignment.

7. Evidence of experience in Africa or with regional development institutions.
8. Declaration of availability.
9. Declaration of absence of conflict of interest.

I. APPLICATION

Applications, including separate technical and financial proposals, must be submitted by email as follows:

- To: alsfprocurement@afdb.org
- Deadline: **2 September 2026 at 18h00 UTC / Abidjan time.**
- Subject: **Request For Proposals – Mid-Term Review of the ALSF Medium-Term Strategy 2023–2027**

Any application submitted after the deadline will be automatically rejected.

Requests for clarification may be submitted from the date of publication until 25 August 2026. Responses to clarification requests will be published on the RFP page on the ALSF website.