



Terms of Reference

Apparel MYP 2016-2020 - Independent Impact Research

July 23, 2020

1. Introduction

IDH Sustainable Trade Initiative (“**IDH**”) accelerates and up-scales sustainable trade by building impact-oriented coalitions of front running companies, civil society, governments, knowledge institutions and other stakeholders in several commodity sectors. We convene the interests, strengths and knowledge of public and private partners in sustainability commodity programs that aim to mainstream international and domestic commodity markets. We jointly formulate strategic intervention plans with public and private partners, and we co-invest with partners in activities that generate public goods.

Based on these Terms of Reference, IDH aims to select a party to provide an external independent impact evaluation of the IDH Apparel Program during the multiyear plan of 2016-2020. This is a thematic evaluation that will assess the contribution and attribution of IDH Apparel program interventions in improving working conditions and reducing gender inequalities through changes in business practices, sector governance and field-level changes. This question should be assessed using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact as established by the OECD-DAC. This evaluation will focus on two of the Apparel program projects: The LABS Program and The Race to the Top Program.

IDH reserves the right to update, change, extend, postpone, withdraw or suspend the Terms of Reference, this tender, or any decision with regard to the selection or contract award. IDH is not obliged in this tender procedure to make a contract award decision or to conclude a contract with a participant. IDH reserves the right to suspend or annul the Tender Procedure at any moment in time.

Participants cannot claim compensation from IDH, any affiliated persons or entities, in any way, in case any of the aforementioned situations occur.

By handing in a proposal, participants accept all terms and reservations made in these Terms of Reference, and subsequent information and documentation in this tender procedure.

2. Background

IDH Apparel Program has been developing sustainable business models, policies on public-private projects, and collaborative improvement programs in some of the key apparel producing countries including Vietnam, Pakistan, India and Ethiopia. Our 2016-2020 strategy has two main objectives: aligning standards across the apparel industry and proving the business case for company practices that focus on the social and environmental impacts of apparel manufacturing.

IDH & gender

IDH considers gender equality both a key driver and concern for sustainability. In all sectors IDH works in, women play a role in the supply chain. However, often they have fewer opportunities for progression and are more vulnerable to exploitation. Therefore, we strive to ensure gender equality and empowerment in global supply chains through building coalitions of public-private partners



around a common strategy. Gender is a key impact theme in IDH's 2016-2020 Strategic Plan, in which we set out to embed gender equality into our transformation strategy.

The Race to the Top (RttT) is a pre-competitive, locally owned multi-stakeholder initiative, that aims to reshape Vietnam's apparel and footwear sector by promoting and enabling embedded sustainable (financial, social and environmental) manufacturing practices. Working toward long-lasting sustainable performance throughout the sector, its added value resides in broad stakeholder commitment and collaboration. Its interrelated priorities – streamlining assessments, referencing environmental best practices, improving worker-management dialogue, sustainable sourcing, and creating access to capital for improvement activities and sustainably operating factories – were determined by the stakeholders involved in Race to the Top¹.

The Life and Building Safety (LABS)² program, strives to make the apparel and footwear supply chain safe from safety risks related to structural, electrical and fire safety. The program was formally launched in Vietnam and India in August 2019 and by early 2020, over 100 factories joined the program, working through structural, fire and electrical safety assessments and remediation. As a result of the LABS methodology, the program saw a remediation rate of around 30%, improving the working conditions of over 120.000 workers. LABS works in collaboration with local governments, and looks to continue support and inform policies, it includes a project with the Ministry of Construction in Vietnam where the LABS standards are serving as the source for new industry guidelines regarding Fire Safety. Both in Vietnam and India, the National Stakeholder Committees, a public-private collaboration, are being institutionalized.

3. Objectives

The overall objective of this assignment is to assess the contribution and attribution of IDH Apparel program interventions in improving working conditions (improving worker's voice, worker safety, reducing gender inequalities, etc.) through changes in business practices, sector governance and field-level changes, focusing on two of the Apparel program projects: The LABS Program and The Race to the Top Program.

The purpose of this program evaluation is to not only assess the effectiveness of the program (2016-2020) as described in objective 1 and 2 below but also to fulfil the data needs of IDH organizational portfolio impact evaluation. For this reason, the methodological requirements that are detailed in Section 4 correspond with the evaluation method of IDH portfolio impact evaluation.

- **Objective 1:** To assess if the intended output, outcome, and impact of the targeted public goods are realized and the extend of IDH's contribution towards the change.
- **Objective 2:** To assess IDH's performance against the key research questions of Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability and Lesson learned.

Relevance

¹ <http://racetothetop.info/>

² <https://labsinitiative.com/>



1. Does IDH's program respond to relevant needs and serve well-identified beneficiaries in partner countries?
2. How does IDH's program perform according to the criteria of "additionality" of Donor Committee on Enterprise Development (DCED)?
3. To what extent was the programs' design appropriate in achieving the intended objectives?

Coherence

4. Do the LABS and The Race to the Top Programs usefully engage and develop synergies with other stakeholders in related areas?

Effectiveness

5. Have LABS and The Race to the Top achieved, or are they expected to achieve, their results objectives at the output and outcome level?
6. What are the drivers that influence women workers' inclusion and workers-management dialogue?

Efficiency

7. Are the program efforts of LABS and The Race to the Top fit for purpose to achieve results at the output and outcome level?

Impact

8. Within the LABS and The Race to the Top programs, have the objectives and results achieved at output and outcome level led to creating impact?
9. Have LABS factories effectively taken steps to protect workers from building safety risks?
10. Have RttT factories seen improvements in workers voice, women inclusion and overall working conditions?
11. Have brands adopted corporate policies to better guarantee safe/sustainable production?
12. Have brands co-invested in the creation of more sustainable factories?
13. How have IDH RttT & LABS delivered:
 - i. Policy influencing and informing
 - ii. Private and Public Standard setting
 - iii. Driving and solidifying Worker-Management Dialogue.

Sustainability

14. Within each proven business cases of private sector players, is there a business case for individual workers?
15. How do the LABS and The Race to the Top programs invest in the long-term delivery of services (e.g. through Train-the-Trainer or other means of strengthening local embeddedness)?
16. To what extent are the outcomes and impact of the LABS and The Race to the Top programs expected to continue after project completion?

Lesson Learned

17. Is the pre-established program's Theory of Change confirmed by program result?



18. What are the best practices and lessons learned on the adequacy of existing results frameworks and performance measurement?

4. Method criteria

4.1 Evaluation Framework

The evaluation framework is to be constructed based on both program-specific Theory of Change and program Proof of Concept statement (Annex 3) while taking into account of the IDH organizational Theory of Change towards the impact themes (Annex 2). The level of significance of the three frameworks aforementioned in the design of the evaluation framework can be ranked as follows: program-specific TOC > IDH organizational impact thematic TOC > Proof of Concept statement.

The evaluator is therefore expected to use program-specific TOC as the primary base while incorporating elements of IDH organizational impact thematic TOC and Proof of concept statement during the design of the framework.

In addition, considering the final deliverable will serve as the primary data source for the organizational portfolio impact evaluation (Annex 1), which assesses programs through the lens of five impact themes, the evaluator is therefore expected to write up the findings by the applicable impact theme “Living Wage and Working Conditions”. For more requirement regarding the format of the final deliverable please refer to the Section Deliverable below.

4.2 Representativeness of Results

Because the core of this evaluation is to utilize the result of the effectiveness of the individual project to extract insights of the program, evaluator needs to gain an oversight of the structure and design of the programs before embarking on data collection.

It is therefore asked of the evaluators to state explicitly in the proposal how representativeness is integrated into the design of the evaluation. It is expected of the evaluator to start the work with the construction of the overview of the project to be used as the foundation of the evaluation.

4.3 Weighing, Comparing and Aggregating Project-Level Results

The issue with representativeness is also related to results weighing and aggregation. Once a project is assessed based on whether currently available evidence (of both primary and secondary data source) is sufficient to prove changes occurred at output, outcome, and impact level, the assessment results per projects are weighted (by its scale and scope) and aggregated with other projects to arrive at a conclusion that applies to the whole program.

It is therefore asked of the evaluators to state explicitly in the proposal how the weighing mechanism is designed to take account of data of different quality and validity while considering the scale and scope of the activities described in a given evidence piece in the backdrop of the program.

4.4 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

In principle, all IDH projects that are active during 2016 – 2020 are included in this evaluation and to be assessed. However, the underlying assumption of this design is that all IDH projects would share an implementation timeline that is roughly similar, with activities initiated in January 2016 and concludes in December 2020. This applies to most of the projects with some exceptions. For



example, a project that started in the year 2020 would still be in inception phase when the evaluation starts, so to avoid programs being assessed by its achievement at the outcome and impact level, the final evaluation excludes projects that are still in inception phase or period of the first-year implementation.

In addition, the program when to be assessed by the research question of *Sustainability* “to what extent are the outcomes and impact of IDH’s interventions expected to continue after project completion?”, the scope of the evaluation should especially include projects that are implemented during 2016-2020 and have concluded before the start of the evaluation. Running projects can be included in further investigation. The evaluator is therefore expected to draw a representative sample from the list of completed projects to assess the extent of continuation of impact.

4.5 Independent Data Source for Verification and Triangulation

To reduce the potential positive bias arises from data sourced from parties of program interests, the evaluator is expected to proportionate the ratio of data from different sources, i.e. complementing data from IDH with additional or newly gathered information.

4.6 Alternative hypothesis

One key learning objective that is addressed in research question 10 is “*is the pre-established TOC confirmed by program results? Is there an alternative hypothesis in question?*”. It is therefore asked of the evaluator to use the data collected through this evaluation to confirm or disapprove the pre-established TOC that is used by the program. Is there an alternative hypothesis or other factors of perhaps of greater importance? What is the underlying assumption that is approved or disapproved by findings? It is asked of the evaluators to actively establish alternative hypotheses either at the project level or at the program level that can be tested using the data collected.

In addition, we would like to see specific descriptions in the proposal to address the following elements:

Research Plan and Analytical Tools

- Description of the research plan and methodological approach. Detailing data sources, analysis plan, measures of data triangulation and verification specific to the question.

Independent Data Source

- Description of plan for data triangulation and verification
- Description of how a panel of interviewees and group of respondents is designed to ensure representativeness and impartiality

Evidence Weighing

- The description on how the analysis of different data sources, i.e. IDH documentations, stakeholder interviews or surveys and public data, are weighted and feed into the conclusion.
- The description of how evidence of different quality weighs against each other.
- The description of how representativeness of evidence is assessed and weighted.
- Description of how the conclusion of individual projects being weighted and aggregated into an overall status report of the program



5. Scope

The scope of the research is the assessment of the public good impacts created in the living wage and working conditions IDH impact area, for the five years of the Apparel Program MYP 2016-2020. This will cover at least the initial and subsequent phases of the RttT program, and the piloting and scaling phase of the LABS Program.

The evaluation shall take stock of the overall contribution of the programs towards the impact themes and its envisioned outputs and outcomes, based on the program Theory of Changes and POCs (Annex 3), IDH Result Measurement Framework (Annex 4) and other program documents, and it shall undertake additional multi-year research to generate deeper data and insights within the impact theme.

6. Key activities for the inception phase

The following key activities need to be undertaken in the inception phase of the evaluation:

1. Design an evaluation methodology that is agreed upon by both parties

- Build upon the methodological approach of IDH portfolio evaluation (Annex 1) to design evaluation method;
- Construct the evaluation framework base on program-specific TOC, taking into account of the TOC of the five impact themes (Annex 2) and Proof of Concept statement (Annex 3);
- Establish a guidance protocol to standardize the practice amongst staff if data collection and analysis is to be conducted by multiple staff.

2. Engagement of program staff

- Conduct IDH staff interviews to contextualize IDH program evidence and gain a better understanding of IDH's role and contribution in the changes observed;

3. Construction of IDH program structure

- Through IDH staff interview and preliminary review of program document, build program overview with a basic construct of projects to demonstrate different workstreams within a program and to map out the scale of individual projects (by number of people reached and # ha land covered), also to establish the relationship between any sub-components within a program;

4. Assessment of IDH documents

- Based on the program structure and project mapping, review IDH's evidence sheet where documents to prove IDH program results are mapped against the Output, Outcome, and Impact statement in the organizational impact thematic TOC.
- Document how each piece of evidence is considered or discarded and the extent of its contribution towards a given statement in a thematic TOC the conclusion;
- Validate findings using independently sourced data such as satellite imagery, public data or primary data collected through Survey and stakeholder interviews



- Identify the evidence gap at Impact and Outcome level, base on which to design the data collection plan.

7. Deliverables

The Evaluator shall produce the following deliverables by December 15th, 2020:

The **final deliverables to include:**

- **Evaluation of workplan.**
- **Interim progress report.**
- Delivery of a draft of the final report that captures quantitative assessments and field-based insights, for internal approval.
- **PowerPoint presentation** where key findings demonstrated, one edition for external usage, one for internal learning.
- **Evaluation report with:**
 - An introductory chapter on the description of the rationale of design, problem analysis, intervention logic and intended impact, quantifying narrative with output and operational data provided by IDH. Provide an overview of the program structure and an analysis of the evolution of program strategy when necessary.
 - Independent chapters on topics of Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability, Lessons learned, provides a narrative analysis of IDH performance against the research questions detailed under evaluation objective 2;
 - Independent chapters on the impact themes that apply to the program, details narrative analysis and program dashboards of changes observed and IDH contribution, per impact themes and disaggregated by projects;
 - **Annex:**
 - A methodological document which explains how the evaluation method is designed to address requirements given in Section Methodological Requirement here includes an evaluation framework in the format of a Theory of Change (see section 4 for reference)
 - A Program structure of project overview, with a breakdown of the country, region, size of the targeted population and geographic area and intervention logic per projects.
 - A list of reference, interviewee, respondents, or academic experts engaged in the writing of the report

Deliverables of project	Deadline
Evaluation Workplan	August 28th, 2020
Interim progress report	September 30 th , 2020
Delivery of a draft report that captures quantitative assessments and field-based insights, for internal approval.	November 16th, 2020

8. Proposal guidelines

In the proposal, please provide the following:

- A succinct, well-documented approach
- Inclusion of a budget with a break-down of man-days/rate per consultant
- A clear description of the project team, relevant experience of team members and time allocation per team member
- Statement of experience (the only experience from the suggested team members is relevant)
- Description of contractors

9. Selection criteria & procedure

Grounds for exclusion

1. Tenderers shall be excluded from participation in a procurement procedure if:
 - a. they are bankrupt or being wound up, are having their affairs administered by the courts, have entered into an arrangement with creditors, have suspended business activities, are subject of proceedings concerning those matters, or are in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided for in national legislation or regulations;
 - b. they or persons having powers of representation, decision-making or control over them have been convicted of an offence concerning their professional conduct by a judgment which has the force of res judicata;
 - c. they have been guilty of grave professional misconduct proven by any means which the IDH can justify;
 - d. they have not fulfilled obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions or the payment of taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of the country in which they are established, or with those of the Netherlands or those of the country where the contract is to be performed;
 - e. they or persons having powers of representation, decision making or control over them have been the subject of a judgment which has the force of res judicata for fraud, corruption, involvement in a criminal organization, money laundering or any other illegal activity, where such illegal activity is detrimental to the MFA's financial interests.

Tenderers must confirm in writing that they are not in one of the situations as listed above.

2. Tenderers shall not make use of child labor or forced labor and/or practice discrimination and they shall respect the right to freedom of association and the right to organize and engage in collective bargaining, in accordance with the core conventions of the International Labor Organization (ILO).



Consultant/Consultancy profile

The consultant(s) need to have the following experience/knowledge:

- Previous evaluation experience in developing countries, and ideally country experience in India and Vietnam, is required.
- Comfort and experience with mixed methods, including examples that draw on qualitative and quantitative approaches;
- Experience with data collection, data analysis and reporting
- Experience using rights-based approach to evaluation;
- At least one team member with experience in the apparel and footwear industry.

The consultant(s) need to have the following skills:

- Skilled communicators with excellent observation, synthesis, listening capabilities;
- High emotional intelligence required to set and manage expectations around roles and outcomes;
- Comfort with using a range of context-specific evaluation techniques and approaches, with the ability to iterate and adapt;
- Ability to engage a diverse range of internal and external stakeholders, across and within multiple levels of an organization,
- Able to work independently
- Fluent in English;

We would like to receive the CV of the consultant(s).

10. Procedure

The procedure will be as follows:

- Inviting consultancy companies for presenting a full proposal based on the TOR;
- Pitching of the proposal for the IDH program teams;
- A decision on selection of consultancy;
- Inception Meeting with the selected consultancy company.

Tender process	Timeline
Terms of Reference published	July 15 th , 2020
Deadline for submission of proposals*	July 31 st , 2020
Pitching of the proposal for program teams	August 10 th – 17 th 2020
Selection of consultancy	August 21 st , 2020
Awarding of the contract to successful consultant	September 14 th , 2020

* Proposals submitted after the deadline will be returned and will not be considered in the tender procedure.

IDH will reject offers if any illegal or corrupt practices have taken place in connection with the award or the tender procedure.



11. Evaluation Method for selection criteria

- Minimum Eligibility and Qualification – In general terms, services providers that meet the criteria specified in section 9 may be considered qualified;
- If the profile and minimum eligibility are fulfilled, IDH shall review and evaluate the Technical and Financial proposals on the basis of their competence to comply with the scope of this proposal, as described in section 9.

12. Confidentiality

The Tenderer will ensure that all its contacts with IDH, with regards to the Tender, during the tender procedure take place exclusively in writing by e-mail to Marine Assahira via assahira@idhtrade.org. The Tenderer is thus explicitly prohibited, to prevent discrimination of the other Tenderers and to ensure the diligence of the procedure, to have any contact whatsoever regarding the tender with any other persons of IDH than the person stated in the first sentence of this paragraph.

The documents provided by or on behalf of IDH will be handled with confidentiality. The Tenderer will also impose a duty of confidentiality on any parties that it engages. Any breach of the duty of confidentiality by the Tenderer or its engaged third parties will give IDH grounds for exclusion of the Tenderer, without requiring any prior written or verbal warning.

All information, documents and other requested or provided data submitted by the Tenderers will be handled with due care and confidentiality by IDH. The provided information will after evaluation by IDH be filed as confidential. The provided information will not be returned to the Tenderer.

13. Contact information

Marine Assahira
Program Officer
+31 6 11835915
[E-mail - assahira@idhtrade.org](mailto:assahira@idhtrade.org)

Attached to and integral part of this ToR are:

- Annex 1: IDH Portfolio Impact Evaluation
- Annex 2: the IDH organizational Theory of Change towards the impact themes
- Annex 3: RttT and LABS Theory of Change/Proof of Concept
- Annex 4: IDH Result Measurement Framework