

TRADE IN GLOBAL VALUE CHAINS INITIATIVE

ANNEX A

Terms of Reference for Evaluation Manager (Updated June 2015)

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Trade and Global Value Chains Initiative (TGVCI) is a £3 million programme that will take place over three years starting in 2013. This project aims to improve the lives and working conditions of those working in value chains. The pilot phase of the programme will focus on horticulture and garment sector value chains in Kenya, South Africa and Bangladesh.
- 1.2 The programme will be a demand led Initiative managed by a Project Management Unit (PMU). The key purpose of the Evaluation Management Unit (EMU) is to ensure robust and independent monitoring and evaluation is established and applied across the projects and delivery of the Initiative.
- 1.3 These ToRs should be read in conjunction with the ToRs for the TGVCI Fund Manager and the business case.

2. Purpose and Scope of Evaluation

- 2.1 The EMU will be required to conduct the following activities:
 - a. Evaluate the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the TGVCI;
 - b. Review and advise on the data to be collected for monitoring purposes;
 - c. Conduct the Annual Reviews and Project Completion Review for the project.
 - d. Undertake dissemination of evaluation findings.
- 2.2 The purpose of the evaluation is to answer the **two main evaluation questions** specified below:
 - a. **Does social upgrading lead to economic upgrading and if so in which sectors and under what conditions?** Answering this question will require assessing the effectiveness of specific projects funded, identifying key factors that contribute to or hinder success and highlighting lessons.
 - b. **Is the implementation model of a modified challenge fund an effective and efficient way to deliver social and economic upgrading outcomes?** This may require comparing the proposed model of a modified challenge fund compare with other models such as conventional challenge funds or a Making Markets Work for the Poor approach.
- 2.3 The evaluation should also make an assessment of sustainability over time and replicability of the programme interventions, addressing questions such as:
 - a. How sustainable are the individual interventions – were any of the benefits realised expected to continue over time in the absence of further DFID or other donor intervention?

- b. How effective was the programme at building coalitions and what role did they play in the interventions? What lessons were learned in how to successfully engage key supply chain actors such as government, local firms, civil society etc.?
 - c. Were firms or others participating in the programme convinced of the value of investing in social upgrading as a good business model and therefore willing to continue similar projects in future in the absence of donor intervention?
 - d. What was the demonstration effect in terms of changes in attitude and/or behaviour of other value chain actors that were not involved in the programme?
- 2.4 The evaluation will make recommendations for whether the programme should be scaled up/rolled out and how this scale up should happen. It should make recommendations on which sectors and countries should be the focus on the scale up. The recommendation on scaling up will be made in a mid-term rather than final evaluation report to allow for continuity in the case that a second phase of the programme is recommended.

3. Responsibilities for Monitoring and Evaluation Activities

- 3.1 The EMU is responsible for designing and updating a performance management framework to measure economy and efficiency of implementing the project. The framework will include indicators such as number of project applications received, projects implemented per year, etc. The framework should include value for money indicators for the PMU performance and the programme. There should also be indicators that assess how well the modified challenge fund model is being implemented such as how effectively the PMU is able to harness coalitions around projects at country level and the quality of advice and support provided by the PMU to projects.
- 3.2 The PMU will review and provide assistance on developing this monitoring and evaluation framework, to ensure that it includes indicators that are feasible to collect data on as part of regular programme monitoring.
- 3.3 Data collection and reporting: The data for monitoring, particularly on project outputs but also outcomes if appropriate, will be collected by grant applicants and recipients and provided to the PMU as one of the conditions of receiving the grant. The PMU will provide quarterly progress reports to DFID and the EMU based on these monitoring data.
- 3.4 Baseline data for evaluation: the PMU will collect baseline data for agreed programme outcome indicators in the Inception Phase. The EMU may request that the PMU collect additional baseline information from grant applicants or recipients for evaluation purposes. The EMU will be responsible for collecting all other evaluation related baseline data that is not reasonably within the PMU's regular monitoring responsibilities.
- 3.5 Subsequent data collection: if any data additional to the monitoring data collected by the PMU is required for evaluation purposes, the EMU will be responsible for planning and managing these data collections in subsequent years of project implementation.

This includes any qualitative data collections through interviews with PMU or grant recipients as well as quantitative data through surveys.

- 3.6 At project level, the PMU will design a monitoring and evaluation framework for each project in consultation with the relevant grant recipients. The level of detail of these individual project frameworks will be proportional to the size of the grant. The EMU will provide advice on the design of these monitoring frameworks.
- 3.7 The EMU is expected to periodically review the monitoring data that is being gathered by the PMU to ensure that it is robust, accurate and suitable for answering the evaluation questions. The EMU will make prompt recommendations to improve the quality of the data collected by the PMU if needed. The EMU should ensure that all data collected or used for monitoring and evaluation is easy to disaggregate by gender and also different segments of the population such as by income level, rural v urban where relevant and possible. The EMU will propose and carry out complementary data collection measures where necessary.
- 3.8 Annual reviews and project completion reviews: The EMU will be responsible for conducting the annual reviews of the project in each year and a project completion review in the final year. These reviews will be based on the monitoring data and cover outputs of the programme and whether the programme is on track to achieve expected outcomes. The reviews also make recommendations for changes to the programme design in future years of implementation. The logframe for the programme will be updated at each annual review. The reviews will need to be completed in close collaboration and consultation with DFID staff and the PMU.
- 3.9 It is expected that the EMU will design the monitoring and evaluation framework in a way that not only monitors performance but also collects information that will ultimately be useful in answering the evaluation questions, as part of an efficient monitoring and evaluation strategy.
- 3.10 Dissemination of findings: The EMU will undertake a number of activities to ensure the evaluation findings of the programme are disseminated. This will include publishing articles, working papers, organising workshops/seminars and ensuring electronic distribution of TGVCI findings.

4. Methodology and Data Sources

- 4.1 The Evaluation Manager will be responsible for development and implementation of the evaluation methodologies for the mid-term and final evaluations. The proposed approach should start with refinement of the theory of change and the logical framework (logframe) within the Business Case and an analysis of where the detailed evidence gaps are. In identifying evidence gaps, the Evaluation Manager should review of current evidence on CtG. Based on this analysis, the Evaluation Manager may propose to DFID refinements of the evaluation questions found in the ToR. The Evaluation Manager will be expected to clearly identify the potential risks and challenges for the evaluation.

- 4.2 The methodology chosen for the evaluation will be rigorous enough to allow for clear identification of outcomes and impact and also provide some indication of the extent to which these outcomes (and impact if feasible) are attributable to the programme.
- 4.3 The EMU is encouraged to make use of quasi-experimental methods along with case study analysis or mixed methods. Where case studies are used, the evaluation must ensure the internal validity of conclusions drawn from each case study. As important, given that learning and replicability are major purposes of this work, the methodology must include a rigorous and credible approach to evaluating the external validity of the conclusions and the major contextual factors affecting external validity.
- 4.4 The methodology should show how the combination of qualitative and quantitative techniques will lead to a robust and credible set of conclusions and recommendations around the two main evaluation questions.
- 4.5 One of the main data sources for the EMU will be progress reports from the monitoring activities of the PMU (see below in Section 6 for more information on this). In addition to this monitoring data, if further primary data is required to answer the evaluation questions, it is expected that the EMU will design and conduct surveys to gather this.
- 4.6 The EMU may consider collecting qualitative as well as quantitative data to answer the evaluation questions e.g. by conducting interviews with the PMU, grant recipients or expected beneficiaries.
- 4.7 The EMU is expected to thoroughly scope out secondary data sources that could be used for the evaluation. These may include national or industry statistics in each of the three pilot countries and in some cases there may be data from other projects in the same sector (e.g. Responsible and Accountable Garments Sector programme in Bangladesh).

5. Expected Outputs

- 5.1 There are four main outputs expected for the EMU's monitoring activities:
 - a. Monitoring framework with finalised logframe, theory of change and results chain
 - b. Annual Review for Year 1
 - c. Annual Review for Year 2
 - d. Project Completion Review in Year 3
- 5.2 There are three main outputs expected for the EMU's evaluation activities:
 - a. Evaluation Inception report with evaluation plan
 - b. Mid-Term Evaluation Report in 2015
 - c. Final Evaluation Report in 2017
- 5.3 Ad-hoc reviews: the EMU may be asked to undertake up to a maximum of 4 reviews over the programme lifetime. These will be on discrete topics that DFID may consider necessary to explore further during implementation e.g. a review of the PMU's

systems for reviewing applications/providing funding/collecting data, whether the technical assistance channels are working as expected, etc. These ad-hoc reviews are not expected to be large deliverables. The timing and payments associated with them will be agreed at the time that DFID decides a review is needed.

6. Reporting Arrangements and Payment Milestones

6.1 The EMU will report to the DFID team responsible for the programme. DFID will ensure that sufficient human resources (technical and administrative) are allocated to engaging with and overseeing the Evaluation Manager. This is likely to include time from one trade policy adviser or economist and one programme officer.

6.2 The proposed milestones are detailed in the table below:

Milestone	Deliverable	Expected delivery date	
Approval of Monitoring Framework for Programme	1. Workshop with PMU and other parties as relevant to divide responsibilities and agree monitoring and evaluation framework. 2. Monitoring framework with a finalised theory of change, logical framework and results chain and quantifiable performance indicators to be used.	September 2013	
Approval of Evaluation Plan	Evaluation Inception report - this report will set out the evaluation design and a detailed evaluation matrix showing how the proposed evaluation design will be implemented, planned data sources and data collection.	October 2013	
Completion of baseline data collection and progress review meeting with DFID	The EMU will quality assure the baseline data collected by PMU, complete collection of any additional evaluation baseline data and update the monitoring logframe where applicable. The EMU will provide a note of the progress review meeting.	December 2013	
Progress review meeting with DFID	The EMU will provide DFID an update on implementation of monitoring and evaluation plans and suggest any revisions to the plans based on early implementation experience. The EMU will provide a note of the progress review meeting.	March 2014	
Approval of Annual Review 1	The first annual review and reporting on outputs and outcomes of projects implemented in Year 1. The EMU will update the logframe.	July 2014	
Progress review meeting with DFID	The EMU will provide DFID with an update on implementation of M&E plans and on implementation of any recommendations or changes from Annual Review 1.	January 2015	
Approval of Annual Review 2	The second annual review and reporting on the outputs and outcomes of projects implemented in Years 1 and 2. The EMU will update the logframe.	July 2015	
Approval of Terms of Reference and outline of Mid-Term Evaluation Report	The EMU will submit terms of reference and outline of the mid-term evaluation report to DFID and the PMU, setting out the structure and proposed content of the report.	July 2015	
Approval of M&E framework for Round 2 projects	The EMU will provide an updated M&E programme framework including the new Round 2 projects	July 2015	

Approval of Mid-Term Evaluation Report	This mid-term evaluation report will assess interim findings on the evaluation questions specified in Section 2. The mid-term report will recommend whether the project should be scaled up or continued beyond 2016 and the way in which to implement scale up.	October 2015	
Mini-workshop/seminar with PMU and country consortia on mid-term evaluation findings	The EMU will organise dissemination of the mid-term findings in the UK and the programme countries as appropriate.	November 2015	
Approval of baseline report for Round 2 case studies	The EMU will provide a baseline report on the Round 2 case studies.	Dec. 2015	
Approval of Project Completion Review	The Project Completion Report will summarise outputs and outcomes over 3 years based on monitoring data. The EMU will update and finalise the logframe.	July 2016	
Progress review meeting with DFID	The EMU will provide an update on progress towards the final evaluation report. The EMU will provide a note of the meeting.	March 2017	
Approval of Terms of Reference and outline of Final Evaluation Report	The EMU will submit terms of reference and outline of the mid-term evaluation report to DFID and the PMU, setting out the structure and proposed content of the report.	June 2017	
First Draft of Final Evaluation Report and approval of communications plan	The EMU will submit a first draft of the final programme evaluation report and a plan for dissemination of findings.	October 2017	
Approval of Final Evaluation Report (including new Round 2 case studies)	Final evaluation report	November 2017	
Seminars, workshops or other communications activity for the Final evaluation	The EMU will organise dissemination of the findings in the UK and the programme countries.	December 2017	

6.3 Reporting process for the Annual Reviews and Project Completion Review: the EMU will submit a first draft to DFID and the PMU for comment at minimum three weeks and a final draft at minimum one week in advance of the milestone due date. The EMU will be expected to be available for discussions or meetings on early drafts of these reviews in the two weeks prior to the milestone due date.

6.4 Reporting process for the Mid-term evaluation report: the EMU will submit terms of reference with proposed structure and content of the report to DFID and PMU for comment three months (12 weeks) in advance of the milestone due date. An early draft of the report will be submitted to DFID and PMU for comment at minimum three weeks in advance of the milestone due date. A near-final draft will be submitted to DFID and PMU at minimum three working days in advance of the milestone due date. The EMU will be expected to be available for discussions and meetings about the draft report in the four weeks prior to the milestone due date. The EMU in consultation with DFID will make arrangements for a peer review or quality assurance process for a draft version of this report before it is finalised.

6.5 Reporting process for Final Evaluation report: the EMU will submit terms of reference with proposed structure and content of the report to DFID and PMU for comment three months (12 weeks) in advance of the milestone due date. An early draft of the report will be submitted to DFID and PMU for comment at minimum three weeks in advance

of the milestone due date. A near-final draft will be submitted to DFID and PMU at minimum three working days in advance of the milestone due date. The EMU will be expected to be available for discussions and meetings about the draft report in the four weeks prior to the milestone due date. The EMU in consultation with DFID will make arrangements for a peer review or quality assurance process for a draft version of this report before it is finalised.

7. Dissemination and Communication of findings to users

- 7.1 Users: While the primary recipient of the evaluation outputs will be DFID, it is expected that the findings will be useful to a range of stakeholders including but not limited to: transnational corporations that act as lead firms in global value chains, domestic private sector firms in developing countries, labour unions, civil society, governments and academia.
- 7.2 The evaluation reports will be published on the DFID website and on the evaluation provider's website.
- 7.3 The EMU is encouraged to consider publication of the final report in a peer-reviewed academic journal. Submission to an academic journal would be expected to happen within 6 months of completion of the final evaluation.
- 7.4 Apart from publication of the reports, the EMU will be expected to pro-actively arrange for dissemination of findings through activities such as workshops or seminars with the private sector, donors and academics and other stakeholders in the UK and in the three programme countries (Kenya, Bangladesh and South Africa).