



## Strategic Partnership for Garment Supply Chain Transformation

### Terms of Reference

Mid Term Evaluation

31 January 2018

#### 1. Introduction

Since 2016, Fair Wear Foundation (FWF) is the lead partner in the five-year 'Strategic Partnership' (SP) for Supply Chain Transformation; a partnership together with Dutch trade unions CNV Internationaal and Mondiaal FNV, as well as the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It is part of the 'Dialogue and Dissent' 2016-2020 framework of the Ministry and aims to improve corporate and government policies regarding human rights compliance in apparel supply chains in eight countries: Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Vietnam, and Pakistan.

The Partnership has now reached its half-way mark and requires a Mid Term Evaluation to take place that will assess the achievements thus far, and the contribution that the Partnership has made to reaching those achievements. For this purpose, the Partnership is looking for engaging consultant(s) to implement the evaluation as per following Terms of Reference.

#### **'Dialogue & Dissent' policy framework**

The policy framework 'Dialogue and Dissent' focuses on strengthening CSOs capacity for 'lobbying and advocacy' to enable CSOs to effectively voice alternative or dissenting views in a dynamic and increasingly global context. When strengthened, it is the belief that CSOs will be enabled to fulfil the role of advocates and lobbyists to contribute to sustainable, inclusive development for all and fight against poverty and injustice. This has been the reason for the Minister to enter into strategic partnerships with CSOs to stimulate complementary action to effectively advocate change and influence policy.

#### 2. Programme background

Combining the expertise of trade unions, NGOs, and progressive brands and factories, the Partnership aims to demonstrate how movement towards living wages, gender equality, and healthy labour relations and social dialogue is possible. With a focus on practical innovations in real supply chains, the Partnership provides models to brands, factories, governments and the labour movement of how a

more equitable apparel industry could work - and could benefit all parties. Through this programme, the Partnership sets out to strengthen the evidence-based approach that is used to influence decision-makers around the world and build the capacity of local partners, particularly for lobby and advocacy and with the aim to improve policy and practice in the garment supply chain.

### Goal & outcomes

The Partnership's high-level goal is therefore: Improved labour conditions in South and Southeast Asian and East African readymade garment (RMG) supply chains, particularly with respect to Living Wage, Reduction of Gender Based Violence and Increased Civic Space for Freedom of Association & Collective Bargaining, while ensuring a healthy and viable RMG industry. A precondition for this to happen is that the social partners are able to operate in an enabling environment (i.e. social dialogue, the right to collective bargaining, labour inspection, and grievance mechanisms) that allows these actors to cooperate, learn and improve.

The SP outcomes are:

- Outcome 1: Human rights are effectively enforced and aligned with international norms by governments, ILO and UN
- Outcome 2: Civil Society Organizations (trade unions and NGOs) have become more effective actors and have strengthened their role in Human Rights Protection and Remedy actions in the RMG sector.
- Outcome 3: Actions of companies (brands and factories) in the RMG sector actively and effectively support and implement Human Rights at the company level.

Three specific, critical and interrelated themes have been identified, which are especially important in the apparel industry that are covered by these three outcomes. The topics align with both the FWF Code of Labour Practices and key international labour standards:

- Payment of living wages
- Social dialogue as standard industry behaviour
- Elimination of gender-based violence and discrimination at work

Government, business and civil society all have key roles to play in making improvements in the three thematic areas, therefore each theme is addressed under each of the three outcomes, and their respective programmatic activities.

### Description of activities

To achieve the mentioned outcomes, there are different activities and tools implemented depending on the audience and thematic focus. Detailed activities have been developed by target group and by topic in dedicated Theories of Action (ToA) based on a priority mapping per country. A ToA is a method the Partners have used to plan the work around the outcomes and impact they wish to achieve. The ToA maps out in a logical order what the Partners think needs to happen in order to reach long term, sustainable change in the garment supply chain.

The following are the most important building blocks in that strategy for action:

- Conception, organization or active participation of FWF, CNV and FNV in conferences, workshops, platform or multi-stakeholder meetings and other relevant gatherings
- Development and execution of advocacy campaigns
- Development of position papers and fact sheets containing evidence and best practices as supporting documents for advocacy activities based on evaluations of FWF member brand activities

- Development of specific information, briefing and training material for partner organizations aiming at a more strategic and harmonized messaging with regard to the objectives of the programme

In addition, through pilot projects, the Strategic Partnership aims to develop pragmatic, replicable and sustainable solutions through a multi-stakeholder approach. The focus will often be on reengineering business processes in a way that reduces human rights violations, increases awareness of the need for social dialogue or develops the capacity of partner organizations to advocate for those changes. The Partnership is using pilot projects as a general term that covers a variety of evidence-generating activities. In turn, this evidence will be used to conduct successful evidence-based advocacy at the international and European level and in production countries.

The pilot projects may cover one or more of the following types of activities:

- Exploratory research, including trying to document a problem that isn't well understood
- Proof of concept, to see if a particular intervention works
- Scaling and replicability assessment: a test of how to start scaling up an existing intervention

#### Partner roles

Broadly speaking, the partners' roles are organized as follows: FWF's role in capacity development is focused primarily on the creation and documentation of evidence that can be used to support lobby and advocacy activities across the supply chain. The evidence is designed to affect the behaviours of European clothing brands, factories in garment-producing countries, and governments at both levels. FWF coordinates the majority of pilot projects and invests in capacity development of FWF member brands to become advocates for responsible supply chain management. Simultaneously, FNV and CNV focus primarily on developing the capacity of local trade unions and NGOs in the use of evidence-based lobby and advocacy strategies within their specific environments. The Foreign Ministry's role is to focus on providing access, fostering dialogue, and engaging with governments and integrating lessons via lobby and advocacy activities into European and international organizations.

In August 2017, the FWF Strategic Partnership requested a quick scan of the progress of cooperation of the strategic partnership and the progress in achieving results and outcomes as reported by the partnership, since its start in January 2016. The report was produced by Frans van Gerwen by the end of September 2017 and will be made available to the evaluators.

### **3. Rationale and purpose of the evaluation**

In 2016-2017 a *baseline study* was conducted, which resulted in a baseline report incorporating reflections on the current behaviour of the three targeted actors (government, business and CSOs) in relation to the thematic areas of the programme and the capacity of key implementing organizations in the programme countries.

The baseline report formed the building block for the development of a *Results Framework* that incorporated a number of indicators, as per request from the funder. Since then the donor requested a shift in the number and content of certain indicators. The evaluators are expected to reflect on a selection of the indicators.

Accountability takes place through the provision of open data in accordance with the *IATI standards*, as in effect in 2016. Routine progress monitoring takes place on the basis of the agreed Theory of Change and the adhering, approved programme. Each Partnership is expected to present an independent mid-term evaluation in 2018 and upon finalization of the activities in 2020.

Within this programme context, the *mid-term evaluation* is intended to assess the relevance, effectiveness and added value of the programmatic activities so far. It looks at signs of potential outcomes of programme activities towards reaching the three outcomes of the Strategic Partnership and how the Partnership contributed to these achievements. The results of the evaluation will help inform the Alliance and its local counterparts of the programme performance and its relevance. In addition, the results will help the Partnership to reflect on the programme plans and make adjustments according to the lessons learned. Lastly, this evaluation, together with other Mid Term Evaluations of Dialogue and Dissent partnerships, will provide input for the Ministry's Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) overall evaluation, that will take place in 2019.

#### 4. Objective(s) & key questions of the evaluation

The mid-term evaluation will aim to determine intermediate outcomes concerning **to what extent the Strategic Partnership is contributing to achieving an enabling environment that allows social partners to cooperate, learn and improve.**

The main objectives of the evaluation are:

- to reflect on outcomes of the Strategic Partnership programme in relation to the Results Framework (RFW) at country level for all three thematic areas (see Annex 1 for a detailed overview of the RFW including the indicators)
- to reflect on outcomes of the Strategic Partnership programme at aggregated programme level
- to reflect on the relevance of the evidence-base of a selection of pilot studies and distil lessons learned for future pilot studies
- to assess the Trade Union and NGO partners Policy Influencing, Lobby and Advocacy capacity as first measured with the baseline study (confidentiality of reporting on data required)
- to generate lessons learned and recommendations for 2018-2020 programming and on possible innovations and adjustments to the Theory of Change

#### 5. Scope of the evaluation

Geographically, the programme roughly mirrors the structure of garment supply chains; some activities take place at a European or international level (reflecting the location of global garment brands), while others take place in garment-producing countries, where the factories are located. Across the supply chain, the programme covers three thematic levels and three stakeholder levels. We intend for this evaluation to assess where a selection of the Partnership's programmatic activities is making an active contribution on these levels in a selection of focus countries and, where relevant, in Europe. The focus countries for the mid-term are Indonesia (FWF-FNV-CNV activities), Bangladesh (FWF-FNV activities) and Vietnam (FWF-CNV activities). Other evaluation activities will require engagement with European and international actors relevant to the programme (e.g. European brands and global trade unions).

The study is expected to offer reflection on some of the unique ways that the Strategic Partnership enables changes to take place in the three core fields of interest of the Partnership - living wage, gender-based violence, and social dialogue - within these countries and overall for the RMG industry.

This evaluation focuses on:

- A. The effectiveness of the overall programme level and the results at country level for each theme
- B. The relevance of the programme's objectives and approach in the different country contexts and thematic areas
- C. The (perceived) changes in approaches of partners and stakeholders (e.g. in relation to tools used, skills adopted, thematic areas addressed)

Taking into account the different implementation phases, the available budget and the deadline of the Mid Term Evaluation, the evaluation will only cover a selection of production countries. In addition, it is expected that not all activities can be evaluated, and therefore it is expected that a purposeful sample of activities will be taken (to be determined in collaboration with the Evaluation Task Manager during the inception phase).

<b>Timeframe:</b>	This evaluation needs to cover programme activities from 2016 to date
<b>Geographical coverage:</b>	Eight programme countries and Europe (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Vietnam and Pakistan)
<b>Thematic areas:</b>	Living wage Gender Based Violence (GBV) Social Dialogue
<b>Stakeholders to be covered:</b>	Government CSOs (trade unions and NGOs) Companies (brands and factories)

## 6. Evaluation questions

The evaluation will need to answer the following evaluation questions. Where possible, the questions should provide answers relevant to each focus country as part of this study, and to each of the three thematic areas of the programme. These are to be further developed and defined in the inception phase of the evaluation in consultation with key stakeholders and the evaluator(s).

### Relevance:

1. To what extent do the needs continue to be relevant in the focus countries?
2. To what extent do the (type of) outputs and outcomes of the SP respond to the needs?
3. To what extent does the Theory of Change appear to represent a realistic hypothesis for transforming SPs outputs into intermediate and ultimate outcomes?

### Effectiveness:

1. Has the programme delivered the outputs identified in the RFW?
2. To what extent has SP contributed to the realisation of the intermediate outcomes identified in the RFW?
3. To what extent has SP contributed to the realisation of the ultimate outcomes in the Theory of Change?
4. To what extent are SP stakeholders involved in the programme in a manner that helps to ensure that its interventions continue to be as effective as possible?

### Changed approaches:

1. Has the intervention broadened existing evidence and action by addressing policy areas that would not otherwise be addressed?
2. Have stakeholders (CSOs and companies) adopted new tools or approaches as a consequence of being involved in programme activities?

Throughout the study, the evaluators are expected to reflect on the sustainability of the programme. Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. When evaluating the sustainability of the programme, it is useful to consider the following questions: 'What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme?'

## **7. Approach on evaluation methodology**

The evaluation methodology and design will be developed by the evaluator(s) in close collaboration with the Evaluation Task Manager and PMEL staff of the three alliance partners FWF, FNV and CNV during the inception phase of the evaluation (see tentative timeline). The evaluator(s) are requested to formulate a brief overview of the proposed methodology based on the evaluation questions and objective of the evaluation. On the basis of available documentation, the evaluator(s) are then requested to further elaborate on methodology, tools and timeline in an inception report. The evaluator(s)' gender sensitivity and awareness are supposed to be methodologically integrated in the process.

Some aspects can be provided as guideline that might be helpful in the development of the proposed methodology.

### Use of baseline data and report

During the inception phase of the evaluation it should become clear to what extent the evaluator(s) can and/or will base their methodological approach on the baseline methodology and results. The report, including methodological references, will be provided by the Evaluation Task Manager.

### Indicators & intermediate steps

The Partnership has developed a results framework that includes a number of indicators that need to be reflected in the proposed methodology of the evaluator(s). For 2017, each indicator has been allocated 'intermediate steps', of which results are collected on quarterly basis by country managers at FWF and partners. The evaluator(s) are requested to incorporate reflections on these indicators and intermediate steps to the best of their abilities, in order to build on existing monitoring data and allow for some degree of comparison, in relation to the baseline and quarterly reports, to take place.

### Intended and unintended results

Concerning the assessment of performance of lobby and advocacy activities, the Partnership is not only interested in the achievement of intended but also in capturing possible unintended (positive or negative) effects of the programme, an approach especially relevant when reflecting on Lobby & Advocacy approaches.

### Field work

The evaluator(s) are expected to conduct field work in a total of [number] production countries, with a strong preference to collaborate with local consultants experienced in the field of CSR and/or the RMG industry, plus work in Europe.

### Pilot projects

No dedicated MEL framework has been developed to monitor and evaluate the pilot projects. The Partners aim to have a guideline developed by end of March 2018. This mid-term should set out to benefit from case studies of pilot projects in a selection of focus countries to attest the MEL framework, to report on the outcomes so far in terms of evidence created and the underlying process, and to make recommendations for a robust MEL framework that can be replicated (in adjusted format) in other pilot project contexts. The focus will be on those pilot projects that have been ongoing for some time, allowing for a mid-term reflection to take place.

## 8. Guiding principles and values

The following principles will guide the evaluation: transparency, partnership, openness, cost-effectiveness, gender awareness and cultural sensitivity. The evaluators are expected to follow appropriate (local) research ethics and procedures. It is imperative for the evaluator(s) to:

- Guarantee the safety of respondents and the research team.
- Apply protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of respondents.
- Ensure confidentiality of data collected of partners and stakeholders
- Select and train the research team on ethical issues.
- Ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data.

## 9. Expected deliverables

The mid-term evaluation is expected to provide the following deliverables as part of its activities. The table below provides a description of the expectation for each deliverable, while Annex 2 provides more specific guidelines as to the content of each report.

	<b>Deliverables</b>	<b>Description of Expected Deliverables</b>	<b>Timeline of each deliverable (d/m/y)</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Mid-term evaluation inception report</b> (language of report: English)	<p>The inception report provides the grantee organization, the Alliance Partners and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.</p> <p>An inception report must be prepared by the evaluators <u>before</u> going into the technical mission and full data collection stage. It must detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection/analysis procedures.</p> <p>The inception report must include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product.</p>	6 April 2018
<b>2</b>	<b>Draft Mid-term evaluation report</b> (language of report: English)	<p>Evaluators must submit draft report for review and comments by all parties involved. The report needs to meet the minimum requirements specified in the TOR.</p> <p>The grantee and key stakeholders in the evaluation must review the draft report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.</p>	8 June 2018
<b>3</b>	<b>Presentation of findings/ validation</b>	The evaluator(s) are expected to provide a presentation of evaluation findings, respond to feedback and questions, and discuss the findings with the Partnership. The location of this presentation is still to be determined.	13 June 2018

<b>4</b>	<b>Final Mid-term evaluation report</b> (language of report: English)	Relevant comments from key stakeholders must be well integrated in the final version, and the final report must meet the minimum requirements specified in the TOR. The report should preferably not exceed a total of 50 pages.	21 June 2018
----------	--	--	--------------

## 10. Evaluation team: qualifications and skills needed

The Partnership would like to contract a team of evaluators that consists of, at least, a lead evaluator, who is end responsible, who collaborates with local consultants in-country.

The full team should together have experience and expertise in the following areas:

- Evaluation expertise of complex multi-partner, multi-country programmes
- Evaluation expertise in evaluating activities related to CSR and lobby and advocacy.
- Subject matter expertise, in terms of living wage, GBV and/or social dialogue in the RMG industry, as well as in terms of CSR approaches and dynamics.
- Affinity with social movements and demonstrated experience with trade unions and in assessing civil society
- Track record of evaluations in South/Southeast Asia and East Africa
- Experience with both qualitative as well as quantitative evaluation methods
- Capacity and flexibility to implement in-depth case studies in the countries selected.
- English and Dutch language skills.
- Knowledge of and demonstrated experience in meeting the IOB quality criteria for evaluations would be a distinct advantage

## 11. Timeline, budget, logistics and deliverables

### Timeline

31 January 2018	ToR published
23 February 2018	Deadline for receiving questions for clarification on ToR
28 February 2018	Deadline for receiving proposals
5-9 March 2018	Interviews & selection of winning proposal
12 March 2018	Contract signed with evaluation team
26 March 2018	First draft of inception report
6 April 2018	Deadline for final inception report
6 April – 31 May 2018	Field work (8 weeks)
8 June 2018	Deadline for draft evaluation report
13 June 2018	Presentation of findings (validation workshop)
21 June 2018	Deadline for final evaluation report

### Budget & payment method

The total costs for this mid-term evaluation will not exceed EUR 100,000. This amount includes fees for the full team, including taxes and including administrative costs, travel and accommodation during travelling, communication costs and social funds. The fees are calculated for the entire assignment, including planning, preparation, data collection, travel, interviews, report writing, report revision, editing and finalization of the assignment. Any required unplanned additional costs in the framework of this assignment are subject to prior approval in writing from Fair Wear Foundation.



## 12. Evaluation responsibilities and management arrangements

The evaluation will be conducted by an external evaluation team based on the contractual agreement and the Terms of Reference. Their performance will fall under the day-to-day supervision of the Evaluation Task Manager within the Partnership.

The Evaluation Task Manager is responsible for the management of the entire evaluation process and will be responsible for the recruitment of the external evaluations and lead the collection of the key documents and data to be shared with the evaluators at the beginning of the inception stage. S/he will also be responsible for coordination with the evaluation team and the Steering Committee of the Partnership; as well as providing administrative and technical support to the evaluation team.

The Steering Committee has been and will be involved at all stages of the Mid-Term Evaluation, including the approval of the Terms of Reference, contracting of the external evaluation team and assessment of the deliverables.

## 13. Request for proposals & selection procedure

The Strategic Partnership would like to invite interested lead evaluators to submit a proposal in the form of an outline of the work plan (suggested approach and methodology) of approximately 2000 words, covering the entire Terms of Reference. The proposal should also include the CVs of the team members, two references, a sample of the lead evaluator's work, and proposed budget. The Partnership can, if necessary, at a later stage suggest names of co-evaluators to complete the team.

Proposals must be sent by email no later than 28 February 2018 to:

Fair Wear Foundation - Evaluation Task Manager

Ms. Liana Hoornweg

[hoornweg@fairwear.org](mailto:hoornweg@fairwear.org)

### Selection criteria

An evaluation panel, consisting of the Evaluation Task Manager, PMEL officers and the Steering Committee, will review the proposals submitted. The panel will evaluate the tenders on the basis of the following selection criteria:

- Demonstrated understanding of the requirements of the assignment 20%
- Quality of suggested approach: the proposed methodology is appropriate, and the team understands the challenges and limitations that may be involved 30%
- Demonstrates value for money through clear, realistic budget breakdown 30%
- Track record of the consultant(s) and/or organization: strong local consultants as part of the Evaluation team 10%
- Experience and qualification of team members: the team members have relevant experience and expertise and are allocated to appropriate roles 10%

Evaluation of all submissions will only consider information presented within the proposal. Evaluation will be fair and transparent.

Two evaluation teams with the highest scoring proposals will be invited for an interview. Applicants will receive a response in the week of 5 March 2018.

For any further inquiries about the Terms of Reference or the assignment, please contact the MEL support officer, Daniëlle de Winter, [danielle@dbmresearch.com](mailto:danielle@dbmresearch.com) before 23<sup>rd</sup> of February.

## Annex 1: Results Framework (tentative)

End Goal 2020	Results indicators	Intermediate steps for 2017	
Inclusive Labour rights, laws and policies are respected, promoted and adequately practiced.	<b>Indicator 1:</b> # of new/updated/ improved labour policies and laws on SP issues are adequately practised upon	1.1	# of (inter) national policies on SP issues implemented in accordance with standards / requirements
		1.2	# of public/private sector institutions that implement (inter)national standards and policies to improve labour conditions
		1.3	# of mechanisms/processes put in place by the public/private sector institutions to ensure implementation of new/updated policies on SP issues
	<b>Indicator 2:</b> # of policies and laws on SP issues adopted/ blocked/ maintained that protect, respect or promote labour rights and improve labour conditions in the garments supply chain	2.1	# of improved or new policies on SP issues, claims and policy goals (changes in regional, national, subnational policies)
		2.2	# of policies / laws formally adopted / improved / blocked in favour of SP claim/issue
	Increased engagement of civil society, business and governments on SP advocacy issues, claims and policy goals	<b>Indicator 3:</b> # of (re)presentations in policy dialogue on SP issues, claims or policy goals	3.1
3.2			# of advocacy messages in political statements, policies, plans etc. using SP evidence base or addressing SP issues and claims
Increased capacity to influence (L&A) on SP issues, claims and policy goals	<b>Indicator 4:</b> # of advocacy initiatives carried out by partners and key stakeholders for, by or with their membership/constituency	4.1	# of coalitions/networks/platforms formed, joined
		4.2	# of times merged with other coalitions
		4.3	# of joint statements issued /collaborative advocacy efforts by partners and key stakeholders
	<b>Indicator 5:</b> # of partners (TUs/CSOs) with increased PILA capacities	5.1	# of FNV / CNV - PILA Capacity Assessments and Outcomes
	<b>Indicator 6:</b> # of 'partnering stakeholders' included by alliance (and collaborating/ delivering services in support of SP)	6.1	# of partnering stakeholders / organisations / platforms delivering services or capacitating with SP to promote or strengthen evidence-base, issues, claims, or policy goals
		6.2	# of partnering stakeholders / organizations signing on as collaborators on advocacy efforts
	<b>Indicator 7:</b> # of Advocacy & Policy Champions promoting evidence base and influencing targeted policy and decision-makers	7.1	# of advocates participating in capacity building (leadership development, trainings etc) on SP policy-issues, claims or strategies
		7.2	# of advocates ( <u>academics, brands etc.</u> ) promoting and influencing public awareness and political will on SP policy-issues, claims or strategies
		7.3	# of advocates ( <u>suppliers</u> ) actively promoting SP issues and evidence base through participation in trainings/ pilot/ WEP/ Research etc.
	<b>Indicator 8:</b> # of evidence produced by alliance partners in support of lobby and advocacy on SP issues, claims and policy goals	8.1	# of Audits
		8.2	# of Workplace Education Programs (WEPs)
		8.3	# of best/inspiring practices submitted (as a result of a pilot)
		8.4	# of complaints handled
		8.5	# of complaint cases remediated
8.6		# of reports, publications, guidelines, videos, books, academic papers	
8.7		# pilots	

## **Annex 2: Elaboration of expected reporting requirements**

### **1. Inception Report (including evaluation plan)**

The evaluation will start with an inception phase in which the selected evaluator(s) elaborate the original proposal, on the basis of documentation provided and interviews with stakeholders.

Inception report should include the following elements:

- Detailed description of methodology, data gathering methods and procedure for country studies.
- Detailed plan, timeline and budget
- Methodological challenges and how these are taken into account

The inception report must be approved by the Evaluation Task Manager and the Steering Committee before the research can start.

### **2. Evaluation report**

The evaluation report is expected to include the following:

- executive summary
- objectives as stated in the Terms of Reference
- justification of the methods and techniques used, including any limitations of the evaluation
- presentation of the findings, their analysis, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations concerning the evaluation questions.
- final conclusions & recommendations

Both Partnership partners as well as southern partners will be asked to provide feedback before the final evaluation report can be approved.