

TERMS OF REFERENCE

for the

MID-TERM EVALUATION

of the

FAIR, GREEN AND GLOBAL PROGRAMME

Final version, December 2017

1. BACKGROUND

1.1. WHO? The FGG Alliance and its members

The Fair, Green and Global (FGG) Alliance consists of six Dutch member organisations: ActionAid, Both ENDS, Clean Clothes Campaign, Milieudefensie (Friends of the Earth Netherlands and International), SOMO and the Transnational Institute (TNI). Together with civil society organisations (CSOs) and networks from all over the world we aim for socially just, inclusive and environmentally sustainable societies.¹ In January 2016, the FGG Alliance has entered its second five-year programme, this time in a Strategic Partnership called ‘Dialogue and Dissent’ with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

1.2. WHY & WHAT? The change that we pursue

Our partner organisations worldwide, and the communities they work with, experience on a daily basis how certain policies and practices lead to violations of human rights and environmental destruction. We work together with them to address these issues and to ensure that policies that protect rights and livelihoods are formulated and implemented. The FGG Alliance members and partner organisations link local realities to national and global policy processes, and challenge existing rules and regulations that maintain or exacerbate the power imbalances that characterise our current economic system. These power imbalances are often most visible and tangible in Low- and Lower-Middle Income Countries, where lives and livelihoods are threatened by climate change, declining biodiversity, and resource grabs. Often in relation to this, human rights are systematically violated and rights defenders are under severe threat.

To address these problems and provide alternative policies and practices, we focus on three interlinked areas of work (or ‘Theories of Change’ (ToCs)): Improved corporate conduct; Improved trade and investment; and Improved financial and tax systems.

ToC1: Improved Corporate Conduct

The aim of FGG’s work under the first ToC is: improved corporate conduct advances social justice, decent work and environmental sustainability. The FGG Alliance is convinced that corporations, including private banks, have a role in and responsibility for fighting poverty and injustice and promoting inclusive and sustainable development. This requires a fundamental change in corporate conduct. Not just on paper, but in practice.

Through globalisation, corporations have acquired greater power and legal rights, but without a parallel increase in accountability. This gap between increasing power and shortcomings in

¹For clarity’s sake: in this ToR, we use the term ‘FGG Alliance’ to refer to the six member organisations (ActionAid, Both ENDS, Clean Clothes Campaign, Milieudefensie (and Friends of the Earth International), SOMO and TNI). FGG (Alliance) ‘partners’ are the 300+ organisations around the world with whom the six Alliance members collaborate within the FGG programme. Where we use ‘FGG’ we mean both its Dutch members as well as their partner organisations worldwide.

accountability / responsibility must be closed for social and gender justice, decent working conditions and environmental sustainability to prevail. This requires rules, regulations and enforcement on the one hand, and improvements in corporate governance, business models and business practices on the other hand. As FGG Alliance we therefore lobby and advocate for sustainability and labour rights throughout supply chains, and fostering local, vibrant, small-scale and sustainable businesses. At the same time we aim to contribute to a (social, political, economic, legal, cultural, etc.) environment in which human rights are respected and civil society actors can engage in development processes safely and effectively.

ToC2: Improved Trade and Investment

The work related to FGG's second ToC is aimed at improved trade and investment that advances socially just, inclusive and environmentally sustainable development. According to the FGG Alliance, trade and investment have the potential to contribute significantly to economic opportunities and equality. However, the current global trade and investment regime has expanded the rights of corporations, while diminishing the policy options available to governments and the possibilities for communities to defend their rights. There is an urgent need to redress this imbalance between the rights and obligations of corporations and the regulatory space available to governments to fulfil environmental and social objectives, including increased gender equality and respect for human rights.

ToC3: Improved Financial and Tax Systems

FGG's work on the third ToC is aimed at improved financial systems, tax regimes and public financing practices, which advance socially just, inclusive and environmentally sustainable development. Financial and tax regimes can secure revenues and domestic resources for governments, promote equality and stability, and generate public financing that serves development goals. However, the current financial system has increased inequality and injustice, especially in Low- and Lower-Middle Income Countries. There is a systematic tendency for financial resources (capital) to accumulate in the hands of a limited number of individuals, corporations and government institutions. In addition, international financial institutions, whilst pursuing development objectives, tend to marginalise human rights and environmental sustainability. They invest in projects which at times are detrimental to communities, particularly those living in poverty and women, and the ecosystems upon which they rely.

The FGG Alliance seeks to contribute to policy coherence for development by helping ensure that financial regulations, tax systems, and the functioning of (public) international financial institutions are geared towards sustainable and inclusive development and equity within and across borders. National and international tax regimes also need to be reconfigured so that they contribute to economic and environmental justice, including by creating incentives for a systemic shift to a low carbon economy.

1.3. HOW? Our ways of working

1.3.1. Mutual capacity development

Mutually (FGG members and partner organisations) developing capacity to lobby and advocate for improved corporate conduct, improved trade and investment and improved financial and tax systems is at the heart of the FGG Alliance. The FGG Alliance defines mutual capacity development as a process of strengthening skills, knowledge and network contacts, involving partner organisations, FGG Alliance members, and key networks and their members as equal partners. FGG partners and members combine their complementary roles and expertise to achieve their joint goals. For more information on this approach, see our publication [*Mutual capacity development; a modern and effective approach for fair, green and global change.*](#)

1.3.2. Lobby and advocacy

Our joint lobbying and advocacy objectives are based on the priorities and agendas of our partners. To ensure 'fair' and 'green' development, the Alliance works with non-governmental organisations, civil

society organisations, community-based organisations, communities, and individuals, that face challenges relating to labour and human rights, the use of and control over natural resources, and the global financial system. For more information on this approach, see our publication [*The strength of lobbying and advocacy; Ten recommendations from the field.*](#)

We work on six (not necessarily sequential) intermediate steps that contribute to improvements in corporate conduct, trade and investment, and financial and tax policies:

- A. An enabling environment – both the rights and the legal and political spaces needed to claim and defend those rights are protected for people, communities and civil society actors, enabling them to address problems and promote alternatives.
- B. Capacities strengthened – increased capacity of civil society actors to research, network and advocate.
- C. Alternatives developed – the FGG Alliance and other civil society actors develop, pilot and promote alternative policies and practices for its areas of work. These alternatives are people-driven, gender inclusive, sustainable, and contribute to policy coherence.
- D. Agendas set – private and public sector decision makers have prioritised improvement measures due to support from influential civil society actors, critical media attention, increased public awareness and effective scrutiny of corporate conduct, trade and investment policies and financial and tax policies.
- E. Policies changed – government and corporate policies related to corporate conduct, trade and investment, tax and public spending, as well as financial regulations and policies are improved.
- F. Practice changed – improved policies, processes and regulations are successfully and sustainably implemented and enforced.

Through several strategies FGG Alliance members and partner organisations achieve successes on the above six steps: we **develop our capacity in a mutual way**; we **develop knowledge** to build evidence for our lobby and advocacy; we contribute to **networking between and among local, national and global** civil society actors and other stakeholders; we **mobilise the public and campaign** to inform the public and create public support for our advocacy goals; we ensure **media outreach** for public support and pressure; we **advocate, lobby and negotiate** to further change; we **monitor and enforce** policies, processes and regulations that contribute to socially just, inclusive and environmentally sustainable societies; and we see a role for the Ministry to contribute to the jointly defined objectives in **soft diplomacy** at national and international level to ensure an enabling environment. See Annex I for a schematic presentation of the FGG Alliance’s Theory of Change.

2. BACKGROUND AND GOALS FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

2.1. Background of the Mid-Term Evaluation

The FGG Alliance is not required by its funder, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to undertake a mid-term evaluation. However, the FGG Alliance would like to learn from its experience to date, both to be able to improve its programme and collaboration in the final years of the current programme, and to take decisions on the future of the programme after its ending by end December 2020. This Terms of Reference (ToR) serves to present the aims and parameters for an external Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the FGG Alliance.

This ToR has been developed by the coordination team (CT) of the FGG Alliance, in close consultation and collaboration with the Steering Committee (SC – the six directors), the Programme Committee (PC – six senior officers of the Dutch Alliance members), the external reference group (three independent experts) and the internal reference group (an SC member, PC member, PMEL colleague, content colleague, member of FGG’s Advisory Group (six representatives of Southern partner organisations), and a member of the CT.

2.2. Goals for the Mid-Term Evaluation

The FGG Alliance commissions this MTE for the following reasons:

- **To learn:** first and foremost, the FGG Alliance aims to better understand what works and what does not work within its own programme, and more specifically to test the assumptions underlying the Alliance's general ToC (encompassing the three theme-specific ToCs)². The specific assumptions we would like to pay attention to, are:
 - a. An enabling environment, a capacitated civil society, and the development of alternatives form the preconditions for FGG partners and members jointly to effectively lobby and advocate, leading to agenda setting, policy change and practice change (assumption A4).
 - b. Increasing civil society's capacity and power to influence governments and corporations is essential (assumption A11/A21/A31).
 - c. Co-operation in joint activities – from research and analysis, to campaigning and exchange – allow us and our partners to mutually strengthen our capacities and in turn, those of the communities and movements we work with (assumption A5).
 - d. FGG members are or work with international and regional CSO networks that focus on improving corporate conduct from sectoral, issue-based or human rights perspectives. Linking local to global civil society actors increases their leverage (assumption A12/A22/A32).
 - e. Soft diplomacy and brokering by the Minister can assist in creating an enabling environment for CSOs and protecting rights defenders globally and in specific partner countries [through diplomacy, embassy programmes, and EU efforts] / Soft diplomacy and brokering by the Minister can help to engage in economic diplomacy efforts to enhance and protect responsible financing initiatives and safeguard policies; support human rights due diligence of IFIs/DFIs; and support human rights defenders through embassies (assumption A16/A26/A36).

It has been a deliberate decision to commission this MTE in addition to the obligatory end of term evaluation to be carried out in 2019-2020; because evaluating at this stage of the programme allows the FGG Alliance to improve its practice based on the lessons learnt and recommendations derived from the MTE. Also, this evaluation is aimed to stimulate the learning character of the Alliance, and foster exchange between FGG members and partner organisations as well as external actors.

- **To increase effectiveness:** it is hoped that the internal reflection and exchange of information will help assess the effectiveness of the FGG Alliance's current approaches and improve these where possible.
- **To take stock of perceptions of partner organisations and external actors:** this MTE provides an excellent opportunity to open up and/or intensify the dialogue with partner organisations and external actors and jointly reflect upon the FGG Alliance and its programme. Understanding others' perceptions of the FGG Alliance helps to fine-tune the FGG approach as well as its communication and its efforts to liaise with actors beyond the six FGG members.
- **To provide inputs** and insights for the obligatory end of term evaluation in terms of methodology, as well as regarding the progress of the programme.

Should the outcomes of the MTE turn out to be of interest to external actors too, the FGG Alliance will explore the possibilities for sharing outcomes externally, while respecting the confidential and internal character of this study.

² Please find our full overview of assumptions underlying our general and three thematic ToCs in Annex IV, available per mail.

3. GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND PARAMETERS

Given the goals of the MTE, the FGG Alliance has defined several guiding principles it would like to be respected in undertaking this evaluation. First, the evaluation should be **utilisation-focused and stimulate learning**: i.e., the evaluation process itself should serve as a learning experience, for example by actively involving staff in data collection, interviews, analysis etc. The evaluation is not driven by accountability requirements.

Inclusiveness and the promotion of democratic processes are important principles for the FGG Alliance. For these reasons, it is important that the approach chosen includes **participatory** methods that allow reflection of different views and perspectives, and triangulation. This refers to FGG staff, partner organisations as well as external actors who are able to reflect on the work of the FGG Alliance. At the same time, the evaluation approach should respect the fact that FGG staff is generally extremely busy; **time is scarce and valuable**.

Methodologies used should serve the purposes of the evaluation and **fit** the focus of the evaluation. These methodologies should prioritise qualitative data gathering (as the FGG Alliance assumes that qualitative methods and reflection better help to tease out mechanisms and processes and therewith enhance our understanding of the dynamics and effectiveness of our programme), be appropriate to the (network and activist) nature of the alliance (i.e. take into account the wide variety of partners involved, also in terms of means of engaging them, and aim for an approach in which people are being heard without demanding too much of their time and energy), and go beyond planned and expected results (i.e. also including unexpected results). In terms of methodology, the Alliance is open to suggestions on how to involve outsiders' views in order to address a possible bias.

4. FOCUS AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

4.1. Rationale behind the evaluation focus

The FGG programme is a large programme (total programme budget of 12,6 million euros a year for 5 years), relating to a wide variety of themes (three ToCs and many sub-themes), in many parts of the world (global programme) and involving a large variety of actors (around 300 partner organisations).

It is a global programme that does not concentrate on a limited or static number of countries; rather the location of the work is actor-driven. FGG members and partner organisations cooperate based on a joint vision in those international forums, regions, countries and local realities where changes in the areas of corporate conduct, trade and investment and tax and financial systems are urgent and feasible. Activities under the FGG programme are carried out in cooperation between one or several FGG members and one or more partner organisations on a specific topic in a specific location. These collaborations are often long-standing, but can also concern very ad hoc responses to immediate changes or opportunities in context. And it means that in one country, different FGG members may work with different (groups of) partner organisations on different topics and in different regions.

This global and dynamic character of the FGG programme has consequences for defining the scope of a programme-wide evaluation, as it is never possible to evaluate everything the Alliance does. The scope of the evaluation has therefore been narrowed down significantly, with the aim of enhancing the feasibility of the evaluation. By focussing on a number of specific cases, we aim to allow for a more in-depth analysis of a limited part of the programme.

As explained in the first chapter of this ToR, the FGG Alliance uses a change theory with six 'steps' or intermediate outcomes. These are (A) enabling environment, (B) capacities strengthened, (C) alternatives developed, (D) agendas set, (E) policies changed, and (F) practice changed. The assumption underlying the FGG programme is that outcomes in these six outcome areas are to a certain extent sequential (though iterative), and that our efforts in outcome areas A, B and C (which we summarise as our 'mutual capacity development' work) eventually lead to changes in outcome

areas D, E and F (which we summarise as our ‘lobby and advocacy’ work). As this general ToC (encompassing the three theme-specific ToCs) underlies all the FGG Alliance’s work, it has been decided for this MTE to gain a deeper understanding of the ways in which and the extent to which the assumptions underlying the relations between the outcome areas in our ToC are correct. This is expected to help the Alliance sharpening its ToC, adjusting it where necessary, and therewith improving its effectiveness on all outcome areas, with the ultimate aim of improved corporate conduct, improved trade and investment and improved financial and tax systems to contribute to a socially just, inclusive and environmentally sustainable world.

In addition, the Alliance would like to learn more about the collaboration between the six Alliance members, with partner organisations and with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This would allow us to more elaborately shed light on the ways in which we can collaborate most fruitfully within the Alliance; reflect upon the most satisfying and constructive modes of collaboration with partner organisations; and better understand how the FGG Alliance and the Ministry cooperate within the Strategic Partnership, and have an added value in relation to the joint strategic goals of (1) supporting an enabling environment and (2) policy coherence for development.

In order to study the assumptions underlying the FGG Alliance’s ToC and the collaboration within the FGG Alliance, with partner organisations, and with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the FGG Alliance has decided to commission three sub-evaluations. The first two concern testing the Alliance’s ToC, the third focuses on the collaboration within the Alliance. Eventually the FGG Alliance aims for a synergy report in which the core findings of the three sub-evaluations are presented and light is shed on the possible linkages between the sub-evaluations. Below follows an explanation of the focus, scope and methodology suggested for the three sub-evaluations foreseen.

For all three sub-evaluations, the sub-questions will be finalised together with the evaluator(s). The organisations involved will prepare and provide the relevant data and information. The evaluator is not requested to provide recommendations on his/her own account - any recommendations should be a result of reflections within the evaluation process.

4.2. Sub-evaluation 1 - Enabling environment

4.2.1. What do we mean?

In many countries worldwide, the legitimacy and ability to operate of civic actors is being threatened and actively restricted. There are growing restrictions on freedoms of association, assembly and expression, and a crackdown on CSOs and human rights defenders (HRDs). According to the CIVICUS *State of Civil Society Report 2017* there are ‘serious threats’ to one or more civic freedoms in 106 countries. According to Freedom in the World, the crucial indicators of democracy experienced declines in 105 countries and suffered net declines during the last 10 years. Governments across the globe, in FGG’s analysis often driven by business interests, have been introducing laws, practices and policies which have led to a situation in which many activities of CSOs and HRDs have become riskier and more difficult. To define the different forms of (shrinking) civic space in this study, the FGG Alliance uses TNI’s framing paper ‘[On “shrinking space”](#)’ and the paper of Partos on civic space as a starting point (only a draft available, called ‘Shrinking Civic Space: some counter-narratives’).

In FGG’s theory of change, an enabling environment for civic actors to play their role is a precondition for the Alliance members and partners to do their work. An assumption at the start of the programme has been that this enabling environment is under extreme pressure, endangering the Alliance’s ability to do its work. At the same time, many of the Alliance’s interventions are aimed at ensuring formal procedures guaranteeing that civic actors can participate in decision-making processes and are taken seriously as speaking partners. In other words a second assumption is that successful implementation of the FGG programme also leads to a stronger enabling environment for civic actors. These two assumptions are the focus of the first sub-study, also given the growing urgency of learning about

shrinking civic space, how to counter this, and how to operate best in the remaining spaces.

4.2.2. Focus of the sub-evaluation

As explained above, the first sub-evaluation is aimed at studying the assumptions that practice change in the area of civic access to decision making processes on corporate conduct, trade & investment, tax & financial systems can contribute to an enabling environment, and that an enabling environment is a precondition for results on Outcome Areas B, C, D, E and F.

Sub-questions:

- a. Why is civic space diminishing?
- b. How do different actors outside the Alliance promote and/or obstruct civic space?
- c. In situations where civic space was or has been shrinking, how do we as FGG Alliance (i.e. FGG members and partner organisations) respond to shrinking civic space and the implications this has for partner organisations (i.e. what kind of interventions do we undertake)?
- d. How do FGG Alliance members and partner organisations contribute to civic space (also taking into account the effects of our work in the area of mechanisms ensuring participation, support to HRDs, and use of grievance mechanisms), and how does the Alliance possibly negatively affect civic space?
- e. What have been enabling and constraining factors (internal and external) for the FGG Alliance to respond to shrinking civic space in the selected countries?
- f. How does the shrinking civic space affect Alliance members in reaching their advocacy goals?
- g. Testing the Alliance's assumptions:
 - I. How and under what conditions does practice change in the area of civic access to decision making processes on corporate conduct, trade & investment, tax & financial systems can contribute to an enabling environment?
 - II. How and under what conditions is an enabling environment a precondition for results on Outcome Areas B, C, D, E and F?

4.2.3. Scope

The FGG Alliance suggests to take a country focus for this sub-study. The Alliance has drafted a shortlist of six countries in which the FGG Alliance is active and in which we have recently seen civic space shrinking severely (these countries are not included in this ToR, for reasons of sensitivity. Consultants can obtain this list by emailing the coordinator of this evaluation, see contact details below). Of this list, all or some (and possibly other) countries can be taken as a focus for this study. We would invite the consultants to indicate on which countries they would suggest to focus (preferably in collaboration with local consultants), and to indicate whether they find it necessary, feasible and safe to do fieldwork in these countries, or to stick to a desk study. The final choice of countries and approach will be identified during the inception phase based on partner organisations' assessment of feasibility and desirability of the study matter and process.

4.3. Sub-evaluation 2 - Lobby and advocacy effectiveness

4.3.1. What do we mean?

A lot of the FGG Alliance's efforts and interventions are focused on achieving policy changes in collaboration with other civil society actors, with as a parallel result mutually strengthened capacities of both FGG members and partner organisations as they learn from (each others') experiences and improve their work. The cooperation and mutual capacity development with civic actors forms the indispensable basis for the policy influencing work. Meanwhile, the FGG Alliance never changes policies itself; it can only really achieve such outcomes by moving decision makers to take these steps, by setting the agendas of all those that have a say in these processes (whether formally or informally), and by providing these decision makers with evidence-based alternative solutions. So although the focus is on policy change, most efforts go into agenda setting and this is also where we will see the highest 'number' of outcomes being achieved. The Alliance's assumption is that agenda setting is only

successful if it offers alternative solutions to the problems identified. At the same time the Alliance has learnt from experience that policies that are improved in line with the Alliance's standpoints do not automatically lead to the desired impact of a socially just, inclusive and environmentally sustainable society. In the Alliance's analysis, in order to secure systemic change, policies should be put in practice as well, and practice change is only achieved if it is thoroughly monitored, tested through the use of (grievance) mechanisms, and promoted based on research. In this mid-term evaluation, the Alliance would like to learn about the relations between these steps in its Theory of Change and the contributing and hampering factors that define these cause and effect relations.

4.3.2. Focus

In this second sub-evaluation, the Alliance aims to study the assumptions that agenda-setting leads to policy change, and that policy change leads to practice change. As part of this question, we hope evaluators will also look at the role of mutual capacity development and alternatives (Outcome Areas B and C) and the assumption that these are preconditions for D, E and F to happen.

Sub-questions:

- a. How, and to what extent, do different types of Alliance partners contribute to agenda-setting and changes in policy and practice?
- b. What are contributing and hampering factors for the FGG Alliance in ensuring that agenda-setting leads to policy change, and policy change to practice change?
- c. How and under what conditions do mutual capacity development between FGG members and partner organisations, and the development and promotion of alternatives by FGG members and partners play a role in this?

It is considered desirable that the evaluators build upon the FGG Alliance's definition and understanding of lobby and advocacy, and mutual capacity development. The FGG Alliance's understanding of lobby and advocacy and mutual capacity development is further elaborated in the following publications:

- Lobby and advocacy: http://fairgreenandglobal.org/publications/the-strength-of-lobbying-and-advocacy/at_download/file
- Mutual capacity development: http://fairgreenandglobal.org/publications/mutual-capacity-development-publication/at_download/file

4.3.3. Scope

Rather than trying to do an assessment of our entire programme (which is, as described under 4.1, quite broad), we suggest to study the correctness of the assumptions underlying the FGG Alliance's lobby and advocacy by looking at a number of FGG 'working areas'. In other words, although we are open to other suggestions and ideas, we propose to use for this study a casuistic approach in order to limit the workload. Below is a 'menu' of possible working areas that could feature in this sub-evaluation. It is suggested that evaluators look into three or four of these working areas. The selection of working areas should be determined in close consultation with the FGG Alliance during the inception phase of the evaluation, also based on the expertise of the evaluators. It is preferred that the chosen working areas together represent all FGG members (i.e. each FGG member features in at least one working area), and cover the width of the FGG programme (i.e. the three ToCs). The 'menu' is below, and can be extended if the consultant and the FGG Alliance agree that this is necessary, in the inception phase of the evaluation. More information on the working areas can be found in an Annex that is not public in light of sensitive information but can be sent to interested evaluators upon request.

- a. **Rana Plaza Arrangement:**

- a. **Brief description:** compensation arrangement for the victims of the Rana Plaza building collapse and setting a pathway for the Employment Injury Insurance Scheme in Bangladesh.
- b. **ToC:** ToC1, improved corporate conduct
- c. **FGG member(s) involved:** CCC
- b. **Mutual capacity development around investment protection**
 - a. **Brief description:** FGG mutual capacity development with partners in Asian region on investment protection in RCEP and other trade and investment treaty negotiations.
 - b. **ToC:** ToC2, improved trade and investment
 - c. **FGG member(s) involved:** BE, MD/FoEI, SOMO, TNI
- c. **Corporate transparency:**
 - a. **Brief description:** FGG lobby for binding regulation (in NL/EU) on corporate transparency (garment sector, or transparency register)
 - b. **ToC:** ToC1, improved corporate conduct
 - c. **FGG member(s) involved:** CCC, MD, SOMO
- d. **Women 2 Kilimanjaro Initiative**
 - a. **Brief description:** FGG mutual capacity development and advocacy by FGG partner organisations for women's land rights, including the promotion of FPIC and the VGGTs through the Women 2 Kilimanjaro Initiative.
 - b. **ToC:** ToC1, improved corporate conduct
 - c. **FGG member(s) involved:** AA
- e. **UN Treaty on Businesses and Human Rights**
 - a. **Brief description:** FGG networking with partner organisations and joint advocacy for binding regulation for businesses on human rights through the UN Binding Treaty
 - b. **ToC:** ToC1, improved corporate conduct
 - c. **FGG member(s) involved:** FoEI, SOMO, TNI
- f. **Tax in Zambia:**
 - a. **Brief description:** Public attention for and advocating for policy and practice change related to tax, e.g. in Zambia (where civil society engaged the government and parliamentarians to advocate for higher mineral royalty taxes. However, when copper prices fell, the government decided to enact low tax rates, to ensure the sustainability of the mines, at the cost of revenue raising for development)
 - b. **ToC:** ToC3, improved tax and financial systems
 - c. **FGG member(s) involved:** AA

4.4. Sub-evaluation 3 – Collaboration

4.4.1. Focus

The FGG Alliance consists of six members in the Netherlands and more than 300 partner organisations around the world. This Alliance has been in a strategic partnership with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs since January 2016, for a period of five years. In order to collaborate in a satisfying manner with all these actors, the FGG Alliance would like to carry out an evaluation of the collaboration between the six Alliance members, with partner organisations, and with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Given its nature, it is foreseen that this sub-study is less resource intense than the first two. The context for this evaluation is the cooperation between these different actors within the premise of the FGG programme; what this entails specifically differs per respondent. Also for this evaluation, the Alliance would like to study its assumptions underlying the collaboration with different actors. These assumptions are:

- a) Related to cooperation with partner organisations:

- a. Co-operation in joint activities – from research and analysis, to campaigning and exchange – allow us and our partners to mutually strengthen our capacities and in turn, those of the communities and movements we work with.
 - b. FGG members are or work with international and regional CSO networks that focus on improving corporate conduct from sectoral, issue-based or human rights perspectives. Linking local to global civil society actors increases their leverage.
- b) Related to cooperation with the Ministry:
- a. Soft diplomacy and brokering by the Minister can assist in creating an enabling environment for CSOs and protecting rights defenders globally and in specific partner countries [through diplomacy, embassy programmes, and EU efforts] / Soft diplomacy and brokering by the Minister can help to engage in economic diplomacy efforts to enhance and protect responsible financing initiatives and safeguard policies; support human rights due diligence of IFIs/DFIs; and support human rights defenders through embassies.
 - b. We believe that governments’ willingness to sustain ‘dialogue and dissent’ with representatives of civil society around the world can lead to transformative change in trade and investment.
- c) Related to cooperation among the six Alliance members:
- a. FGG members have complementary capacities enabling us to employ a tailor-made mix of eight key interventions to achieve these intermediate steps.

Sub-questions:

FGG members and partners:

- a. What were the expectations on which collaboration between FGG members with partner organisations was started?
- b. How is the collaboration between FGG members and partners organised, especially in terms of: when and how are decisions made about roles and responsibilities, the distribution of resources, the design and implementation of advocacy interventions? Who makes the decisions? How does the decision-making within the Alliance effect on the ground advocacy work? How is information-sharing and learning organised?
- c. What were enabling and constraining factors in the perceived added value and appreciation of the cooperation between FGG members and partner organisations?

FGG members and the Ministry:

- d. What were the expectations on which collaboration between the FGG Alliance and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was started?
- e. What does the strategic partnership between the FGG Alliance and the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs look like in practice?
- f. What were enabling and constraining factors in the (non-)achievement of the original objectives of this Strategic Partnership, and in meeting or not meeting the original expectations (e.g. what were expectations in terms of the added value of the collaboration, and what is this added value in practice)?

FGG members amongst themselves:

- g. What were the expectations on which collaboration between FGG members was started?
- h. What is the added value that different Alliance members have brought to the Alliance in the second FGG programme, so from January 2016 up till time of the evaluation?
- i. To what extent have FGG members appreciated the collaboration and complementarity within the Alliance?
- j. What were determining factors (positive and negative) for the extent to which FGG members appreciated the collaboration and complementarity within the Alliance?

4.4.2. Scope

It is expected that an assessment is done of the level of synergy and complementarity within the FGG Alliance and with partner organisations, and more specifically on the satisfaction of FGG members, partners and the Ministry on cooperation within the Strategic Partnership and the added value of each partner to the partnership in relation to the joint strategic goals of (1) supporting an enabling environment and (2) policy coherence for development. The expected synergy, complementarity, roles and responsibilities are partially laid out in MoUs and similar documents. This can be taken as a starting point, though further exploration of expectations will be part of the assignment.

This evaluation is mild in the sense that we do not aim for an extensive and time-consuming participatory process, though we do foresee that some reflection will take place between FGG members.³ Somewhat more attention should be paid to assessing the relation between FGG members and their partner organisations, as well as between FGG members and the Ministry. It is assumed that this sub-study can best be carried out by someone with expertise in the field of organisational development, and with experience in working in the development sector and/or working with specifically the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

5. METHODOLOGY, DATA GATHERING AND SOURCES

5.1. Methodology

The exact methodology(ies)⁴ for the evaluation will be defined together with the external evaluator(s). The organisers welcome proposals for methodologies that are based on and respect the guiding principles and parameters mentioned in paragraph 3. In addition, the FGG Alliance considers it important that the methodologies of the three sub-evaluations do not interfere with each other.

Regarding the three sub-evaluations, the following is suggested in terms of methodology:

1) Sub-evaluation 1 - enabling environment:

- a. Desk study of literature on enabling environment/civic space (with a focus on the countries identified);
- b. Review of monitoring data on Outcome Area A – enabling environment;
- c. Survey among partner organisations;
- d. Interviews with e.g. partner organisations, embassies, other civic actors in the chosen countries, lobby targets or government officials in the chosen countries;
- e. Possibly fieldwork, depending on the feasibility per country, added value and safety of fieldwork as compared to methods that involve digital communication (number of countries to be decided as well);
- f. Reflection meeting with FGG Alliance members' staff on the ToC and underlying assumptions related to 'enabling environment'.

2) Sub-evaluation 2 - lobby and advocacy effectiveness:

- a. Desk study of literature on the topic;
- b. Reviewing monitoring data;

³Although the budget for this sub-evaluation on collaboration is lowest as compared to the other sub-evaluations, and this sub-evaluation should be 'mild', this should not be perceived as a hierarchy or lower commitment to the sub-evaluation on collaboration. The rationale behind the lower budget and 'mild' approach is that the costs for this sub-evaluation are expected to be lower and the dedication of FGG Alliance members to this sub-evaluation is expected to be higher when carefully dealing with the sparse time of Alliance staff.

⁴Examples of methodologies, frameworks and methods that the organisers consider inspirational are outcome mapping, outcome harvesting, most significant change, appreciative inquiry, theory of change, stakeholder review and the Bellwether questions (from Coffman and Reid, 2007).

- c. Survey among partner organisations and/or other relevant stakeholders;
- d. Workshop forms to foster reflection such as timelines; joint outcome harvesting;
- e. Fieldwork to interview relevant actors in the setting of the selected working area, observe the situation, and possibly organise workshop forms to foster reflection;
- f. Interviews and focus groups to triangulate findings with other relevant NGOs, academics, policy makers, private sector actors, etc;
- g. Reflection meeting with FGG Alliance members' staff on the ToC and underlying assumptions related to agenda-setting, policy change and practice change.

3) **Sub-evaluation 3 - collaboration:**

- a. Desk study of literature on the topic;
- b. Interviews with staff of FGG members, partner organisations and the Ministry;
- c. Workshop forms to foster reflection;
- d. Survey among staff of FGG members and/or partner organisations;
- e. Reviewing monitoring data.

The scope and specificities of the sub-evaluations and the fieldwork will be further defined in close consultation between FGG's internal reference group and the evaluators. There will be time reserved between deciding upon the focus of the fieldwork for the sub-evaluations and the start of the studies, to assess information available as well as availability of involved partner organisations and FGG staff to ensure the studies can be executed well, within the set time frame and in coherence with each other. Practical preparations for the fieldwork are to be arranged by the evaluators, with adequate support from the FGG Alliance and partner organisations. For the first two sub-evaluations, an amount of 30 work days is estimated, which includes preparations and reporting. The fieldwork is expected to last about one week. Involvement of local consultants for the sub-evaluations is appreciated. For the third sub-evaluation, an amount of 10 work days is estimated, which includes preparations and reporting. As indicated, for the FGG Alliance there is no hierarchy in the three sub-evaluations. The three sub-evaluations are considered to build upon each other and in terms of methodology, it is expected that adequate attention is paid to the interrelations between the sub-evaluations.

5.2. **Data collection**

Acknowledging that the three sub-evaluations will require different methodological approaches, consultants could consider to start data collection with internal reports and staff of the FGG Alliance members as informants, and from there move to other stakeholders such as representatives of communities involved, networks, partners, decision makers, government representatives, journalists etc. to triangulate observations. The results of this data collection should then form the basis for the evaluator to use, to provide the organisations the opportunity to reflect, learn and formulate recommendations. In terms of process it is desired that a first draft report containing preliminary observations is discussed with a broader group of relevant/committed FGG (and if possible partner) staff to deepen understanding, and reflect on the assumptions underlying our ToC. Also, an element of triangulating first findings with external stakeholders would be appreciated.

5.3. **Sources**

Primary sources will be:

- Internal documents of the FGG organisations: progress reports, monitoring data and minutes of meetings. FGG's targets, monitoring on outcome indicators, as well as annual plans and reports, can be found on the Ministry's public IATI dashboard: <https://public.tableau.com/profile/ministerie.van.buitenlandse.zaken#!/vizhome/IATIvisualisatie/Portfolio>. Internal documents will be shared in the inception phase of the evaluation.
- External documents of the FGG organisations: reports of events and publications.
- Interviews or participation in meetings/workshops/discussions by staff of organisations.

Secondary sources could be:

- Interviews with or participation in meetings/workshops/discussions by external stakeholders of the organisations (community representatives, networks and social movement allies, targeted decision makers, donors, journalists, academics, NGO colleagues, etc.).
- Documentation and resources of academics or other organisations with a similar (strategic or content) focus as the FGG Alliance.
- Sources on (shrinking) civic space (e.g. Civicus).

6. EVALUATORS

6.1. Team set-up

It is foreseen that the evaluation will be carried out by a team of consultants with complementary expertise, or a combination of consultancy teams. In both cases, it is expected that these teams are self-identified with one consultant responsible for the overall lead and synthesis report. The team structure is expected to be as follows:

- > One **overall lead consultant**, responsible for liaising with the FGG Alliance and coordinating the evaluation with the other consultants. This lead consultant is encouraged to also take the lead in one of the three sub-evaluations listed below;
- > A (team of) consultant(s), responsible for the sub-evaluation on **enabling environment**;
- > A (team of) consultant(s), responsible for the sub-evaluation on **lobby and advocacy effectiveness**;
- > A (team of) consultant(s), responsible for the sub-evaluation on **collaboration**.

6.2. Necessary qualifications

The FGG Alliance welcomes proposals from teams of evaluators who, in addition to the necessary expertise as related to the sub-evaluations listed above:

- Have proven experience in conducting similar evaluations (including process facilitation);
- Have knowledge and expertise of participatory evaluation methodology and approaches for examining advocacy outcomes
- Are available and accessible in the evaluation period;
- Have an inspiring and realistic proposal in terms of methodologies, planning and budget;
- Are pleasant to cooperate with; good adjustment of engagement approach to the different actors involved;
- Speak and write fluent English, as well as Spanish or French (for carrying out fieldwork). Speaking Dutch is also beneficial;
- Include team members with intricate knowledge of and are preferably based in the countries where fieldwork is foreseen.

6.3. Selection process

This Terms of Reference will be sent to evaluators within the network of the organisers. Interested evaluators are requested to send a short letter of interest (maximum 3 pages - in English) setting out their main suggestions for the methodology, as well as feedback on this ToR (if any), complemented with the following:

- CV or portfolio clearly presenting experience in conducting evaluations
- One previous evaluation report
- References to two or three previous clients
- Indication of code of ethics the evaluator ascribes to

Based on the proposals received, the Internal Reference Group will organise a Skype call or live presentation with the one to three best proposals, where the evaluator(s) present their proposal. This presentation needs to be explicit about the evaluation methodology as well as costs. After the Skype call(s) the evaluator(s) will be selected. Selection criteria will be a combination of the considerations mentioned above.

7. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

An **internal reference group** has been formed, consisting of one member of the FGG Alliance's Steering Committee (SC), one member of FGG's Programme Committee (PC), one so-called anchor (responsible for PME tasks per FGG member), one member of the FGG Alliance's Advisory Group (AG), and one content colleague. These are respectively Donald Pols (SC member on behalf of Milieudefensie), Nathalie van Haren (PC member on behalf of Both ENDS), Caroline Janssens (anchor on behalf of Clean Clothes Campaign), Ruchi Tripathi (AG member on behalf of ActionAid) and Katie Sandwell (programme officer at TNI). The responsibilities of the internal reference group for this evaluation include:

- Finalisation of ToR for dissemination
- Selection of external evaluator(s)
- Together with external evaluator, task force and organisations involved, finalise ToR and evaluation plan.
- Monitor the evaluation process through regular contact, planned meetings at crucial moments.
- Report on progress to SC.

Lieke Ruijschoot, member of the **coordination team** of the FGG Alliance, will be the main contact person for the evaluation. Her tasks for this evaluation include:

- Selection of external evaluator(s), together with the internal reference group.
- Liaison between the external evaluator(s) and other people involved: provide information and answer questions.
- Together with external evaluator, and internal reference group, finalise ToR and evaluation plan.
- Support the evaluator in making appointments for meetings and interviews.
- (Ensure that FGG colleagues) provide all the necessary data and information to the external evaluator in a timely, ordered and readable manner.
- Monitor the evaluation process.

An **external reference group** has been formed, consisting of Alexander Otgaar, Rita Dieleman and Willem Elbers. This external reference group is responsible for:

- Reviewing the Terms of Reference for the MTE;
- Possibly giving inputs on first selection of Evaluators;
- Reflecting on the methodology of the MTE, which the evaluator will develop in close consultation with the FGG Alliance, in the inception phase of the evaluation;
- Reviewing the draft final report of the MTE (with a focus on the methodology, consistency, and separation of observations by interviewees/evaluators and recommendations) and providing recommendations on follow-up to the MTE within the FGG Alliance;
- [Possibly reflecting upon the management letter that will be written by the FGG Alliance in response to the final report.]

The **external evaluator** will:

- Provide inputs on methodologies and approach.
- Together with the FGG coordination team and internal reference group, finalise ToR and evaluation plan.
- Conduct the evaluation activities.
- Analyse the collected data and information (together with FGG members and partners).
- Facilitate reflection meeting on the findings.
- Write the draft and final report (in English) and present it to the organisers. Again: lessons learnt and recommendations are expected to be identified together with FGG members and

partners as a result of reflections within the evaluation process, and not by the evaluator on his/her own account.

- Monitor the evaluation process and timely flag problems in terms of process or scope.

8. PRODUCTS, USERS AND FOLLOW-UP

Major products of the evaluation will be some of the evaluation activities themselves, that are expected to spark important conversations within the organisations involved on the relevance, effectiveness and cooperation we engage in within the FGG programme. The final product of the evaluation will be one overall synthesis report (of max. 40 pages, preferably less, in English) and sub-reports for the three sub-evaluations. The evaluation of the collaboration is expected to be part of the synthesis report. See Annex I for a suggested Table of Contents for the overall synthesis report, including an indication for number of pages per section. We invite consultants to propose additional evaluation products that in an accessible manner present the main evaluation findings. In principle, the process and outcomes of the evaluation will be used for internal learning of the FGG Alliance and its partner organisations. Only with consent of people involved, and in case results that are also of interest for external actors can be shared safely, this may be considered, and most likely by only sharing specific results of the evaluation and not the evaluation report in whole.

9. PLANNING

No.	When	What	Who ⁵
1.	December 2017	ToR finalised and final version disseminated	CT
2.	January 22, 2018	Deadline proposals	ET
3.	January 25, 2018	Best proposals selected using scoring format and invited for Skype/live presentation	IRG
4.	January 29-31, 2018	Skype calls, evaluators selected	IRG, ET
5.	February – March 2018	Phase 1: inception phase (finalising evaluation plan)	ET
6.	April – May 2018	Phase 2: desk study & first data collection, preparations for reflections/exchanges	ET
7.	May – June 2018	Phase 3: fieldwork	ET
8.	June 2018	Phase 4: reflection activities & exchanges	ET
9.	July 2018	Phase 5: submission first draft report	ET
10.	July 2018	Internal discussion on preliminary outcomes	IRG
11.	August 2018	Feedback on draft report	IRG
12.	August 2018	Phase 6: triangulation	ET
13.	August 2018	Submission second draft report	ET
14.	September 2018	Presentation of second draft report	ET
15.	September 2018	Feedback on second draft report by IRG and ERG	IRG, ERG
16.	October 2018	Final report	ET
17.	October 2018	Formulation of management response to final report	SC

Exact planning and deadlines are to be determined during the inception phase of the evaluation. Throughout the evaluation process, regular stocktaking meetings will be held between the evaluator and the internal reference group.

10. FINANCES

An indication of the budget for this evaluation is as follows:

Responsibility	Budget indication	Estimated number of work days
Overall lead	€10.000	15

⁵CT = Coordination team; ET = Evaluation team; IRG = Internal reference group; ERG = External reference group; SC = Steering committee

Sub-evaluation 1 - enabling environment (incl. fieldwork)	€30.000	30
Sub-evaluation 2 - lobby and advocacy effectiveness (incl. fieldwork)	€30.000	30
Sub-evaluation 3 - collaboration	€10.000	15
Total	€ 80.000	90

The above budget indications include honorarium for the evaluators, travel, accommodation, and translation (and some material) costs. The amounts also include taxes, in case applicable. Evaluators will be asked to present a detailed budget if invited for a Skype call, indicating the number of days per activity proposed, honorarium, and direct costs. Payment arrangements are to be agreed upon the signing of contract.

11. CONTACT DETAILS

For questions, or to submit your proposal, please contact: Lieke Ruijmschoot and Elyne Doornbos, members of the coordination team of the FGG Alliance:

- Email: l.ruijmschoot@bothends.org, e.doornbos@bothends.org
- Phone: +31 (0)20 5306600
- Skype: lieke.ruijmschoot

12. PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS – FINAL OVERALL REPORT MTE OF THE FGG ALLIANCE

- 1) Summary & main lessons learnt (3p)
- 2) Introduction (1p)
- 3) Background and reasons for the MTE (1p)
- 4) Methodological reflections, including attention for limitations of the study (2-3p)
- 5) Outcomes of the evaluation process (including from sub-evaluations), at least answering the evaluation questions (10-20p)
- 6) Conclusions and recommendations (3-6p)
- 7) Annexes, e.g. ToR, list of resources, list of interviews, sub-evaluation reports.

Annex I. The FGG Alliance's Theory of Change

(Document with full explanation from FGG Alliance's original programme proposal can be obtained during inception phase).

