

GENERAL INFORMATION

Title of Consultancy: Asia Pacific Regional Programme mid-term evaluation

Application Closing Date: 06/08/2018

Duration: approx. 30 working days

Start and End Date: approx. 01/09/2018– 31/10/2018

Location of Consultancy: remote, with site visits to Berlin, two countries in Asia and two countries in the Pacific region.

BACKGROUND

Transparency International (TI) is the global civil society organisation leading the fight against corruption. Through more than 100 chapters worldwide and an international secretariat in Berlin, Germany, TI raises awareness of the damaging effects of corruption and works with partners in government, business and civil society to develop and implement effective measures to tackle it.

The Transparency International Secretariat (TI-S) in Berlin is seeking to commission a mid-term evaluation of the “Asia Pacific Regional Programme” to an external consultant.

The TI Asia Pacific Regional Programme is a four-year programme running from 2016 - 2019, seeking to contribute to policy and behaviour change in the Asia Pacific region through regional and national interventions coordinated at the TI Secretariat. It is funded by the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), with a total programme budget just over 4 million Euro.

The program has four goals, under which several outcomes are envisioned:

1. Enhanced social accountability and the role of civil society: citizens are supported to voice their corruption complaints and seek redress for their grievances, and space for civil voice is preserved: (a) citizens will be supported to voice their corruption complaints and seek redress for their grievances (b) space for civil society in legislation, policy and practice will be preserved and mechanisms to protect civil society activists will be strengthened.

2. Strengthened anti-corruption legislation: new anti-corruption legislation is passed, and existing anti-corruption legislation is strengthened - (a) new anti-corruption legislation where relevant and critical tabled and passed (b) improvement of weak existing anti-corruption legislation

3. Strengthened anti-corruption organisations and enforcement of anti-corruption systems: relevant public institutions are supported to be more transparent and accountable, anti-corruption agencies are strengthened to be more effective, and public service delivery improves - (a) relevant public institutions are supported to be more transparent and accountable (b) anti-corruption agencies are strengthened to be more; and

4. Demonstrated business integrity: (a) improved business regulation is supported, e.g. through engagement with private sector stakeholders.

The advocacy goals are supported by a fifth goal of capacity support for TI Chapters in the Asia-Pacific region to deliver relevant activities and contribute to a reduction in corruption. Currently, ten chapters have implemented national projects under the programme: Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia, Maldives, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, PNG, Sri Lanka, and Vietnam. The TI Secretariat is also looking at how to effectively engage with chapters in the Pacific such as Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. Regional coordination and advocacy

have been implemented by the Asia Pacific Programme team at the TI Secretariat, with input and support from chapters in the region.

OBJECTIVES

The main purpose of the evaluation exercise is to provide an external and independent review that assesses the performance and achievements in meeting the expected results and contributing to positive changes. Additionally, the evaluation will assess whether the grant led to any unforeseen positive or negative results. The assessment will stimulate learning and inform TI's upcoming activities under the grant.

The overall objectives of the evaluation are the following:

- Provide an objective assessment of the achievements and results;
- Identify weaknesses and strengths of the programme.
- Generate lessons learned and good practices from the programme's work.
- Provide clear and forward-looking recommendations that can guide TI-S and National Chapters in developing and improving the rest of the activities for the remaining period.
- Review the systems and processes in place to improve gender equality as well as to drive innovation and learning across the network

A key audience for this evaluation is the TI Secretariat who will use the results to improve the implementation of the investment. DFAT is planning to use the evaluation for accountability purposes, including verification that TI is implementing the programme in a way that is consistent with good aid practice, and in particular verification that TI is actively improving its M&E systems and approach to gender equality. DFAT also plans to use the evaluation to look more deeply at the issues and approaches to supporting national TI chapters in the Pacific.

KEY ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

The following questions could be addressed during the grant evaluation, but are subject to discussion and agreement with TI-S during the period of designing the evaluation approach. The evaluator is free to further prioritize these questions in the proposal and suggest others it deems necessary.

Relevance: To what extent does the programme suit the priorities and policies of the target groups, TI and the donor organisation?

- Have the programme priorities been in line with National Chapters' as well as TI's strategic priorities?
- Are the initial objectives of the programme still appropriate to the priorities and policies of the National Chapters, the TI Secretariat, and the donor organisation?
- In what ways has the programme supported TI National Chapters to carry out their objectives to address corruption issues in the participating countries?
- Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the programme goals and objectives?

Impact: The positive and negative changes produced by the grant directly or indirectly. This involves the main targets and outcomes/ impact, both intended and unintended.

- What have been the key outcomes/ impact (positive as well as negative) achieved so far either directly or indirectly and how does this compare with what was expected?
- How did the grant add value to the outcomes/ impact achieved?
- Who were the direct and indirect beneficiaries of the programme? What real difference have the activities made so far to the beneficiaries?
- Which other factors contributed to the changes that were generated, and to what extent can the changes be attributed to the programme activities (plausibility)?

Effectiveness: Assessment of how far the intended outcomes were achieved in relation to target set in the original grant proposal and in the national plans:

- To what extent have the objectives so far been achieved or are likely to be achieved? Can these achievements be linked to TI-S and Chapter work?
- What main factors have played a role in the achievement or non-achievement of the programme goals and objectives? With hindsight, how could it have been improved?
- To what extent were the objectives set by the TI Asia Pacific Regional Programme realistic?
- How effective was the support of TI-S in terms of enabling National Chapters achieving the objectives?

Efficiency: How far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time, other resources and procedures contributed to or hindered the achievement of targets.

- Is progress being achieved at reasonable costs? Is the programme being implemented in an economically justifiable way under the given circumstances? Are there any benchmarks to support the answers?
- Is the actual timeline of development and implementation realistic? Are the objectives on track to be achieved in time?
- To what extent are effective management and administration systems in place? How suitable is the current organisational structure for and conducive of positive progress?

Sustainability: Potential for the continuation of the impact achieved after the end of the grant.

- To what extent are the benefits of the programme likely to continue once donor funding has ceased?
- What is the link between the financial sustainability of national chapters and the context of the country? (i.e. compare the larger growing economies in Asia with the small island states in the Pacific and implications on the optimal funding models and type of support from the TI Secretariat and donors)
- How sustainable is the approach post current funding – financially and conceptually?
- What concrete steps were/ are being taken to enhance the sustainability of the programme?
- What are the major factors that will influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the grant?

Monitoring and Evaluation and Gender Equality

- To what extent is the M&E system being used to effectively measure progress towards expected outcomes, drive innovation and support learning?
- To what extent is the programme effectively considering gender equality?

METHODOLOGY

The evaluator is ultimately responsible for the overall methodological approach and design of the evaluation and is expected to propose methodologies that they consider most appropriate to achieve the aims of this evaluation. However, the evaluation should use a participatory and gender-sensitive approach engaging relevant staff at TI-S and implementing partners and beneficiaries through structured methods and selected field visits. Both quantitative and qualitative data should be utilised to assess the grant. Data collection methods may include among others interviews with internal and external stakeholders, survey questionnaires, field visits, and desk review of relevant documents.

The evaluator is expected to refine the scope and methodology of this evaluation during the inception phase in cooperation with TI-S and provide a detailed evaluation plan. The evaluation expert should present a detailed statement of the proposed review methods in the technical proposal.

The mid-term review can include but not necessarily be limited to the following methods, which can be discussed with the consultants at the beginning of the assignment:

- Inception Meeting with TI-S.
- Desk review of relevant documents.
- Individual and/or group interviews with internal and external stakeholders.
- Meetings with external stakeholders.
- Survey questionnaires to internal and external stakeholders.
- Visits to two National Chapters in Asia and 2 National Chapters in the Pacific.
- Development of two to four case studies presenting learning on relevant issues, challenges, or trends emerging from the Programme, one of which should focus on the Pacific.

EXPECTED DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE

The evaluator or team is expected to deliver:

- A concept note outlining the proposed methodology, timeframe of planned actions, including scheduled country visits for approval by TI-S.
- A draft evaluation report for review and comments by TI-S including annexes covering conducted interviews, questionnaires and list of reviewed documents
- A validation meeting with key stakeholders to discuss findings and feedback on draft report.
- A final report, including clear lessons-learned and recommendations.

All evaluation deliverables are to be submitted in English, in electronic form (in word and excel for OS Windows compatible), in accordance with the deadlines agreed. The consultant is responsible for editing and quality control of language. The final report should be presented in a way that directly enables publication. TI-S retains the sole rights with respect to all distribution, dissemination and publication of the deliverables.

Report structure

The evaluation report shall document the evaluation activities and results, and serve as a reference for follow-on activities. It must therefore have a clear structure.

The evaluation report will contain the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the mid-term review as well as a recording of the lessons learned. The draft report will be discussed

with the Asia Pacific Programme Team and the MEL Unit at the TI Secretariat. While considering the comments provided on the draft, the evaluation expert(s) shall use their independent and impartial judgment in preparing the Final Report.

The Final Report should not be longer than 20 pages, excluding the annexes and the executive summary.

The proposed structure of the report is as follows:

- **Introduction.** The first part should describe the programme and the programme context as a basis for the analytical and evaluative sections that follow.
- **Main findings in relation to the standard review criteria.** This section focuses on the findings related to the questions listed above under 'Key issues to be addressed'. This is the main section for data presentation and analysis.
- **Case Studies.** This section will look at relevant emerging issues, challenges, or trends emerging from the Programme, one of which should focus on the Pacific.
- **Conclusions and Lessons Learned.** The conclusions follow logically from the main findings but are clearly distinguishable from these. The conclusions should provide answers to the main evaluation questions.
- **Recommendations.** The recommendations follow logically from the conclusions. They should be actor oriented (i.e. Who should do what?) and prioritised (i.e. What is most important? What could be improved?).
- **Annexes.** Annexes to the Final Report should be kept to an absolute minimum. Only those annexes that serve to demonstrate or clarify an issue related to a major finding should be included. Existing documents should be referenced but not necessarily annexed.

In addition to the final evaluation report, a PowerPoint presentation should contain a visual synthesis of the report.

Timeline

The tentative timeline, set out below, will be discussed at the beginning of the assignment:

- Beginning of the evaluation by 1 September 2018
- Draft Evaluation Report by 10 October 2018
- Final Evaluation Report by 30 October 2018

SELECTION CRITERIA

Essential profile:

- University degree in social sciences or related field from a reputed institution and postgraduate education in social sciences methods, strategic management, evaluation, or equivalent experience.
- At least 7 years of proven relevant professional experience in an international development environment, of which at least 3 years should be in Monitoring & Evaluation of multiple country projects & programmes.
- Demonstrable experience of NGO or social enterprise management, with knowledge of social accountability initiatives.
- Knowledge and experience of working in good-governance and public accountability related programmes.
- Substantial experience of conducting evaluations.
- Experience working in Asia and the Pacific, with particular experience working with civil society in Asia and the Pacific and the operational challenges they face.

- Excellent drafting and report writing capacities.
- Highly motivated and committed to the values of transparency and integrity.
- Availability to carry out most of the work in September/ October 2018.

Desirable experience:

- Experience in monitoring and evaluation of grants funded by the Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT).
- Familiarity with the activities and procedures of TI-S and TI National Chapters is an advantage.
- Experience in results-based programmes/ project management approach.
- Knowledge of good governance and anti-corruption issues.

Working language:

- The working language is English.

REMUNERATION AND COSTS

The Consultant should provide a detailed breakdown, before any VAT or other charges, of all their estimated costs, including but not limited to; total fee as a lump sum or standard daily or hourly rates, (if applicable), work materials. Any costs related to international travel will be covered by TI-S. The expected number of working days is approximately 30 days, including travel days.

Transparency International e.V. (Secretariat), (TI-S) is registered as a Business Entity in Germany with VAT identification number DE273612486. In order to determine the Value Added Tax (VAT) implications of this tender, we kindly request that the consultant fill out the VAT Form for Tenders/ Vendor Form (instructions inside the form) and submit the completed and duly signed form along with their email application.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Applications (in English) must be sent by email to apmidterm@transparency.org by close of business **6 August 2018** with “Mid-term Evaluation” in the subject line. Applications should contain:

The application should contain the following documents:

- A cover letter outlining motivation and evidence that the evaluator is qualified to undertake this evaluation.
- Curriculum Vitae with full description of the applicant’s profile and experience.
- One sample of previous work (confidentiality guaranteed).
- The approach and proposed data collection methods based on the information provided in these Terms of Reference including timeline.
- Financial offer for undertaking the work, with estimation as to the number of days that will be spent on each task.
- Contact details for at least two independent referees with in-depth and proven knowledge of the applicant’s expertise and relevant work experience.
- Completed [VAT form for tenders](http://www.transparency.org/whoweare/work) also available at www.transparency.org/whoweare/work

Please note that only shortlisted applicants will be contacted. TI retains the right to reject any or all of the applications and/or to enter into additional negotiations with one or more of the tendering parties.