

GIFT is calling for independent bidders to conduct the evaluation of the network for the period 2013-2016

Please find below the terms of reference of the independent evaluation

The Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency action network is undertaking its first independent evaluation, for the period 2013-2016. GIFT is planning to conduct this evaluation between May and December 2016.

The GIFT Operation Procedures stipulate that the Lead Stewards must approve an external, independent system for reviewing GIFT performance and identifying its impact, while trying to understand the nature and significance of that impact on the countries, arenas, networks and processes in which it has been working. Section 12 establishes that “these evaluation mechanisms might overlap with or be the same as the ones planned as part of the donors’ requirements for reporting on the grants awarded to the action network.”

The objectives of the independent review include the following:

- Evaluate the impact of GIFT on advancing significant and sustained improvements in fiscal openness in countries around the world
- Assess the role of GIFT in global political agenda setting, furthering the coherence and comprehensive of global norms, strengthening incentives, building of knowledge and facilitating of peer learning for fiscal openness;
- Assess the role of GIFT in plans and actions on the degree of fiscal openness of the countries in which it has worked;
- Assess the way in which it works and complements other processes, networks and actors that are moving this international agenda forward;
- Assess GIFT outputs regarding the documentation of evidence of the impact of fiscal transparency and incentives for advancing and institutionalizing fiscal openness;
- Make some recommendations for helping define the future of GIFT.

GIFT Lead Stewards decided to hold an independent evaluation of the action network, starting in the Spring of 2016, in order to have preliminary results by the Fall, when a strategic planning meeting will take place (September 20); the final results of the evaluation are expected by December 2016.

The terms of reference for the services of the independent evaluation of GIFT’s work for the period 2013-2016 are below.

This is a public call for proposals to conduct an independent evaluation of the GIFT action network. The proposals should comply with the terms of reference and should be submitted before May 1, 2016, to Juan Pablo Guerrero, Network Director, (guerrero@fiscaltransparency.net) and Albertina Meana, Program Assistant, (albertina@fiscaltransparency.net), copying Nicola Smithers (nsmithers@worldbank.org), Lead Public Sector Specialist, World Bank, and Warren



Krafchik (wkrafchik@internationalbudget.org) , Executive Director, IBP. Shortlisted candidates will be contacted and interviewed in May.

The selected bidder will be awarded a consultancy contract with the International Budget Partnership, where the GIFT network is nested.

Independent Evaluation of the Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency (2013-2016) Terms of Reference and Scope of Services for Independent Evaluation of Program, 2013-2016

The GIFT Lead Stewards decided in their meeting of February 25th to start an independent evaluation of the action network in the Spring of 2016 in order to have preliminary results by the Fall, when a strategic planning meeting will take place (September 20); the final results of the evaluation are expected in December 2016. They also decided to create a plural Evaluation Committee to supervise the evaluation. These are the terms of reference for the services of such independent evaluation of GIFT's work for the period 2013-2016. In addition to the ToRs, this document provides the background and governance information about GIFT and it includes the profile of the evaluator and the composition and rules of engagement for the Evaluation Committee.

1. Background

a) Origin, value proposition and objectives of GIFT

GIFT is a multi-stakeholder action network that seeks to achieve sustained, measurable improvements in fiscal transparency by bringing together a diverse group of international and national actors that hitherto have pursued this agenda independently.

GIFT was established in 2011, when important fiscal transparency international standard setters concluded that significant and sustainable improvements in public fiscal transparency demanded a concerted and coordinated global approach. By then, multi-lateral institutions, notably the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the International Budget Partnership and the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI), had developed useful tools for measuring fiscal transparency and many of them were providing support to increase the capacity of governments to disclose information. However, efforts to improve fiscal transparency have lacked coordination across stakeholders and the multiplication of approaches, assessment tools and standards were posing a number of challenges.

One motivation for the founders of the Initiative was the growing recognition that efforts in the field would benefit from a new approach to collaboration between those that demand greater transparency and accountability (civil society, legislatures, supreme audit institutions, donors, and international financial institutions) and those that can supply it (executive branches, ministries of finance, donors, and international financial institutions).

The wide recognition among multilateral and bilateral donor agencies of the urgent need for improvements in fiscal transparency to achieve better governance and sustainable development, there was complemented by a growing network of skilled civil society organizations operating in over 100 countries, focused on fiscal transparency and accountability, as well as strong civil society networks on related issues of extractive industries and aid transparency. Furthermore, a growing open data movement spanning



civil society and the private sector was looking for new low-cost technologies to make government data available in more accessible and usable formats. With improved access to budget and policy processes, these diverse independent institutions could serve as critical partners for governments in improving governance and the effective delivery of services.

GIFT was designed as a multi-stakeholder action network engaging a broad group of public, private, international and private sector stakeholders in order to provide an effective approach for substantial and sustainable change. By providing a forum to share experiences, GIFT intended to create incentives through peer pressure, as well as practical approaches and innovations. By promoting a multi-stakeholder approach at a global and national level, GIFT sought to provide civil society and the private sector with opportunities to bring their influence to bear in advancing reform in a way that responds to their information and engagement needs. GIFT also started using south-south exchanges between practitioners as the basis for its knowledge and learning strategy.

Since 2011, the action network has grown quickly, and today it comprises 29 stewards including 10 governments (ministries of finance), 10 budget civil society organizations, international donors, international financial institutions, specialized organizations and one investor sector network. The founders constituted the Initiative steering committee which became the GIFT General Stewards, and the founding members of the network (the World Bank, the IMF, IBP and the governments of Brazil (General Comptroller of the Union -CGU) and the Philippines (Department of Budget and Management) became the GIFT Lead Stewards. Representatives of the Federal Secretariat of Budget and Planning replaced the CGU as the representative of the government of Brazil. In 2014, the International Federation of Accountants joined the Lead Stewards. The establishment of these two bodies of GIFT, General Stewards and Lead Stewards, set the grounds for the rules of engagement and the governance of the network. Additional information on GIFT, its activities, its governance structure, program management, and the resources it offers to network members can be found on the network's website: www.fiscaltransparency.net

GIFT's value proposition (or theory of change) proposes that strengthening norms, incentives, peer-learning, technical assistance, high level dialogue and use of technologies/open data will advance and institutionalize more transparent, participatory, and accountable fiscal decision-making processes and policies in countries around the world. This in turn will foster more efficient, effective and equitable use of public resources, and help curb corruption, enabling governments to provide better service delivery for citizens as well as financial and macro-economic stability, to advance the ultimate goals of poverty alleviation and, more broadly, inclusive and sustainable human development. GIFT fills a major gap in the field of fiscal openness by bringing together a uniquely diverse group of actors - its efforts complement and leverage those of other individual actors and initiatives. In fact, no single actor could undertake this ambitious and complex task on its own: a concert of multiple, influential and engaged actors is needed to advance fiscal transparency and participation in a sustainable manner.

GIFT agreed from its inception to organize actions around work streams led by stewards with an expertise or a particular interest in the activities undertaken. GIFT's core work

focuses on four main activity streams:

1. Advancing Global Norms on Fiscal Transparency
2. Increasing and Improving Peer-Learning and Technical Assistance
3. Aligning Incentives Work with Greater Knowledge and Private Sector Involvement
4. Harnessing New Technologies/Open Data to engage the General Public

In addition, as a strategic stream for global political agenda setting, GIFT would develop a governance model that enables the expansion of its membership and reach.

Consequently, the key final outcomes of GIFT are the following:

- Institutionalization of a more coherent and comprehensive global architecture of norms on fiscal transparency;
- A broader group of countries actively pursuing fiscal transparency and participation through the Open Government Partnership (OGP)-GIFT Fiscal Openness Working Group;
- An enhanced body of evidence, knowledge and peer/south-south learning on incentives, development impacts, practical approaches and innovations in fiscal transparency reforms, in a format useful for international and country stakeholders;
- Development and expansion of the current vibrant and efficacious GIFT network.

b) Funding sources and administrative status

To achieve these long term goals, GIFT has received support from the World Bank (Development Grant Facility for US \$ 2.25 million for the period 2013-16), the William & Flora Hewlett Foundation (Grant for US \$ 1 million for 2014-2017) and the Omidyar Network (Grant for US \$ 1 million for 2015-2017). All of these grants require an external evaluation of the performance of the Initiative. The World Bank DGF, in particular, establishes that GIFT needs to submit the results of an independent evaluation of the Program, in accordance with generally accepted principles and standards of development evaluation, such as those in the *IEG/DAC Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs: Indicative Principles and Standards, 2007*, by an entity satisfactory to the Bank, not later than November 30, 2017. This independent evaluation needs to cover the period from July 1, 2013 to December 31, 2016.

The seed funding for the launching phases of the network was provided by IBP, Metanoia and the William & Flora Hewlett Foundation, but the Governments of Brazil and Philippines, the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and others provided in-kind contribution of resources. Between 2011-12, a contractor (Innovations for Scaling Impact –iScale-) provided major coordination support for the GIFT network, including the creation of internal and external communications with stakeholders, production of key reports and documents, facilitation of meetings and workshops. However, even though in-kind resources mobilized from the Lead Stewards were significant, the team-members of iScale were half-time, and actual financial resources were limited. When the World



Bank's DGF awarded its grant in October 2013 (which allowed for the hiring of a full-time Network Director), the funds were housed and managed by the IBP.

Under this arrangement, GIFT has become a project supported and facilitated by a lead steward organization, under the terms of the grants agreements, in which IBP personnel provide comprehensive back-office management including human resources management, financial administration, risk management and legal institutional status.

2. Governance and management of GIFT

In July 2015, the lead stewards approved a governance plan for the period 2015-2017 and a set of operating procedures for the network (*Network Governance, Legal Structure and Operating Procedures*). The formalization of the [Operating Procedures](#), which establish clarity on the purpose, the roles and functions, and the rules of engagement in the network- have allowed a more systematic enlargement and strengthening of GIFT.

The governance proposal plan addresses the questions of resource mobilization for sustainability, the active engagement of the members of the network, bodies, functions and responsibilities within the governance system, the expansion and the internal dynamics of the network, and considerations concerning the legal structure of GIFT in the near future.

In a nutshell, the members of the multi-stakeholder action network are GIFT's stewards. The governance structure further consists of lead stewards (who are responsible for leading the network and have additional representational and decision-making roles), the network director and the coordination team. Finally, an independent evaluation system is included in a set of bodies designed to ensure accountability and effectiveness.

The stewards are the representatives of the set of stakeholders engaged in defining GIFT's value proposition, core strategies and main areas of action. A common denominator for these members of GIFT is that they are willing to work to advance and institutionalize significant, continuous improvements in fiscal openness (transparency, participation, and accountability) in countries around the world by strengthening global norms, incentives, peer-learning, and technical assistance. The stewards meet twice a year in the General Steward Meeting and constitute the core advisory body of the network. They advise and agree on the content of the products, proposals, declarations, principles and guidelines that are produced under GIFT's name.

The lead stewards are selected from the Stewards and have additional decision-making roles in leading the network. They are the primary governing body of GIFT: among other key responsibilities they appoint/remove, guide and supervise the network director and review in more detail GIFT's strategy and budget.

The executive responsibilities of the network fall upon the network director, who is also in charge of the legal representation of GIFT, coordinating its activities and leading its operations. The network director, in charge of coordination and reporting, reports directly

to the lead stewards. Finally, GIFT also has a highly qualified, though small, coordination team, in charge of the coordination of the work streams: research agenda, the technical assistance and normative agenda, peer-to-peer learning, and the information technology and open data activities.

As mentioned, GIFT is hosted by the International Budget Partnership. Therefore, all coordination, administrative and control functions of GIFT must comply with IBP finance and administrative policies and procedures; this includes the internal and external audit systems of the host institutions. Simultaneously, GIFT benefits from the support of IBP human resources and institutional capital.

3. Independent Evaluation as part of the Governance of the GIFT Action Network

GIFT's Operating Procedures include an independent review mechanism of the network's performance in order to identify its impact and to understand the nature and significance of that impact in the countries, arenas, networks and processes in which it works. The GIFT Operation Procedures stipulate that the lead stewards shall approve an external, independent system for reviewing GIFT performance and identifying its impact, while trying to understand the nature and significance of that impact in the countries, arenas, networks and processes in which it will be working. Section 12 establishes that "these evaluation mechanisms might overlap with or be the same as the ones planned as part of the donors' requirements for reporting on the grants awarded to the action network". The Procedures also define the objectives of the independent review.

4. Purpose, Scope and Objectives of the first evaluation of GIFT

In line with the objectives of the independent review set by GIFT Operating Procedures, the focus of this first evaluation will be at the network level, including governance, and the activity level. The evaluation will provide a clear view of GIFT's achievements and failures and the reasons behind these.

a) The objectives of the evaluation are to:

1. Verify if GIFT has met the indicators related to the intermediate and the development outcomes as stated in the DGF results framework;
2. Measure performance against the five evaluation criteria described below;
3. Verify whether the funds were used effectively and efficiently;
4. Record lessons;
5. Inform future design and strategies for the project.

b) Evaluation Time Period and Coverage

The evaluation will cover the entire DGF period from October 2013 to December 2016. The evaluation will take into consideration all of the activities of GIFT, including ongoing/in-progress activities.

c) Features of the Evaluation Process and Selection of the Evaluation Team

This evaluation is being commissioned by GIFT as a requirement of DGF funding and other grant requirements. The TOR has been prepared in partnership with the World Bank and the Evaluation Committee, closely following the guidance template for Program-Level Evaluations of Global and Regional Partnership Programs.

The evaluation team will be selected by the Evaluation Committee, with the candidates being assessed against 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.

GIFT, in coordination with its lead steward host (IBP) will invite bids from organizations or individuals with the appropriate skills and experience. Joint bids will be welcome. Tenders should include:

Cover letter explaining how the candidate's(s') 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 for each evaluator;
- One example of previous a evaluation.

Tenders should be submitted to Juan Pablo Guerrero, Network Director, (guerrero@fiscaltransparency.net) and Albertina Meana, Program Assistant, (albertina@fiscaltransparency.net), copying Nicola Smithers (nsmithers@worldbank.org), Lead Public Sector Specialist, Global Lead Managing Public Finance, and Warren Krafchik (wkrafchik@internationalbudget.org), Executive Director, IBP, by April 30, 2016. Shortlisted candidates will be contacted and interviewed by the beginning of May.

The evaluator/evaluation team will report to the Evaluation Committee, and findings will be reported to GIFT, the members of the Evaluations Committee, the World Bank Global Practice representative and the DGF.

d) Features of the GIFT's Development Outcomes to be considered

The World Bank DGF agreement defines development outcomes covering the lifetime of grant support (2013-2016) as well as intermediate outcomes for each of the three fiscal

years of the grant. Furthermore, the development and intermediate outcomes have both been operationalized with specific indicators. Among other objectives, the first evaluation will be devoted to assessing progress against these indicators as stated in the DGF results framework (more on this below).

e) Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The evaluation should cover the following five areas: relevance, efficacy, efficiency, governance and management, and sustainability. The criteria might be, however, refined jointly with the successful consultant(s).

Criteria #1: Relevance (the project's significance in relation to improvements in its final expected outcomes)

The following questions will be addressed:

- To what extent is the global architecture of norms on fiscal transparency more coherent and comprehensive as a result of the network activities?
- Is the concept of public participation in fiscal policy better codified and illustrated with practical and replicable examples?
- Are an increasing number of countries actively pursuing fiscal transparency and participation through the Open Government Partnership (OGP)-GIFT Fiscal Openness Working Group?
- Have the FOWG activities been carried out efficiently and inclusively?
- Has the research on evidence of the impact of fiscal transparency been used as an incentive for advancing this agenda?
- Has the research on practical approaches and innovations in fiscal transparency reforms been useful for international and country stakeholders?
- Has the network been developed and expanded with efficacy and solidity (robustness)?
- To what extent did GIFT fill an existing gap with regard to knowledge sharing and incentives creating?
- Does GIFT enhance the work of network members and create opportunities for them or does it sometimes undermine or substitute their efforts? How can it contribute to strengthening the work of the stakeholders?
- Can the stewards achieve what GIFT has delivered in another manner? How could stewards provide another kind of assistance to countries to achieve the same results?
- Which of the GIFT work streams and projects add the most value? What is GIFT doing that no one else is doing? What new lines of activity should be explored?
- What additional data should the network put together that speaks to the contribution of GIFT to the overall fiscal transparency landscape?

Criteria #2: Efficacy (the extent to which the project objectives and intended outcomes were achieved in relation to targets set in the DGF results framework)

In terms of the overall purpose of GIFT, the evaluation will assess whether the GIFT network filled a gap and fulfilled a significant role in advancing fiscal transparency and public participation in fiscal policies at the global level. The following program activities, among others, will be assessed through the lens of efficacy:

- *Building a coherent and comprehensive global architecture of norms on fiscal openness.*

The evaluation will assess whether standards, codes, indicators, indexes and norms were modified, and whether these changes produced a more coherent global set of norms on fiscal transparency and on adopting the principles of public participation in fiscal policy. In addition, the evaluation will assess the work on creating a normative instrument to encourage citizen engagement and generating greater knowledge about the fiscal areas and processes with opportunities for public participation. In other words, the evaluation will check if GIFT provided clear, practical tools and guidance to governments and civil society organizations on direct public participation mechanisms. Finally, it will assess the impact of this work in encouraging governments to make commitments to adopt practices that move them towards fiscal transparency and public participation within the OGP framework.

- *Increasing and improving peer sharing/learning and associated technical assistance on fiscal openness*

The evaluation will assess whether there was an improvement in GIFT's members and partners' levels of knowledge of fiscal transparency, public participation and accountability. In this area, the contribution of the following activities in achieving this outcome will be assessed: peer to peer FOWG workshops, engagement of stewards in the works streams (particularly, principles formulation) and the provision of technical assistance to countries on their OGP National Action Plans and commitments.

- *Strengthening the incentives that motivate governments to advance and institutionalize fiscal openness*

The evaluation will assess if the research documentation generated by GIFT has increased and systematized the amount of evidence available on the impacts of fiscal transparency on fiscal performance, policies, governance, service delivery and development outcomes and will also assess if these materials can be used as motivation for governments and other relevant stake-holders to advance this agenda.

- *Harnessing New Technologies and Open Budget Data Activities*

The evaluation will assess whether the web platform has helped provide a supply of -and met the demand for- fiscal information and also will verify the progress in producing a tool for publishing micro-level budget and fiscal information in open data formats and with data visualization and data analysis tools to help non-experts use the data (Open Fiscal Data Package, which is based on the budget data developed by BOOST and on the technical specification under development by Open Knowledge).

- *Communication tools*

The evaluation will assess the GIFT web portal and the GIFT communications to the lead stewards, the stewards and the newsletters.

- *GIFT as an action network*

The evaluation will assess the evolution of the number of GIFT members and the strength of the network and it will assess the level of satisfaction among members of the network, as well as their expectations of GIFT; and assess the way in which it works and complements other activities of the lead stewards at the international level and with the local stakeholders engaged in advancing fiscal transparency (ministries of finance and budget civil society organizations).

- *Internal monitoring*

Lastly, under the criteria of efficacy, the following questions will be addressed: To what extent did the GIFT coordination team measure the progress of activities, outputs, and outcomes?

Criteria #3: Efficiency (the extent to which funding, staffing, time and administrative resources were effectively used for the achievement of results)

The following questions will be addressed in the evaluation:

- Were the levels of funding, size of the team and administrative resources appropriate?
- Did GIFT provide value for money?
- To what extent are there links between significant expenditures and key outputs?
- Has GIFT cost more or less than planned?
- Have there been any cases of wasted resources?
- Are the management arrangements efficient?

Criteria #4: Governance and management (day-to-day operation of the project and structures in place to ensure transparency)

The following questions will be addressed in the evaluation:

- Is GIFT's governance structure appropriate and effective?
- Was the discussion and formulation of the Operating Procedures sufficiently planned and comprehensive?
- Is the design of the governance structure consistent with the network's main goals? What changes in the rules of engagement and the role of the coordination team might improve GIFT effectiveness?
- Is the current administrative arrangement adequate for the work and activities of the network?
- What new areas/activities could be developed/covered in order to better serve the networks' goals?
- What should the structure and staffing of GIFT be in the medium term?
- How were the stewards selected? How were the lead stewards selected? How was the network director selected?
- How does the Coordination Team operate?
- Did GIFT develop a monitoring and evaluation strategy?
- Was the financial management of good quality?
- Were appropriate contracting procedures followed when selecting consultants?
- Are there accountability systems in place? Are they working as expected?

Criteria #5: Sustainability (the project's potential for continuation of the impact achieved following the end of current funding)

- The following questions will be addressed in the evaluation:
- Has GIFT developed and implemented a resource mobilization strategy that ensures continuation of GIFT beyond 2016, and that implies financial support from multiple donors?
- At the end of 2016, does GIFT still have legitimacy and effective management?
- What role has GIFT played in its field and how sustainable is this role?
- How has GIFT's context (OGP, follow the money, other international initiatives) affected its impact? How can opportunities and obstacles to future interventions be detected and seized or avoided?
- Is there still sufficient interest among major donors to sustain the program financially?
- To what extent has GIFT developed its institutional capacity?
- Is GIFT effectively marketing its achievements in order to sustain its reputation?

f) Lessons Learned and Recommendations

In addition to presenting findings which answer the aforementioned evaluation questions or address the required topics, the GIFT action network evaluation is expected to report any other lessons learned (that are presumably applicable to future activities) and it is expected to make recommendations. The areas of recommendations include (but are not necessarily limited to) the following:

- How to better meet program objectives or improve results under the existing strategy?
- How to address issues identified, keeping strategy constant?
- How to adapt objectives or strategy to new conditions?
- How to improve the governance or management of the program, or specific policies or processes?
- How to shape the network for the near future in terms of resources, capacities, working methods, institutionalization?

g) Evaluation Design and Methodology

The designed consultant(s) will be required to develop a broad framework for the evaluation process. This will be refined in conjunction with the GIFT Network Director and a more detailed evaluation plan will be developed following discussions. The data collection will comprise a desk review (project M&E reports, etc.) and interviews with key informants (internal and external stakeholders, purposively sampled). Data related to each of the evaluation criteria will have to be collected from at least three informants, or assessed by both desk research and interview data, to ensure a robust assessment through triangulation.

Special consideration needs to be given to the fact that different GIFT interventions work on different dimensions of fiscal transparency and have adopted different approaches in order to achieve impact. This makes measuring change difficult; bidders are requested to outline in their proposal how they will address this challenge. Moreover, the project has employed different strategies in each of the streams of work (global norms, peer-to-peer

learning and technical assistance, evidence of impact and innovative mechanisms research, use of information technologies and open data, etc.) to contribute to the overall goal. The consultant will therefore have to devise an appropriate approach to assess the efficacy of the project that takes this complexity into account.

h) Evaluation Budget

As previously mentioned, bidders are requested to provide both technical and financial proposals. Thus, bidders can specify a preferred methodology, estimate its costs, and have control over their ability to meet the deliverables.

i) Menu of Evaluation Instruments

The following represents a menu of possible approaches or instruments, which bidders may draw upon for their proposals. The sources of information and types of analysis for the GIFT network could include, but would not necessarily be limited to the following:

- Desk review of key documents including strategy documents, recent DGF Progress Reports, minutes of governing body meetings, the GIFT website, newsletter and internal communications to stewards and lead stewards, reports from activities, workshops and events, research production and any other documents judged relevant by the stewards or coordination team;
- Literature search and review of material on the global environment in which the network operates, and recent national and international developments which impact on the program's objectives and activities;
- Portfolio review of activities representative of all of GIFT network's activities;
- Personal interviews with members of the coordination team, former members of the team, and IBP staff that support and supervise the program's activities from the lead steward host perspective;
- Interviews of representatives of the stewards and the lead stewards, including members of the private sector, academia, foundation leaders in the field who have an awareness of GIFT or who have participated in the networks activities, recipients of program reports or attendees at workshops, and to the extent possible, former lead steward members;
- Structured surveys of selected groups of stakeholders;
- Focus group discussions with stakeholders;
- Web-based surveys;
- Case studies, which usually require site visits to judge the outcomes and impacts of an agreed-upon sample of program activities;
- Quality review of written products;
- Attendance at governing body meetings, beneficiary meetings, workshops, and training activities
- Review of semi-annual, interim and annual reports of GIFT;
- Any additional sources of information or procedures necessary to contribute to the analysis and findings on the program that the evaluator feels to be necessary in order to accomplish the tasks set forth in the TOR, including the option of sub-contracting certain tasks or topics to local consultants or recognized experts in particular fields.

j) Presentation of Evidence

All findings and conclusions should be based on evidence presented in the evaluation report so that they can be critically assessed by any member of the GIFT network, and by the Evaluation Committee, donors and the GIFT coordination team. Such evidence may take the form of tabulations of data, compilation of survey results, analysis, case study reports, testimonials, objective observations of measurable data, etc. In cases where the source of information is interviews, the method of selecting those to be interviewed should be presented in the evaluation report. For case studies, site visits, or reviews of a subset of activities, the criteria and processes for selecting those cases should be presented. In the case of surveys, the questionnaire, information on the population or samples, and the response rates should be presented in the report.

k) Assessing Effectiveness and Efficiency at Different Levels

The evaluation will focus primarily on GIFT's overall work at the global program level, but should also focus on some of the most strategically important activities, such as technical assistance, networking or knowledge sharing.

l) Required Qualifications of the Evaluation Team

Bids can be from either individuals or an evaluation team. Composition and number of team members can be determined by bidders. In the interest of receiving an objective, unbiased evaluation, bidders are required to divulge any prior involvement with the program so that potential conflicts of interest may be assessed and ways to mitigate these devised.

The candidates will be assessed against the following skills and competencies:

- Strong track record in conducting high-quality evaluation work, especially of international network and advocacy work;
- Excellent knowledge of M&E methodologies;
- Experience of working with/evaluating multi-stake holder work;
- Familiarity with public finance and fiscal transparency issues;
- Experience of working in or assessing networks;
- Ability to write concise and accessible analytical reports in English;
- Excellent interpersonal skills in English, Spanish and French;
- Clear, realistic and robust proposed evaluation methodology for this project; and
- Value for money of the proposal.

m) Work Plan and Schedule

Timeframe

Task	Timing
Issuing of TOR	March 2016
Bid submission	By April 30, 2016
Bid evaluation and award of contract	By May 30, 2016
Develop an evaluation plan	By June 20, 2016

Evaluation	Depending on availability, 7 weeks, with evaluation finishing no later than August 15, 2016
Interim evaluation report with preliminary results and data findings	By September 10, 2016
Preliminary finished version of the evaluation	By October 15, 2016
Final version of the evaluation	By November 15, 2016

Deliverables

The consultant/firm responsible for the evaluation will be expected to produce the deliverables listed below. Deliverables should be sent in electronic format to the GIFT Network Director, the Evaluation Committee members, and the lead stewards; the final version of the evaluation will be posted on the GIFT website.

- Plan for evaluation process;
- Outline of evaluation report;
- Interim evaluation report with preliminary results;
- Preliminary finished version of the evaluation; and
- Final evaluation report, of publishable quality, to include an executive summary and recommendations for improvement. The main body of the report will be structured around the 5 evaluation criteria. It will also include a technical appendix, with sample details and instruments used.

Logistics and Administrative Support

GIFT will cover the costs of the evaluation (travel to the secretariat and/or activity sites, accommodation, etc.). Office space and logistical support can be made available by the International Budget Partnership on a short-term basis.

5. Obligations and Roles of the Stakeholders of the Evaluation

a) Role of GIFT and the IBP

- Ensure that the budget is commensurate with the methodology and other requirements.
- Coordinate and establish the Evaluation Committee and a point person to oversee the evaluation, and handle issues referred to it by the oversight committee.
- Review final report and provide a timely written response, which is made available to the public.

b) Obligations of the Evaluation Committee

The Evaluation Committee will be integrated by: Nicola Smithers (The World Bank), Warren Krafchik (IBP), Janet Abuel (Department of Budget and Management, The Philippines), Kay Brown (National Treasury, South Africa), Katarina Ott (Institute for Public Finance, Croatia), and Ruth Levine (Hewlett Foundation).

The Committee will oversee the evaluation process in coordination with the Network Director, provide direct feedback to the evaluation team, and resolve issues that arise on contracts, conflicts of interest, or access to information between the consultant and the

program manager and GIFT coordination team. It will also review the evaluation plan and the interim report, approve preliminary and final versions to be presented to the lead stewards, and review the final report before submission to the lead stewards.

c) Obligations of the Network Director

- Facilitate the work of the evaluation;
- Provide temporary office space during the week of first consultations, and after submission of the inception and interim reports;
- Assign a member of the coordination team who will (a) provide key documents, (b) facilitate contacts with program constituents and members of governing body, and (c) facilitate access to communication/conference facilities, if useful.

d) Obligations of the Consultant(s)

- Inform the Network Director in a timely fashion of all contacts made with program constituents;
- Treat documents in a confidential manner, when appropriate;
- Not publish evaluation results or outputs without permission from the Lead Stewards;
- Return all program documents used in the evaluation;
- Report on a timely basis any possible conflicts of interest.
- Inform the Network Director about any problem or event that might affect the good development of the evaluation.

e) Obligations of Other Parties (IBP, WB, Donors, etc.)

- Provide information on all aid-financed projects in the country in that sector.
- Assist in arranging appointments with country-level stakeholders.