Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Transparency International

1. Background

Transparency International is a global civil society organisation leading to fight against corruption. Through more than 90 chapters worldwide and an international secretariat in Berlin, Germany, TI works to raise awareness of the damaging effects of corruption and cooperates with partners in government, business and civil society to develop and implement effective measures to tackle it.

Norway has supported Transparency International (TI), both its Secretariat in Berlin (TI-S) and its National Chapters (NCs), for many years. In 2004 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs transferred the responsibility for support to TI to Norad. It is estimated that Norad in the period 2005 to 2010 will have supported TI with core support of NOK 15,7 mill.

There have been many reviews and evaluations of various programs that TI-S implements, but there is no recent independent overall evaluation of TI-S. In the TI-S donor meeting in Berlin in October 2009, Norad informed TI-S and other donors that it intended to conduct such an evaluation. Norad has consulted TI-S and some major donors to TI-S in the preparation of the ToR for this evaluation.

2. The Evaluation Purpose, Questions, scope and methodology

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to evaluate the Transparency International Secretariat and to derive lessons which will enable the TI-S and the wider movement to inform its strategies, programmes, approaches and set-up. The lessons learned will also inform the future relationship between TI-S and Norad. The lessons will be drawn from a systematic assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of Transparency International's interventions to fight corruption.

The target audience and main users of the findings of the evaluation will be Norad, Norwegian embassies and Transparency International (TI-S, NCs, board, etc). TI-S partners and other stakeholders will also benefit from the findings (including other donors, governments, private sector, research institutions, NGOs, media).

2.2 Objectives and Scope

The main evaluation objectives are:

- Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of TI-S to fight corruption with respect to the results achieved.

- Assess the strengths and weaknesses of TI-S in fighting corruption.

The evaluation will apply the DAC evaluation criteria of relevance[1], effectiveness[2], sustainability[3], and efficiency[4]. The evaluation should report on selected outputs and outcomes achieved by TI-S. While impact[5] will not be a core focus of the evaluation, evidence of impact should be reported on when found in the evaluation.

Where areas for improvement are identified, clear recommendations on how improvement should be achieved should be included in the report.

The focus of the evaluation will be on the work of the TI Secretariat in Berlin and its relationship with and added value and support to selected National Chapters.

The time frame for the evaluation will be from 2000 to date and the evaluation should hence cover developments in TI's strategies, programming, structure and context over this time frame. The evaluation will also discuss Norway's relationship with TI-S. The evaluation should indicate how Norway can best support TI-S in the future.

2.3 Key Evaluation Questions

The key evaluation questions follow the DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

Relevance

- Are TI-S's activities, programmes and tools relevant to achieve the objectives of the TI movement? (specific activities, programmes and tools shall be selected in consultation with TI-S and Norad during the inception phase and will be analysed in detail)
- Are initiatives to combat corruption based on adequate needs and context analyses? Are TI-S's activities and programmes relevant for the global fight against corruption? Are its target audiences clearly defined?
- Have TI-S objectives been well defined in the context of the global fights against corruption? Have they responded to changes in the external environment/internal capacity? Are they clearly understood within TI-S and in the NCs visited?
- Is the structure of TI-S relevant to address the capacity and other needs of the chapters and achieve its objectives?
- Are the areas of focus consistent with Norad and other donors priorities in the field of Anti-Corruption?
- Is the Secretariat meeting the capacity development and other needs of the Chapters?

[1] Definition of relevance: "The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies" (Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, OECD/DAC).
[2] Definition of effectiveness: "…an aggregate measure of (or judgement about) the merit or worth of an activity, i.e. the extent to which an intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives" (ibid.).
[3] Definition of sustainability: "The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed" (ibid.).
[4] Definition of efficiency: "A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results" (ibid.).
[5] Definition of impact: "Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended" (ibid.).

- What is the added value of the Secretariat for the chapters?

Effectiveness

- Is the TI Secretariat achieving satisfactory progress towards its stated role and objectives?
- What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of objectives? Have any corrective measures been identified and/or considered?
- What can be done to make TI-S's interventions more effective in order to achieve the objectives of the Secretariat and of the movement?
- How appropriate is Results Based Management for the organisation? What are its opportunities and challenges? Should changes be made in the TI-S planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting systems and procedures and if so which?

Efficiency

- Are anticipated activities and outputs being delivered on time and according to specifications? (specific activities and outputs will be selected during the inception phase and will be analysed in detail)
- How is TI-S coordinating its activities with other regional and global organisations and initiatives to avoid duplication? Can coordination be improved and if so how?
- What are the problems and constraints the Secretariat faces during implementation of activities, programmes and tools?
- How is the financial and administrative set up for TI-S? Does TI-S represent "good value for money" in relation to the results achieved?
- How are regional and global projects identified and budgeted?

Sustainability

- To what degree are the interventions and activities analyzed in the evaluation adequately resourced? Has TI-S been able to scale up its work, and what can be learned from experience to ensure financial viability in the future?
- Are National Chapters and TI partners consulted in designing Secretariat interventions and priorities and during their implementation?
- Are global and regional programs coordinated by the Secretariat consistent with National Chapter priorities?
- Do the National Chapters have the capacity to continue their activities without the Secretariat's support?
- Is the TI Secretariat a 'learning organisation'? Are results from evaluations and reviews disseminated and followed up internally in the organisation? How effective and efficient is TI-S in bringing knowledge and lessons learned from one part of the movement to the rest of the movement? Are there incentives to encourage learning and use of lessons learned?

Impact

As mentioned earlier, due to the complications in measuring impact, this is not the core focus of this evaluation. The following questions would nevertheless need to be answered

- Can evidence be found of the work of TI-S having an impact in the global fight against corruption?
- Have there been any unexpected positive or negative impacts resulting from TI-S' s work?
- Is TI-S cooperating and coordinating its efforts with relevant institutions and actors to maximize its impact?

Additional questions

- What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in the relationship between TI-S and Norad?
- How could TI-S and Norad build on its current relationship?
- What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in the relationship between TI-S and other donors and stakeholders (e.g. governments, private sector)?
- How could TI-S and other donors and stakeholders build on its current relationship?
- What type of future support would TI-S need from Norad and other donors to achieve its objectives and fulfil its mandate? (e.g. Coalition building? Financial? Organisational development? Other?)
- Are there possible conflicts of interest when funds are from (1) private and (2) donor agencies?

2.4 Evaluation Approach/Methods

It will be part of the assignment to develop a methodological and conceptual framework to ensure an objective, transparent and impartial assessment of the issues to be analysed in this evaluation as well as ensuring learning during the course of the evaluation.

The evaluation team should make use of empirical methods such as document analysis, interviews, focus groups, field visits, case studies and data/literature surveys to collect data which will be analysed using specified judgement criteria and suitably defined qualitative and quantitative indicators.

The team is expected to interview different stakeholders including TI-S and NCs at country level, Norad, and other partners including international, multilateral and non-governmental organisations depending on the case programme/projects selected.

In order to document results at output and outcome level as well as identifying lessons learnt, during the inception phase the consultant, a few cases at project/programme level should be selected for closer scrutiny. The proposed cases should be selected using the criteria (i) size of funding (ii) cases representing different interventions and (iii) cases representing different geographical target areas. The proposed case studies should be presented in the inception report for discussion with TI-S and Norad.

Data collection
The evaluation team is responsible for data-collection, management, analysis and reporting. Access to archives will be facilitated by TI-S and Norad.

Validation, interpretation and feedback workshops shall be held, involving those that have provided information, and others who are relevant.

Field visits

As a part of the process to identify how TI-S has impacted on its chapters, field visits to six national chapters are envisaged in this evaluation. Chapters will be selected during the inception phase based on criteria agreed upon between the consultants, Norad and TI-S. Considering TI works globally a (sub) regional spread in the selection of national chapters is necessary.

3. Organisation and requirements

3.1 Composition of Team

The evaluation team will report to Norad through the team leader. All members of the team are expected to have relevant academic qualifications and evaluation experiences. In addition the evaluation team should cover the following competencies:

Competence	Team Leader	The evaluation team
Academic	Higher relevant degree.	Political science, social anthropology, sociology, economics, or equivalent.
Discipline	Higher relevant discipline	Political science, Social anthropology, sociology, economics and similar.
Evaluation	▪ Proven successful team leading; the team leader must document relevant experience with managing and leading evaluations. ▪ Advanced knowledge and experience in evaluation principles and standards in the context of international development.	▪ Competence/ experience in evaluation and/or research of similar programmes
Development Cooperation	▪ Competence in the area of governance and corruption ▪ Competence in the area of civil society/NGOs	▪ Competence in the area of governance and corruption ▪ Competence in the area of civil society/NGOs
Language:	• English - Written, reading, spoken	• Norwegian - Written, reading, spoken

During the inception phase the tendering firm shall on need basis identify appropriate national consultants with relevant language skills to assist the team in its fieldwork.

Quality assurance shall be provided by the company delivering the consultancy services, including a person that is external to the evaluation team

3.2 Organisation

The evaluation will be managed by the Evaluation Department of Norad. An independent team of researchers or consultants will be assigned the evaluation according to the standard procurement procedures of Norad (including open international call for tenders). The team leader shall report to Norad on the team's progress, including any problems that may jeopardize the assignment.

The team is entitled to consult widely with stakeholders pertinent to the assignment. All decisions concerning these TOR, the inception report, draft report and final report are subject to approval by Norad.

The evaluation team shall take note of comments received from stakeholders. Where there are significantly diverging views between the evaluation team and stakeholders, this should be reflected in the report.

3.3 Budget and Deliverables

The project is budgeted with a maximum input of 50 person weeks. The tenderer shall quote a total price for the assignment **excluding** travel and subsistence costs related to field visits. The deliverables in the consultancy consist of the following outputs:

- **Inception Report** not exceeding 20 pages shall be prepared and discussed with Norad and TI-S before final approval by Evaluation Department of Norad.
- One work-in-progress reporting **seminar.**
- **Draft Final Report** for feedback from TI-S and its relevant NCs and Norad. The feedback will include comments on structure, facts, content, and conclusions.
- **Final Evaluation Report**.
- **Seminar for dissemination** of the final report. Direct travel-cost related to dissemination in the case countries if any, will be covered separately on need basis, and are **not** to be included in the budget.

All presentations and reports (to be prepared in accordance with the Evaluation Department's guidelines given in *Annex A-3 Guidelines for Report*s of this document) are to be submitted in electronic form in accordance with the deadlines set in the time-schedule specified under *Section 2 Administrative Conditions* in *Part 1 Tender specification* of this document. The Evaluation Department retains the sole rights with respect to all **distribution, dissemination and publication** of the deliverables.

The team is supposed to visit the TI secretariat in Berlin and six National Chapters. Additionally, two team members are expected to participate in the following meetings in Oslo and Berlin: A contract-signing meeting and a meeting to present the final report to relevant stakeholders.

3.4 Reporting and Outputs

The Consultant shall undertake the following:

- Prepare an inception report in accordance with the guidelines given in annex 3.1 in this document. This includes a preliminary description of the context, a description of the methodological design to be applied and suggested selection of focus areas for more in-depth evaluation. The inception report should be of no more than 20 pages excluding necessary annexes.
- At the end of each programme/country visit, present preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations in a meeting to relevant stakeholders, allowing for comments and discussion.
- Prepare a draft final report and a final report in accordance with the guidelines in annex 3.2 of this document. The final report shall not exceed 60 pages, excluding annexes.
- Present the final report at seminars in Oslo/Berlin and/or in one of the case countries.

All reports shall be written in English and are to be submitted in electronic form in accordance with the deadlines set in the time-schedule specified under *Section 2 Administrative Conditions in Part 1 Tender Specifications* of this document.

The Consultant is responsible for editing and quality control of language. The final report should be presented in a way that directly enables publication. The Evaluation Department retains the sole right with respect to all distribution, dissemination and publications of the deliverables.

The evaluation team is expected to adhere to the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards[6] as well as the Norad Evaluation Guidelines.

Any modification to these terms of reference is subject to approval by the Norad Evaluation Department.

[6] http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/12/56/41612905.pdf