

Criteria for choosing the consultant for the independent evaluation of GIFT (May 2016)

The purpose of this document is to provide to the members of the GIFT Evaluation Committee enough elements and information in order to select the consultant to perform the independent evaluation in 2016. I suggest that we select the winner by Monday May 23rd.

In April 2016, GIFT made a public call for proposals to conduct an independent evaluation of the action network. Five proposals responded on time to the open call and complied with the terms of reference. This document presents a summary of the qualifications of the candidates and a comparative framework, based on the terms of reference for the evaluation, of the five groups/consultants who bid in the public call.

I kindly ask the members of the Evaluation Committee to please verify the ratings of the different proposals, in order to choose the winner of the open call (the proposals and required documentation have been shared with you via google drive). As you know, the selected bidder will be awarded a consultancy contract with the International Budget Partnership, where the GIFT network is nested.

I will be available this week to speak with you in case there are any questions. Unless there is an unsurmountable objection from any of you, I suggest that the Committee take a decision by Monday May 23rd, for which I ask each of you to please express your opinion and preference on suggested method and outcome (below and attached).

Tenders were asked to include in their proposal:

- Cover letter explaining how their skills and experience meet our requirements, providing examples;
- 2-page outline of the proposed evaluation process, including methodology and management arrangements;
- 1-page budget;
- CVs of each evaluator;
- One example of a previous evaluation.

Following the Terms of Reference of this call for proposals, the candidates must be assessed with respect to the following skills and competencies:

- Strong track record in conducting high-quality evaluation work, especially of advocacy work;
- Excellent knowledge of M&E methodologies;
- Experience of working with/evaluating NGO work;
- Familiarity with Public Finance Management and Fiscal Transparency issues;
- Experience of working in or assessing networks;
- Ability to write concise and accessible analytical reports in English and to develop field research in Spanish and French;
- Excellent interpersonal skills;
- Clear, realistic and robust proposed evaluation methodology for this project;
- Value for money of the proposal.

The following tables provide a brief explanation of the information presented for each of these skills and competences and proposes a grade for each line. Each category was rated from 1 to 5, where 5 is the best possible grade of the scale. Number 5 reflects that the criteria seems to be

completely fulfilled and number 4 means significant fulfillment but not entirely satisfactory; grade 3 reflects that the criteria seems moderately met. Number 2 would reflect deficiencies and 1 serious deficiencies. These proposed rating results are subject to questions and discussion within the Evaluation Committee. The last table compares the five proposals.

Organization # 1 (based in Mexico)	Budget: \$47154	Points awarded
Experience with evaluations (i.e. advocacy work)	Social development program in Belize; social coordination for public security in Northern cities, MX; civic participation in Public Education, MX	3
M&E Methodologies	M&E experience accredited	4
Experience / SCO work	At least two evaluations related to SCO work	5
Experience on PFM/FT	One consultant has PFM experience	3
Experience with networks	Little experience with networks reported; experience with multi-stakeholder initiatives	2
Report writing & research	Reports provided as examples with good research capabilities	3
Methodology proposal	Consistent methodological proposal including several forms of data collection	4
Subtotal		24
Value for money	Each point has a value of \$1964	4
TOTAL		28

Organization # 2 (based in the USA)	Budget \$68,145	Points awarded
Experience on evaluation (i.e. advocacy work)	Over 10 years experience with evaluations and 5 years with governance issues	5
M&E Methodologies	M&E experience well-accredited	5
Experience on SCO work	Experience with advocacy evaluation	4
Experience on PFM/FT	Little experience reported with PFM	2
Experience on networks	Vast experience reported with networks (co-authored a paper & casebook on the matter)	5
Report writing & research	Two references to evaluations, including a casebook on evaluating networks & multi-stakeholder initiatives	5
Methodology proposal	Expert methodological proposal founded on systematic work on network evaluations	5
Subtotal		31
Value for money	Each point has a value of \$2198	3
TOTAL		34

Organization # 3 (based in England)	Budget \$145159	Points awarded
Experience on evaluation (i.e.	Two decades on experience in independent	5

advocacy work)	analytical work specialized in development (in all regions with various clients –DfiD, PEFA, UN system), including advocacy	
M&E Methodologies	Strong M&E experience	5
Experience on SCO work	Experience on SCO works but not particularly their strong point	3
Experience on PFM/FT	Strong experience on PFM	4
Experience on networks	Experience reported with multi-stakeholder initiatives	4
Report writing & research	World Food Program's Purchase for Progress Initiative provided as example (15 donors)	5
Methodology proposal	Expert methodological proposal founded on vast experience of development and network evaluations	5
Subtotal		31
Value for money	Exceeds budget; each point has a value of \$4682	0
TOTAL		31

Organization # 4 (Based in Sweden)	Budget \$53000	Points awarded
Experience on evaluation (i.e. advocacy work)	Vast evaluation accredited in many countries and for more than 15 years, including the WBG, PFA and INTOSAI.ISO 9001:2008 certified. Would sub-contract Scanteam if awarded the contract.	4
M&E Methodologies	Several evaluations on development issues accredited	4
Experience on SCO work	Evaluations of SCO development work accredited	4
Experience on PFM/FT	Mr. X, with significant experience on PFM, is part of the team	4
Experience on networks	Experience on networks (INTOSAI) but not multi-stakeholder initiatives	4
Report writing & research	Several works referred to; the example of INTOSAI Financial Audit Subcommittee was provided	5
Methodology proposal	No particular proposal submitted, but experience on evaluations well accredited	3
Subtotal		28
Value for money	Each point has a value of \$1892	4
TOTAL		32

Organization # 5 (based in Chile)	Budget \$ 125330	Points awarded
Experience on evaluation (i.e. advocacy work)	CSO devoted to governance and human rights issues and NGO capacity building; little evaluation experience reported	2
M&E Methodologies	Little experience reported with M&E	1
Experience on SCO work	Significant work on SCOs capacity building	4
Experience on PFM/FT	Little experience on PFM issues; experience with	2

	transparency, accountability and participation projects	
Experience on networks	No experience on working with networks or multi-stakeholder initiatives reported	1
Report writing & research	No previous reports of evaluations works referred to	1
Methodology proposal	The proposal submitted includes gathering data and information through various means, and refers to a mixed methodology, but the proposal does not integrate a comprehensive evaluation methodology	3
Subtotal		14
Value for money	Exceeds budget; each point has a value of \$8952	0
TOTAL		14

Name of bidder/ Skills and competences	Organization #1	Organization #2	Organization #3	Organization #4	Organization #5
Experience evaluating advocacy work	3	5	5	4	2
M&E Methodologies	4	5	5	4	1
Experience/SCO	5	4	3	4	4
Experience/PFM/FT	3	2	4	4	2
Experience/network	2	5	4	4	1
Report writing & research	3	5	5	5	1
Methodology proposal	4	5	5	3	2
Value for money	4	3	0	4	0
TOTAL POINTS AWARDED	28	34	31	32	13
Proposed budget USD	\$47,154	\$68,145	\$145,159	\$53,000	\$125,330
Proposed ranking	4	1	3	2	5