

Terms of Reference for Mid Term Evaluation of the Fair, Green and Global programme Final version, 13 March 2014

1. Background

The Fair, Green and Global Alliance consists of six organisations that have been implementing the FGG programme since 2011, to achieve fundamental shifts in policy and practices that are based on new, more socially just and environmentally sustainable approaches. The current economic crisis, the energy crisis, the pressure for land and resources, and their adverse effects on the healthy development of countries, all underline the urgent need for such fundamental shifts. The FGG Alliance strategically supports people and organisations in the Global South as well as in the Global North who challenge the structural problems that are causing these crises. At the same time, the deepening of the crises illustrates that decision makers in many cases lack better, innovative ideas for the future. This is why the FGG Alliance also puts specific focus on identifying, experimenting with and promoting alternative models.

ActionAid Netherlands, Both ENDS, the Clean Clothes Campaign, Milieudefensie (Friends of the Earth Netherlands), SOMO and Transnational Institute cooperate to work towards four strategic objectives: developing and promoting exemplary policies and practices (1), effective corporate accountability (2), reoriented trade and investment policies (3) and improved financial policies (4). Per objective, between four and six of the FGG member organisations implement projects, together or individually, to work towards these goals. The FGG Alliance is one of twenty alliances funded within the MFS II subsidy scheme of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It is the only alliance that has a global programme and focuses on policy influencing. Therefore, main activities include lobby & advocacy, policy analysis, research & publications, and campaigning. All of this is done in close cooperation with the Alliance's Southern partners. The FGG Alliance sees such processes of social and economic change as complex processes subject to many competing forces and also broader contributions to similar ends by organisations outside of the alliance.

The FGG Alliance would like to learn from its experience to date, both to be able to improve its programme in the final years of the current programme, and to take decisions on the future of the programme after its ending in 2015. This Terms of Reference serves to present the aims and parameters for an external Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) of the FGG Alliance.

2. Reasons for the evaluation

This evaluation will be commissioned in addition to the MFS II joint evaluation (SGE). Reasons to do an extra, own evaluation are:

- To **learn** about what works in our approach and what does not work; in order to be able to adapt and improve (current and future) programmes. This will concern both the **process** (ie. internal cooperation between alliance members) and **content/strategy** of the FGG programme.
- To **showcase** our approach and work; to create an evidence based narrative for the network and our work. To establish and describe the 'FGG way of working', i.e. the 'agile' methodology of reacting flexibly to immediate changes in context while keeping eye on end goals.

- To **complement** the joint MFS II evaluation (SGE) in these aspects, which focuses on only a part of the FGG programme (the work on strategic objective 3, just one of the FGG Alliance’s four objectives), and for which the final measurement and report are expected in 2014 and 2015.¹
- To contribute to the knowledge base about the evaluation of lobby & advocacy programmes; **experiment**.

3. Guiding principles and parameters

The Alliance has defined several important guiding principles (some based on our values) and parameters which should be respected during the evaluation process.

- a. The evaluation should be **utilization-focused**: i.e. the MTE process itself should serve to learn from, for example by actively involving FGG staff in data collection, interviews, analysis etc. Similarly, the MTE can take inspiration from ‘responsive evaluation’ which entails ‘engagement with and among all stakeholders about the value and meaning of their practice.’
- b. The MTE should **complement the ILA** (joint evaluation on International Lobby & Advocacy) in terms of focus and content. This also means care should be taken not to do double work or burden the same people within the alliance with requests for data etc.
- c. The FGG Alliance recognises that several of the main questions posed cannot be answered in a purely objective manner; there will be room for subjectivity. Also, 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.
- d. **Methodologies** used should serve the purposes of the evaluation and **fit** the focus of the evaluation. These methodologies should prioritise qualitative data gathering, be appropriate to the (network) nature of the alliance, and go beyond planned and expected results. As experience in evaluating lobby & advocacy programmes is limited, the use of innovative methods is welcomed and encouraged.

4. Focus of the evaluation

This evaluation concerns a *mid-term* evaluation. The focus of the evaluation will be on process, relevance, effectiveness, and approach.

In terms of **process**, the aim is to assess the process of cooperation within the alliance, to learn about what works well, and what could be better.

In terms of **relevance**, the aim is to establish the extent to which the FGG programme contributes to the achievement/realization of the priorities and policies of the Alliance’s target groups².

¹ The FGG Alliance is being evaluated only in one of the ten studies of the Joint Evaluation; the ‘International Lobby and Advocacy’ (ILA) part (the other nine studies focus on 8 countries, and one synthesis study; FGG is not involved in these as it does not have any country programmes but concerns a global programme focusing on international lobby and advocacy). Evaluation questions being addressed in the ILA study are 1) *What are the changes achieved in the priority result areas during the funding period?* 2) *Did the ILA efforts of the MFS II Alliances contribute to the identified changes (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?* 3) *What is the relevance of these changes?* 4) *Were the efforts of the MFS II alliances efficient?* 5) *What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?* The scope of the evaluation for the FGG Alliance is on strategic objective 3 (trade and investments) of the FGG programme. More information can be obtained if necessary.

² See next page for explanation of these target groups.

In terms of **effectiveness**, the aim is to establish the extent to which the FGG programme attains its objectives.

In terms of **approach**, the aim is to establish what defines the FGG alliance's way of working, and what the benefits and downsides of this approach are, given the alliance's objectives.

The exact scope of the evaluation will be defined together with the evaluator. For process and approach, the entire Alliance, programme and the period from its formulation (mid 2009) to date (December 2013) should be within the scope of the evaluation. For relevance and effectiveness, both data concerning the entire programme and timeframe can be collected, as well as more detailed information on a specific selection or case(s) within the programme as illustration.

5. Subject of the evaluation

In line with the focus of the evaluation, the main questions will be the following. For each main question, sub-questions are suggested below, categorised into descriptive and normative questions.³ These questions will be finalised together with the evaluator.⁴ For the descriptive questions, a team within the FGG Alliance will prepare and provide the relevant data and information. The final questions resulting in recommendations should be answered by alliance representatives based on analysis of the preceding questions.

Main questions:

1. What can be learned from the way the alliance members cooperate within the FGG alliance?
2. To what extent is the FGG programme relevant to the priorities and policies of its target groups?⁵
3. To what extent did the FGG Alliance attains its objectives, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended (i.e. what was the effectiveness of the FGG programme)?
4. What are the characteristics of the FGG Alliance's way of working (approach, strategy), and what are the benefits and downsides of this approach?

Ad. 1. Sub-questions for process:

- a. How has the FGG Alliance organised the cooperation among the alliance members (descriptive)?
- b. What works well in terms of cooperation within the alliance (normative)?
- c. What could be better in terms of cooperation within the alliance (normative)?
- d. What could the alliance members learn from this experience in case of future cooperation?

Ad. 2. Sub-questions for relevance, to be assessed by the alliance's target groups:

- a. To what extent were the objectives of the FGG programme as formulated at the time of the proposal valid in the eyes of the target groups (normative)?
- b. To what extent are the objectives of the FGG programme still valid in the eyes of the target groups (normative)?

³ NB. No cause-effect questions are expected to be answered in this evaluation.

⁴ Including agreeing on where the focus of the evaluation will lie, as it is recognized that the suggested scope is broad and choices will have to be made.

⁵ See the sub-questions for clarification of what is meant with target groups.

- c. Are the activities, outputs and outcomes of the FGG programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of the FGG programme objectives, in the eyes of the target groups (normative)?
- d. How could the alliance (continue to) be relevant in case of future programmes?

Two main target groups⁶ are defined for whom the FGG programme aims to be relevant. First, as defined in the original proposal, these are ‘communities of poor people and the Southern CSOs that work with them in bringing about the changes necessary to enable people to access basic services, decent work and sustainable livelihoods’.⁷ For this, it is proposed to focus on the FGG alliance’s partner organisations, both the six alliance members and their counterparts that were supported through the programme, and where possible, collect information on their ‘beneficiaries’⁸. A second relevant target group is formed by decision makers in public and private sector, whom the alliance aims to both influence and provide information and contacts. Finally, the FGG Alliance’s funder, the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is an important stakeholder.

Ad. 3. Sub-questions for effectiveness:

- a. To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved (descriptive)?
- b. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives (descriptive)?
- c. What were dynamics in the definition of objectives and priorities, and to what extent have these dynamics influenced the effectiveness of the programme (descriptive)?
- d. How can the alliance improve its effectiveness in case of future programmes?

Ad. 4. Sub-questions for approach:

- a. What are characteristics of the FGG Alliance’s way of working (its approach or strategy) (descriptive)? How could this approach be defined (descriptive)?
- b. What are benefits of this approach (normative)?
- c. What are downsides of this approach (normative)?
- d. How did the methods used for planning, monitoring and evaluation fit the practice of programmes geared towards policy change (descriptive)?
- e. What should the alliance (dis)continue in terms of its approach in case of future programmes?

6. Methodology, data gathering and sources

The exact methodology(ies) for the evaluation will be defined together with the external evaluator. The Alliance welcomes proposals for methodologies that are based on and respect the guiding principles and parameters mentioned under (3).⁹

Data collection could start with internal reports and FGG staff as informants, and from there move to other stakeholders such as partners, decision makers, Ministry representatives, journalists etc. to

⁶ It is recognized that target group may not be the most appropriate term here, but for reasons of consistency this term was taken over from the Alliance’s original proposal.

⁷ From the original proposal, phase II, Section 5 Objective and strategy, page 16.

⁸ Beneficiaries of the counterparts are the communities and people for and with whom they aim to achieve (policy) changes.

⁹ Examples of inspirational methodologies, frameworks and methods are outcome mapping, most significant change, appreciative inquiry, theory of change, Social Return on Investment, Gross National Happiness, Creating Shared Value, and the Social Progress Indicators.

triangulate observations. Additional data collection is however not the main objective of this evaluation; the process itself should in the first place provide the alliance the opportunity to reflect and strategise. The evaluation process should include a meeting in which the analysis of the data gathered by the evaluator is discussed with a relevant group of FGG staff, in which recommendations are formulated.

Primary sources will be:

- Internal documents of the FGG Alliance: progress reports and minutes of meetings.
- External documents of the FGG Alliance: reports of events and publications.
- Interviews or participation in meetings/workshops/discussions by staff of FGG member organisations.

Secondary sources will be:

- Interviews or participation in meetings/workshops/discussions by external stakeholders of the FGG Alliance (partner organisations, targeted decision makers, donor, journalists, NGO colleagues, etc.)

7. Evaluators

The FGG Alliance welcomes proposals from evaluators who:

- Have proven experience in conducting similar evaluations (including process facilitation);
- 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.

The evaluator can be an individual or a team.

Selection process:

This Terms of Reference will be sent to evaluators with whom the FGG Alliance has worked previously but will also be disseminated publicly through various channels. Interested evaluators are requested to send a short letter of interest (maximum 3 pages) setting out their main suggestions for methodology, as well as major feedback on this ToR (if any), complemented with the following:

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

Based on the proposals received, the MTE task force will select three to four proposals and invite these evaluators to present their proposal during a meeting, after which the evaluator will be selected. Selection criteria will be a combination of the considerations mentioned above. The presentation needs to be explicit about the evaluation methodology as well as costs.

8. Roles and responsibilities

Lieke Ruijmschoot, PME advisor of the FGG Alliance, will be the main contact person within the alliance for the MTE. Her tasks will be:

- Liaison between the external evaluator and other people involved: provide information and answer questions.
- Form a small task force within the Alliance for guidance of the process.

- Invite two to three external experts to make up the advisory committee.
- Together with external evaluator, MTE task force and advisory committee, finalise ToR and evaluation plan.
- Provide all the necessary data and information to the external evaluator in a timely, ordered and readable manner.
- Support the evaluator in making appointments for meetings and interviews.

The external evaluator will:

- Provide inputs on methodologies and approach.
- Together with PME advisor, MTE task force and advisory committee, finalise ToR and evaluation plan.
- Conduct the evaluation activities.
- Analyse the collected data and information.
- Facilitate reflection on the findings.
- Write the draft and final report and present it to the FGG Alliance.

The MTE task force will:

- Consist of three to five FGG staff members (including the PME advisor).
- Provide guidance at relevant moments during the MTE: finalisation of the ToR and evaluation plan, selection of evaluators (shortlist and final), discuss any upcoming issues or questions, provide feedback to draft report.

The MTE task force has been formed and consists of Fiona Dove (director TNI), Ronald Gijsbertsen (director SOMO), Sandra Ball (manager international campaigns Milieudefensie), and back-up member: Liesbeth van Brink (Head Partnership Development and Programs ActionAid).

The MTE advisory committee will:

- Consist of two to three external experts on evaluation and/or policy change processes.
- Provide methodological advice on the ToR, if necessary on the final proposals by the evaluators, and on the draft evaluation report.

The MTE advisory committee has been formed and consists of María Eugenia Di Paola (FARN, Argentina), Michael Koen (CSRSC, South Africa), Floris Blankenberg (IOB), Robert Went (WRR).

9. 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 FGG Alliance on process, relevance, effectiveness and approach. The final product of the mid term evaluation will be a report (in English). See Annex I for a suggested Table of Content for this report, including an indication for number of pages per section.

10. Planning

Below follows a tentative planning. The exact activities during implementation of the evaluation depend on the final plan; the activities mentioned here are indicative. Deadlines (in bold print) however, are final. The Mid Term Evaluation report needs to be finished by late May so that it can be discussed at the FGG Annual Meeting on 5th June. After this, the final version can be written.

No.	When	What	Who
1.	6 March	Formation of Advisory Committee and of MTE Task Force (MTF)	LR
2.	10 March	SC, PC, MTF, AC give feedback on ToR	SC, PC, MTF, AC
3.	13 March	ToR finalised and disseminated	LR
4.	2 April	Deadline letters of interest	Ev
5.	3 April	Candidates shortlist selected and informed	MTF
6.	10 or 11 April	Shortlisted candidates present plan	LR & MTF
7.	16 April	Evaluator selected, contract signed	LR & MTF
8.	30 April	Phase I: Evaluation plan finalised	Ev & MTF
9.	May	Phase IIa: desk study	Ev & MTF
10.	May	Phase IIb: first data collection	Ev
11.	30 May	First analyses written for use in phase III and shared with MTF; check plan phase III	Ev
12.	5 June	Annual Meeting FGG; possibly sharing analysis	Ev & MTF
13.	June	Phase IIIa: triangulation of first data	Ev
14.	June	Phase IIIb: building on first data (eg meetings, workshops, interviews)	Ev
15.	30 June	First draft report MTE to MTF (possibly with live presentation of findings)	Ev
16.	11 July	Feedback MTF & AC on first draft	MTF
17.	23 July	Second draft report MTE	Ev
18.	8 August	Feedback from AC and others (e.g. SC, Advisory Group)	AC and others
19.	Late August	Final report MTE	Ev
20.	September	Debriefing	Ev & MTF

11. Finances

An indication of the budget for this evaluation is in total € 30.000, based on around 30 working days for the evaluator and some material and travel costs. Shortlisted evaluators will be asked to present a budget as part of their proposal on 10/11 March, indicating number of days per activity proposed, honorarium, and direct costs. Payment arrangements to be agreed upon signing of contract.

12. Contact details

Lieke Ruijmschoot, PME advisor FGG Alliance
l.ruijmschoot@bothends.org; 020 5306613

Annex I Proposed Table of Content final report Mid Term Evaluation FGG Alliance

1. Summary & main conclusions (2p)
2. Introduction (1/2p)
3. Background and reasons for evaluation (1/2p)
4. Methodology used (1p)
5. Limitations (1/2p)
6. Answering the evaluation questions (15p)
 - a. Process
 - b. Relevance
 - c. Effectiveness
 - d. Approach
7. Conclusions (2p)
8. Recommendations (2p)
9. Annexes
 - a. Terms of Reference
 - b. Sources
 - c. List of interviews
 - d. (If relevant) Summaries of evaluation activities such as meetings