

Annex F: Terms of Reference (full version)

Evaluation of Danida Business-to-Business Programme

1 Background

Support to partnerships between Danish companies and companies in partner countries has in various forms been an element of the Danish development cooperation since 1993, initially under the Private Sector Development Programme, subsequently under the Business-to-Business (B2B) Programme and latest under the Danida Business Partnership Programme.

In general terms, the Danida support in this area aims at achieving development outcomes by supporting business development in a range of partner countries through the promotion of long-term and mutually committing partnerships between Danish companies and companies in partner countries.

The Danida support to business partnerships, since 2011 named Danida Business Partnerships (DBP), is an element of the Danish support to economic development as reflected in the Strategic Framework for Growth and Employment (Danida 2011). In addition to DBP, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is subsidising loans for development activities, mainly infrastructure, under the initiative Danida Business Finance (DBF, formerly Danida mixed credits). The bilateral development cooperation within the priority area of private sector development also includes sector programme support in Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Tanzania, Uganda, and Vietnam. Furthermore, Danida provides funding to a number of initiatives which were initiated by the Africa Commission (2009) and the Industrialisation Fund for Developing Countries, which acts as an adviser and co-investor for Danish enterprises' investments in developing countries.

A strategic framework for growth and employment guiding Danida development cooperation in this area was established in 2011. Prior to this, the area was guided by the overall development strategy "Partnership 2000" and the "Action plan for private sector development (2006)".

The Business-to-Business (B2B) Programme

Business partnerships were supported by Danida through the B2B Programme from July 2006 to June 2011 replacing the Danida Private Sector Development Programme. With the B2B Programme the developmental outcomes of the programme were emphasised, and more requirements in terms of project documentation and results measurement were introduced. Furthermore, the Public Private Partnership (PPP) Programme and, later, the Innovative Partnerships for Development (IPD) Programme were introduced supporting public private partnerships and partnerships that advance strategic corporate social responsibility (CSR) and socially responsible innovation.

According to the B2B Company Guidelines (last version: Danida, 2010), the overall objective of the B2B Programme was to contribute to poverty reduction by promoting economic growth and social development in developing countries. The immediate objective was to promote the establishment of long-term, sustainable and commercially viable partnerships between companies in developing countries and Danish companies, with an aim of strengthening local business devel-

opment. The B2B Programme encouraged companies in developing countries and in Denmark to form such long-term, sustainable and commercially viable partnerships and supported each partnership with advice and finance. The focus of this support was to ensure a transfer of know-how and technology from the Danish partner to the local partners thereby strengthening the competitiveness of the local partner and by that, their local and international market presence. In turn, by partnering with a local company, the Danish company could gain access to new markets, raw materials and reduced production costs.

The B2B Programme supported the establishment of contact between companies and the establishment and implementation of partnerships, normally up to a period of five years. The B2B Programme support was divided into three phases: Contact phase, pilot phase and project phase. During the contact phase, the matching process was supported by helping Danish companies to identify suitable companies in the partner country, and vice versa, and by co-funding study visits, workshops, meetings, etc. Until April 2008, the Danish Federation of Small and Medium Sized Enterprises was contracted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to assist companies in approaching the programme and in the match-making process. In the pilot phase, the B2B Programme funded expenses related to studies and the establishment of pilot projects of up to two years' duration. By the end of the pilot phase, the concept for business cooperation should be developed. Based on this concept, and a new application, the B2B Programme provided funding for the project phase related to training, environmental efficiency, CSR activities, establishment and, to a more limited extent, equipment of the partnership. The Danida share of funding was normally 90% of the cost in all phases, except for studies (75%) and for equipment (25% for normal equipment and 90% for equipment related to environmental aspects). All projects were required to include CSR/environmental activities in their project proposal. The maximum amount of support for a partnership was DKK 5 million aggregated for all phases of support. It should be noted that B2B guidelines were modified during the period of implementation.

The B2B Programme operated in developing countries with programmatic development cooperation with Denmark, the so-called Danida programme countries¹, including Egypt and South Africa. Of these countries, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Egypt, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda and Vietnam were considered focus countries of the programme. Furthermore, the programme was operating in China and Indonesia where only partnerships related to the environmental sector were supported.

The Department for Green Growth in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was responsible for policy, coordination and guidelines, whereas the implementation and administration was delegated to the Danish embassies. Full-time B2B coordinators were responsible for the day to day implementation at the embassies in the focus countries.

The total number of projects supported in the project phase is estimated to be around 250 and the total amount disbursed on these projects to date is approximately DKK 756 million. Additionally, between DKK 10-20 million have been spent annually for marketing and administration of the programme. The total grant amounts and disbursements for the programme are indicated in Table 1.

¹ Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Tanzania, Uganda, Vietnam, Zambia.

Table 1 B2B and DBP project grants and disbursements 2006-2011 (DKK)

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Grant amount	140,302,120	238,379,027	139,656,507	186,968,850	173,022,113	139,768,692
Disbursed*	123,324,693	174,498,425	112,840,876	140,148,469	133,132,451	72,257,735

* Note: Disbursements are recorded in the year the grant was committed regardless of the actual year of disbursement.

Earlier evaluations

The Business-to-Business programme in South Africa was evaluated in 2000 and the Danida Private Sector Development Programme was evaluated in 2001 (Danida, 2001). A meta-evaluation of Danida private and business sector development interventions was undertaken in 2004. Furthermore, the Danida country evaluations of development cooperation with Ghana (Danida, 2008a) and Mozambique (Danida 2008b) included aspects of the PSD/B2B programme. Furthermore, a synthesis of evaluations on support to business development was prepared in 2009 (Danida, 2009). A desk review of the “Action Plan for private sector development” was undertaken in 2010.

2 Evaluation purpose

The Evaluation will focus on both accountability and learning. The Evaluation has a dual purpose of assessing and documenting the B2B Programme as well as providing lessons for future implementation of Danida Business Partnerships.

The Evaluation will document what has worked well and less well in the achievement of the results using both quantitative and qualitative data. The Evaluation is expected to assess the support provided with regards to its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Furthermore, the Evaluation will identify the most important factors in the programme context and in relation to the characteristics of beneficiary companies that affect the programme achievements, and assess their importance.

3 Scope of work

Evaluation Period

The Evaluation will cover appropriations made under the B2B Programme from July 2006 to June 2011. In some countries, PSD Programme appropriations made just prior to the introduction of the B2B Programme were converted to B2B projects and implemented according to the B2B guidelines. Furthermore, some embassies continued to approve B2B projects in second half of 2011. These few additional projects will also be included in the Evaluation. The evaluation will furthermore take into consideration the changes made under the present programme, Danida Business Partnerships, in order to assess the changes under this programme in relation to partner selection and characteristics of participating companies. Recommendations should, as far as possible, be directed towards the present programme, Danida Business Partnerships, and it is therefore expected that the Evaluation Team will familiarize themselves with the procedures for this programme.

Type of B2B support

The Danish finance bill budget line for the B2B programme is 6.32.05.12 which also includes Public Private Partnerships, Innovative Partnerships for Development, Danish support to Global Compact and other funding initiatives related to business development. Only the B2B Programme and expenses related to the management and administration of the programme is included in this Evaluation. B2B projects in contact phase, pilot phase and project phase will be included in the analysis, but when assessing impact and sustainability, focus will be on B2B projects in the project phase.

Countries

The Evaluation will cover the B2B Programme globally and analysis will be undertaken across the entire portfolio. Field work will be undertaken in Bangladesh and Uganda and furthermore an additional number of B2B projects (approximately 30) will be selected for desk case studies.

4 Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions

The overall evaluation questions to be answered by this Evaluation are the following:

- 1) To what extent and how has the B2B Programme contributed to poverty reduction by creating growth and employment in Danida partner countries?
- 2) What lessons can be learned for improved design, implementation monitoring and management of future Danish support to strengthen local business development through partnerships with Danish businesses?

The Evaluation will apply OECD/DAC's five criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability to answer the key evaluation questions through a number of detailed questions, some of which are listed according to these criteria below.

It is acknowledged that causal links at outcome and impact level may be difficult to establish and that developments at this level are influenced by numerous factors and may evolve in a non-linear manner. The evaluation analysis should take these factors into account, but should nevertheless – where possible – document outcomes and the wider impact of the programme.

Relevance

The relevance of the overall B2B Programme objectives to Danida policies and to partner country policies should be assessed, but emphasis should be given to programme relevance at a lower and more concrete level in at least the following two aspects:

- To which extent was the B2B Programme relevant for addressing the constraints of private sector companies in the partner countries?
- To which extent did the programme stimulate the creation of international partnerships that would not otherwise have occurred?
- How appropriate was the B2B programme for – through partnerships between Danish and partner country companies - promoting the overall objectives of Danida support in relation to private sector development, i.e. poverty reduction through private sector growth and employment.

Efficiency

Due to the difficulties in establishing credible data for results at programme level and the lack of benchmarking data, the efficiency at the overall programme level is difficult to establish, and the efficiency assessment will therefore focus on specific issues, including:

- How efficient were the instruments used by the B2B Programme to establish the initial contact between companies in Denmark and in the partner countries (“match making”) and how can this effort be strengthened in future Danida support to establishing long-term, sustainable and commercially viable partnerships between companies in developing countries and Danish companies?
- Under which circumstances did the B2B Programme provide the best results in terms of achieving its objectives in relation to inputs (programme costs)? The response is expected to be based on a comparative analysis of the programme achievements between B2B projects with differences in external factors influencing the programme (local economic factors, enabling environment, sector, etc).
- To which extent was the administration and management of the programme well-balanced between ensuring control of public funds, providing easy access for private companies and providing the framework for an efficient use of Danida/embassy administrative resources?
- Is the documentation and monitoring system of the programme, and the way it has been administered, a useful basis for assessing progress and documenting results at individual project level, country level and programme level?

Effectiveness

Effectiveness is assessed at the following three levels, which relate to specific steps in the theory of change (cf. Annex 1). Where relevant, considerations regarding the counterfactual should be included by testing alternative hypotheses of change and by giving consideration to additionality, i.e. the type of activities pursued with the B2B programme support that would not have been pursued without the support.

- A number of companies engaged in a preliminary partnership in the contact phase or pilot phase did not take the cooperation further in an actual partnership project. Did any specific factors (for instance company type, motivation, financial incentives, power relationship between partners, type of partnership project, or other) systematically come into play in this process, and how can the rate of companies establishing successful partnerships be increased?
- To which extent and under which circumstances did the support under the B2B Programme lead to adoption of new knowledge or technology in the partner company?
- To which extent did the partnership, through the adoption of new knowledge or technology or otherwise, lead to an improved performance, increased employment and/or increased turnover of the local partner company?
- To which extent did the support under the B2B Programme lead to improved occupational health and safety conditions for employees?
- What was the effectiveness of environmental improvements and CSR activities introduced as part of B2B projects, or otherwise improved conditions for employees or the wider population?

Impact and sustainability

In terms of longer term development effects, the Evaluation should assess both intended and unintended, positive and negative effects of the programme intervention, including:

- To which extent, and under which circumstances, have partnerships been continued beyond the period supported by the B2B Programme, and has there been a transition to other Danida support from sector programmes, mixed credit (Danida Business Finance) or the Investment Fund for Developing Countries (IFU)?
- What were the longer term effects of the B2B partnership on the development of the local partner business, and were there any factors in the country context or company type systematically influencing the longer-term effects?
- What were the longer term effects of the B2B partnership on the Danish partner company in terms of other international strategic alliances, increased access to markets, improved competitiveness, or other? Have this led to other Danish companies investing in international strategic alliances?
- Who has benefitted from the programme and has there been a counterproductive selection bias related to gender, population groups, geography, or other factors.
- To which extent did the programme contribute to poverty reduction, increased employment and growth, both directly through the partner company and indirectly through market changes and effects on the wider economy?
- Were there any discernible longer term effects beyond the local partnership company at national level, sector level or in the local vicinity of the local partnership company in terms of technology adoption, CSR, environmental aspects, occupational health and safety, or other?
- What was the impact of the programme in terms of poverty reduction or sustained changes in livelihood for the people directly affected by the programme through employment, capacity development or CSR activities?

The Evaluation is expected to prepare recommendations to the future implementation of Danida Business Partnerships programme on the basis of the way it is currently being implemented, i.e. taking into account the recent (2013) modifications of the DBP programme guidelines.

5 Approach and Methodology

The Evaluation will be carried out in accordance with the Danida Evaluation Guidelines (January 2012) and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (2010). The Evaluation must be based on a sound methodology. The Evaluation design must be methodologically rigorous and credible when judging both the internal and external validity of the results.

Bidders are free to propose the most appropriate designs for responding to the evaluation questions indicated above. This section provides some initial thinking on the proposed approach and methodology which will need to be further developed by the Evaluation Team in the technical proposal and in the inception report through concrete and practical solutions.

The Evaluation may find some inspiration in the literature on international strategic alliances, which is defined as *a mutually beneficial agreement between at least two partners in which resources, knowledge, and capabilities are shared with the objective of enhancing the competitive position of each partner*. (Hansen, H., Klejnstrup, N.R. and Rand, J., 2013). Business partnerships are sometimes considered a mechanism for coping with risk of engaging in new activities. Some strategic alliances are established to facilitate easier access or to create new markets, whereas other alliances may seek to protect existing market positions and share the financial risk of introducing a new expensive technology, which is an investment needed to maintain current market power. Firms may also engage in strategic alliances for efficiency reasons and seek to gain economies of scale by sharing processes and/or production capabilities. As part of these processes business partnerships are often argued to facilitate learning spill-overs, which may take place through immediate transfer of new innova-

tive technology or through financial, marketing and production process channels. However, as emphasized in the technology transfer literature there may be limits to these learning effects depending on the nature of the alliance.

For instance, the Evaluation will look into whether the strategy and the motivation behind the decision to enter into business alliances under the B2B Programme are factors influencing the degree of success of the partnership (as included in the evaluation questions above).

Preparatory studies on monitoring data available for the B2B Programme and on the methodological considerations for the Evaluation (Broegaard & Broegaard, 2013) conclude that the data material does not allow for statistical analysis of programme results. Additionally, the counterfactual situation cannot be established in a convincing manner. In terms of effectiveness and impact, it appears to be most feasible to evaluate whether and under which circumstances the B2B Programme interventions worked as intended and led to positive effects. The Evaluation will therefore focus on a theory-based context-mechanism-outcome (CMO) approach. The evaluation questions above are based on this approach and focusing on specific topics of interest in view of the purpose of the Evaluation. The enclosed diagrammatic outline of the theory of change of the B2B Programme is used as the basis for defining the focus of the Evaluation and should be used and refined further in the course of the Evaluation. The intervention logic includes a number of contextual factors and assumptions which may be changed, confirmed or ranked by the Evaluation Team, thereby establishing a solid theory of change to add to the future understanding of the programme. It is expected to be possible to carry out a systematic analysis of a number of different context-mechanism-outcome configurations.

While aiming at solidifying the broad quantitative foundation as far as possible, a core of case based analysis is called for. This may again build on both qualitative and quantitative information and should have a comparative character. The analysis of cases should where possible identify relative comparison cases and a systematic comparison across different CMO constellations. If results data can be reliably established for the case studies, this may allow for considering different levels of success as part of the basis for comparison.

The following elements will be required in the overall methodology:

- A review of the relevant academic literature and of the available programme documentation. The literature review will serve as an input to determining factors in the country context that should be included in the Evaluation and what type of factors in relation to the companies that would be relevant to include in the Evaluation.
- On the basis of the portfolio overview and the existing monitoring data, an analysis should be undertaken at portfolio level according to specific factors in the country context and in the characteristics of beneficiary companies.
- Interviews with key stakeholders in Denmark and in the selected partner countries, including amongst others the relevant departments in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Danish Federation of Small and Medium Sized Enterprises, the Danish Agriculture and Food Council, the Confederation of Danish Industry, relevant Industry Associations and relevant government departments in the two field countries.
- E-survey administered to business partners. The E-survey should be used to investigate issues such as their motivation for joining the programme, their assessment of the administrative procedures, the possible effects of the B2B project and the further development of their business after the support has ended. An E-survey may also be directed towards

business partners who only participated in contact phase/pilot phase in order to establish characteristics of companies that did not proceed to the project phase. The exact scope and purpose of the E-survey(s) should be determined during the process in agreement with EVAL.

- Focus group discussions (at least two) among Danish business partners to validate findings of the e-survey.
- Field studies for in-depth case studies in Bangladesh and Uganda. The field countries have been selected on the basis of their considerable number of projects and because they are expected to represent a great variety of project cases and of context configurations. During field studies, case studies involving interviews should be undertaken with a sample of not less than 75% of the B2B projects having reached project phase² in each of the field countries. The studied cases should be selected on the basis of a systematic and deliberate sampling strategy that amongst others include size of local company, geographical location and industrial sector. Achievement of project targets and reasons for deviations should be investigated during the field trip.

A sample of local companies that have engaged in contact or pilot phase, but not in the project phase should be interviewed in order to assess the factors causing them to discontinue the partnership. Furthermore, interviews should be undertaken with programme stakeholders, government and local business associations in order to establish knowledge regarding the national context of the programme.

Where possible, examples of non-supported businesses engaging in international strategic alliances in the two countries should be selected and investigated in the same parameters as the B2B cases in order to discern any marked differences.

The Evaluation Team is expected to interview both responsible embassy staff and partners on their use of the monitoring system and the indicators. It is envisaged that two core team members and one country specific team member participate in each of the two country field visits. Follow-up field work may be required by country specific team members.

- Desk-based case studies supplemented with interviews of Danish partners, video conference with relevant B2B coordinators and possibly other stakeholders involved in the project. The selection of specific projects will be done using a systematic and deliberate sampling strategy, based on the information established during the field studies and the portfolio analysis. The size of the sample is envisaged to be around 30 projects and will be decided on the basis of criteria agreed with EVAL. Based on the initial overview, and the suggested approach it is suggested that the sample should include:
 - A variety of country context, i.e. with regards to
 - Level of economic development (within the range of the B2B countries)
 - Enabling environment for business development
 - Exposure to international markets
 - A variety of partnerships, i.e. with regards to
 - Characteristics of partners (size, activities, etc.)

² The number of projects being supported in project phase is approximately 16 for Bangladesh and 25 for Uganda.

- Prior basis for establishing partnerships (prior knowledge or not; how contact was established between partners, motivation for entering the programme, etc.)
- Types of specific objectives for the partnership, in line with the variation mentioned above.
- Different performance patterns
 - From aborted attempts to top performers – and those in between (based on data from the B2B-Indicator Report and progress reports). It should be considered to include a specific analysis of the “best cases”, to assess whether they have any common characteristics.

Preferably, cases identified during field visits of companies that have entered into international partnerships without support should be included in the analysis, in order to have a more complete set of variations in the context-mechanism-outcome configurations.

6 Documentation

All available programme documentation will be made accessible to the Evaluation Team, including:

- Overview of portfolio: The entire portfolio of B2B projects by country with information on project phase, grant size and disbursements, year of approval and current status.
- B2B-Indicator Report: The indicator report is part of the reporting system for the global B2B-program and is based on self-reported results compared to initial targets of six indicators: Gross turnover, investment in local company, local job creation (male), local job creation (female), investment in environmental measures, employees affected directly by CSR-initiatives.
- Project documents as submitted by project partners with their application.
- Appraisal notes, progress reports (to a varying degree) and Project Completion Reports.
- Review of B2B Programme at country level. These reviews exist for Bangladesh, Vietnam, Tanzania, Uganda, Mozambique, South Africa, Bolivia and Nicaragua.
- Annual Reports for B2B-programmes in the priority countries, prepared by Embassy
- Business Opportunity Profiles prepared by the Embassy for each of the B2B priority countries

The list of references in these ToR furthermore includes a number of documents that are relevant to consider for the Evaluation.

Availability of the required documentation has been assessed as part of the preparation of the Evaluation on the basis of B2B projects in the project phase in two countries (Broegaard & Broegaard, 2013). The conclusion of this assessment is that background information is available in terms of planned budgets, activities and objectives and targets. Baseline information on a few important quantitative outcome indicators is generally included (turnover, employees). For some projects, information on local context conditions is given as well. However, information is scarcer in regards to implementation and results, although observed changes in project outcome indicators are generally reported on. For outcomes related to additional project specific objectives, or to the overall development objective of poverty reduction, the available information appears less systematic than for the other indicators. Information on progress, implementation processes and costs of the activities undertaken etc. appears in general more limited than for the planning. Thus, while existing information can serve as an important point of departure for looking at the workings and results of the B2B projects, it is expected that the Evaluation will have to carry out

a substantial effort to supplement information, both in regards to data on additional subjects of importance to the selected evaluation approach, and in order to add depth and help validate existing information.

7 Outputs and milestones

Outputs

1. An inception report in draft and final version (not exceeding 30 pages excluding annexes) including:
 - preliminary findings from the desk review in so far as they affect the focus and approach of the Evaluation;
 - overview of B2B project portfolio using a typology of projects based on the desk analysis;
 - a revised overview of the theory of change for the B2B Programme
 - an evaluation matrix
 - a detailed methodology, including sampling strategy plan for the case studies,
 - a detailed work plan
 - suggested outline of the evaluation report

The draft inception report should be submitted to Danida Evaluation Department and the Evaluation Reference Group for comments, based on which a final version will be prepared for approval by EVAL.

Regarding the portfolio overview:

On the basis of the available documentation, the typology prepared for the overview of the B2B project portfolio may include the following categories:

- Country context
 - Partnership project (project phase, sector, sub-national geographic location, market orientation, technology level)
 - Partner company (size, market, sector, geographic location)
 - Danish company (size, market, sector, geographic location)
2. A debriefing note from each of the two country visits to be discussed with the Danish Embassy.
 3. An issues paper following the field work with preliminary findings and a strategy for addressing outstanding issues through desk studies, interviews, focus group discussions, survey among Danish B2B project partners and follow-up field work in selected countries. The issue paper should also include an elaborated version of the theory of change and a sample strategy for the desk case studies based on what aspects of the theory of change needs more testing.
 4. An evaluation report in draft (possibly several draft versions) and in final version according to the agreed outline not exceeding 60 pages excluding annexes and with cover photo proposals. The evaluation report must include an executive summary of maximum 8 pages, introduction and background, presentation and justification of the methodology applied, findings, conclusions and recommendations. Furthermore, the evaluation report must include a presentation of the amended theory of change for the B2B Programme / Danida Business Partnerships reflecting the findings of the Evaluation. The evaluation report should follow Danida lay out guidelines and will be made publicly available once printed by the Danida Evaluation Department.

Milestones	Date
Start-up meetings in Copenhagen	4-8 November 2013
Draft inception report	6 December 2013
Final inception report	18 December 2013
Fieldwork	January – February 2014
Issue paper	March 2014
Remaining data collection and report editing	March-April 2014
1 st Draft Evaluation report	1 May 2014
Final Evaluation Report	15 June 2014

8 Organisation of the Evaluation

Management of the Evaluation will follow the Danida Evaluation Guidelines (2012) and OECD-DAC quality standards (2010). There are three sets of roles in the evaluation process: a) the Evaluation Management b) the Evaluation Team (Consultant) and c) the Evaluation Reference Group.

Role of the Evaluation Management

The Evaluation will be supervised and managed by the Evaluation Department (EVAL) in the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The tasks of the Evaluation Management are to:

- Participate in the selection of Evaluation Team based on received tenders. The MFA contract office chairs the tender committee, assisted by an independent tender consultant.
- Coordinate with all relevant evaluation stakeholders.
- Ensure that quality control is carried out throughout the evaluation process. In so doing, EVAL may make use of external peer reviewers.
- Provide feedback to the Evaluation Team. Comment on draft versions of the inception report, work plan, progress reports and the evaluation report. Approve final reports.
- Organise and chair meetings of the Evaluation Reference Group.
- Facilitate and participate in evaluation workshops, including possibly at least one open dissemination workshop towards the end of the Evaluation.
- Organise presentation of evaluation results and follow-up on the Evaluation to internal Danida Programme Committee, the Danida Board and the Minister for Development cooperation (responsible department or embassy develop the management response).
- Advise relevant stakeholders on matters related to the Evaluation (reference is made to the Codes of Conduct, which form part of the Danida Evaluation Guidelines, and which can be found at <http://evaluation.um.dk>).

Role of the Evaluation Team (the Consultant)

The DAC evaluation principles of independence of the Evaluation Team will be applied. The Evaluation Team will carry out the Evaluation based on a contract between MFA and the incumbent company/institution. The Evaluation Team will:

Prepare and carry out the Evaluation according to the ToR, the approved Inception Report, the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and the Danida Evaluation Guidelines.

Be responsible to the Evaluation Management for the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Evaluation.

Ensure that quality assurance is carried out and documented throughout the evaluation process according to the Consultant's own Quality Assurance Plan as described in the proposal.

Report to the Evaluation Management regularly about progress of the Evaluation.

Organise and coordinate meetings and field visits, and other key events, including debriefing session and/or validation workshops in the field visit countries.

The Team Leader is responsible for the team's reporting, proper quality assurance, and for the organisation of the work of the team. The Team Leader will participate in the Evaluation Reference Groups' meetings and other meetings as required.

Suggestions provided by the Evaluation Team in the inception report and work plan will be addressed by members of the Evaluation Reference Group and the Evaluation Management prior to the initiation of the analysis and implementing fieldwork.

Role of the Evaluation Reference Group

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) will be established and chaired by EVAL. The mandate of the ERG is to provide advisory support and inputs to the Evaluation, e.g. through comments to draft reports.

The members of the ERG include:

- Representatives from relevant departments at HQ level (UFT, GRV)
- Representatives of embassies in Uganda and Bangladesh
- Representatives of Danish private sector associations
- Researchers or resource persons from DK and/or international community.

The tasks of the ERG are to:

- Comment on the draft inception report, the issue paper and draft evaluation report with a view to ensure that the Evaluation is based on factual knowledge about the B2B Programme and how it has been implemented
- Support the implementation, dissemination and follow up on the agreed evaluation recommendations
- Other key stakeholders may be consulted at strategic points in time of the Evaluation either through mail correspondence or through participation in stakeholder meetings/workshops.

The reference group will work through e-mail communication and video-conferencing mainly. Meetings will be held to discuss the draft inception report and the draft evaluation report. Members of the reference group who are not based in Copenhagen may participate through video link or by forwarding written comments in connection with the meetings.

9 Composition and Qualification of the Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team must contain substantial experience in evaluation of development assistance (i.e. evaluations that conform to the DAC evaluation definition), including evaluations of private sector support. Strong methodological and analytical skills are required, and the tender

should explain the specific experience of the suggested team with evaluation work and the specific methods applied. The team must include competence with regards to the specific context for the private sector in Bangladesh and Uganda. The team must include members(s) with knowledge of relevant Danish strategies and aid modalities, and at least one team member must be able to speak and read Danish. The ideal team combines a high level of evaluation experience with field level experience from private sector development and strong academic background related to private sector development.

The Evaluation Team is expected to consist of at least four members: Two core members with international experience who will be involved in all aspects of the Evaluation, one team member with substantial experience from Bangladesh and one team member with substantial experience from Uganda. The Tenderer can decide to include personnel for additional functions, e.g. re-search assistants. If so, they will not be assessed on an individual basis but as part of the overall team composition and backup.

The team leader and team members are expected to complement each other so that the specific profile of the proposed team leader will have implications for the team members (and vice-versa). All suggested profiles will be assessed with a view to the role, competences and tasks they are suggested to cover in the team. If a team of fewer or more persons is suggested, the reasons for this and the role of the different team members must be clarified as part of the suggestion.

The Tenders should clearly state who of the proposed team members covers which qualification criteria. The team must contain experience with all methodologies and tools suggested in the tender.

The organisation of the team's work is the responsibility of the consultant and should be specified and explained clearly in the tender. It is expected that the team leader is closely involved in the elaboration of the tender, and this should be indicated in the technical offer. The Team Leader should have an international background/experience and strong analytical skills. The Team Leader is responsible for the team's reporting to and communication with Danida EVAL, and for the organisation of the work of the team. The Team Leader will participate in meetings with EVAL as well as with the Reference Groups or Stakeholder Forums, as requested by EVAL.

More specifically, the Evaluation Team should cover the following competencies:

Qualifications of the Team Leader

General experience:

- Relevant, higher academic degree.
- A profile with major emphasis on development issues, with 10 years or more of relevant professional experience from development cooperation in several countries, preferably including work in relation to private sector development.
- Experience as team leader for multi-disciplinary teams (at least three references).

Specific experience:

- Proven capacity to lead, plan and report similar kind of complex evaluations (preferably several references e.g. as deputy team leader; at least one reference as Team Leader).
- Extensive experience in evaluation of development assistance at project, programme and strategy or country level (three or more references).
- Extensive knowledge on and experience from establishing evaluation approaches and application of evaluation methods, including theory based evaluations, contribution analysis, and mixed methods evaluation.

- Substantial experience with collecting, systematizing, analysing and reporting large amounts of different types of data. Experience with synthesis studies an advantage.

Country experience and language:

- Relevant working experience from East Africa and South Asia.
- Fluent in English.

Qualification of the expert

General experience:

- Relevant, higher academic degree.
- A profile with major emphasis on development issues, with preferably 10 years or more of relevant professional experience from development cooperation in several countries.
- Experience as team member on multi-disciplinary teams (at least three references).

Specific experience:

- Extensive knowledge on and experience from development cooperation within private sector development, preferably including issues related to company level competitiveness, international partnerships or technology transfer.
- Experience in evaluation of development assistance at project, programme and strategy or country level is an added advantage.

Country experience and language:

- Relevant working experience from East Africa and South Asia.
- Fluent in English.

Qualifications of the two country specialists

General qualifications:

- A relevant higher academic degree.
- 10 years of relevant professional experience, including experience from consultancy work.

Specific qualifications:

- Experience from development cooperation within private sector development in a case country (one team member with experience from Uganda and one team member with experience from Bangladesh).
- Experience with private sector in a case country, for instance from a national private sector organisation or from academia, could be an alternative to experience from development cooperation.
- International experience and experience from working with evaluations is preferable but not a requirement.

Qualifications within the team

Specific qualifications to be covered by at least one and preferably several of the team members:

- The team must include experience with methodologies and tools proposed in the tender, e.g. experience with qualitative and quantitative data management and analysis.

- Knowledge about Danida development cooperation.
- Experience with and ability to assess programme management, results monitoring and reporting.
- A gender balanced team is preferable.
- One team member must be able to speak and read Danish.

Team Composition

Team composition will be evaluated according to relevance and complementarity of the qualifications of the entire proposed team. Relative gender balance will be part of this assessment.

10 Eligibility

The DAC evaluation principles of independence of the Evaluation Team will be applied. In situations where conflict of interest occurs, candidates may be excluded from participation, if their participation may question the independence and impartiality of the Evaluation. Any firm or individual consultant that has participated in the preparation or implementation of support funded by the B2B Programme may be excluded from participation in the tender.

Tenderers are obliged to carefully consider issues of eligibility for individual consultants and inform the Client of any potential issues relating to a possible conflict of interest (cf. Danida Evaluation Guidelines).

11 Inputs

The total budget for the consultancy services is a maximum of DKK 2.6 million. This includes all fees and reimbursables required for the implementation of the contract. A sum of DKK 100,000 should be dedicated to undertaking stakeholder workshops.

EVAL will cover the expenditures of printing of the final evaluation report, Danish and English Summaries and any additional dissemination activities as and if agreed upon.

12 Requirements of home office support

The Evaluation Team's home office shall provide the following, to be covered by the consultants' fees:

- General home office administration and professional back-up. The back-up activities shall be specified.
- Quality assurance (QA) of the consultancy services in accordance with the Evaluation Team quality management and quality assurance system, as described in the Tender. Special emphasis will be given to quality assurance of draft reports prior to the submission of such reports.
- Implementation of the business integrity management plan, as described in the Consultants application for qualification, in relation to the present Evaluation. This implementation shall be specified.

The Tenders shall comprise a detailed description of the proposed QA, in order to document that the Tenderer has fully internalised how to implement the QA and in order to enable a subsequent verification that the QA has actually been carried out as agreed.

The Tenderer should select a QA Team, envisaged to consist of minimum two persons, to be responsible for Head Office QA. The members of the QA should not be directly involved in the Evaluation. Their CV should be included in the Tender. The QA team should have the similar competence and professional experience as the Evaluation Team. All QA activities should be properly documented and reported to Danida EVAL.

13 Documents and websites³

Broegaard & Broegaard, 2013. Approach Paper.

Danida, 2013. Layout guidelines for Evaluation Reports.

Danida 2011. Strategic Framework for Priority Area Growth and Employment 2011-2015.

MFA Webpage of the B2B Programme: <http://um.dk/en/danida-en/activities/business/partnerships/b2b-programme/>

Danida, 2009. Synthesis of evaluations on support to business development. Evaluation Study 2009/5. Ministry of Foreign affairs, Danida.

Danida 2008a. Joint Evaluation of the Ghana-Denmark Development Cooperation 1990-2006, Danida Evaluation 3/2008.

Danida 2008b. Evaluation of the Development Cooperation between Mozambique and Denmark 1992-2006, Danida Evaluation 5/2008.

Danida, 2006a. Fra privatsektor program til Business2Business Programme. Analyse af og anbefalinger til en videreudvikling af privatesektor programmet. <http://www.ft.dk/samling/20051/almdel/uru/bilag/109/242383.pdf>

Danida, 2006b. B2B company guidelines 2006-2011. See http://um.dk/da/danida-en/results/eval/reference-documents/?sc_lang=en

Danida, 2006c. Danida Action Plan for Business Sector Development. (Erhverv, vækst og udvikling: Handlingsplan for støtte til erhvervsudvikling i udviklingslandene).

Danida, 2004. Meta-Evaluation of Private and Business Sector Development Interventions, 2004/6.

Danida, 2001. Evaluation of the Private Sector Development Programme. Danida Evaluation 1/2001.

Hansen, H., Klejnstrup, N.R. and Rand, J. (2013): A Brief review of Studies with Relevance for an Evaluation of Danida Business Partnerships.

³ Danida evaluation reports and studies can be found at: http://um.dk/en/danida-en/results/eval/eval_reports/

Annex 1

Tentative B2B Programme Theory of Change: Impact pathway and context factors / assumptions

