

MODEL CALLDOWN CONTRACT

Framework Agreement with: e-Pact led by Oxford Policy Management led by ITAD

Framework Agreement for: Global Evaluation Framework Agreement (GEFA)

Framework Agreement Purchase Order Number: 7448

Call-down Contract For: Evaluation and Learning Unit for DFID's Stamping out Slavery in Nigeria Programme.

Contract Purchase Order Number: 10004

I refer to the following:

1. The above mentioned Framework Agreement dated 11 September 2018;
2. Your proposal of **25 October 2019**

and I confirm that DFID requires you to provide the Services (Annex A), under the Terms and Conditions of the Framework Agreement which shall apply to this Call-down Contract as if expressly incorporated herein.

1. Commencement and Duration of the Services

- 1.1 The Supplier shall start the Services no later than **20 December 2019** ("the Start Date") and the Services shall be completed by **15 August 2023** ("the End Date") unless the Call-down Contract is terminated earlier in accordance with the Terms and Conditions of the Framework Agreement.

2. Recipient

- 2.1 DFID requires the Supplier to provide the Services to the DFID Nigeria ("the Recipient").

3. Financial Limit

- 3.1 Payments under this Call-down Contract shall not, exceed **£772,993.20** ("the Financial Limit") and is inclusive of any government tax, if applicable as detailed in Annex B. **OR**

When Payments shall be made on a 'Milestone Payment Basis' the following Clause 16.1 shall be substituted for Clause 16.1 of the Framework Agreement.

16 Milestone Payments

16.1 Where the applicable payment mechanism is "Milestone Payment", invoice(s) shall be submitted for the amount(s) indicated in Annex B and payments will be made when the relevant milestone is achieved in its final form by the Supplier. Payments pursuant to clause 16.1 are subject to the satisfaction of DFID's Project Officer in relation to the performance by the Supplier of its obligations under the Call-down Contract and to verification by the Project Officer that all prior payments made to the Supplier under this Call-down Contract were properly due.

4. DFID Officials

4.1 The Project Officer is:

REDACTED

4.2 The Contract Officer is:

REDACTED

5. Key Personnel

The following of the Supplier's Personnel cannot be substituted by the Supplier without DFID's prior written consent:

Name	Proposed Role
REDACTED	REDACTED
REDACTED	REDACTED
REDACTED	REDACTED
REDACTED	REDACTED
REDACTED	REDACTED
REDACTED	REDACTED
REDACTED	REDACTED
REDACTED	REDACTED
REDACTED	REDACTED
REDACTED	REDACTED

6. Reports

6.1 The Supplier shall submit project reports in accordance with the Terms of Reference/Scope of Work at Annex A.

7. Duty of Care

All Supplier Personnel (as defined in Section 2 of the Agreement) engaged under this Call-down Contract will come under the duty of care of the Supplier:

- I. The Supplier will be responsible for all security arrangements and Her Majesty's Government accepts no responsibility for the health, safety and security of individuals or property whilst travelling.
- II. The Supplier will be responsible for taking out insurance in respect of death or personal injury, damage to or loss of property, and will indemnify and keep indemnified DFID in respect of:
 - II.1. Any loss, damage or claim, howsoever arising out of, or relating to negligence by the Supplier, the Supplier's Personnel, or by any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier, in connection with the performance of the Call-down Contract;
 - II.2. Any claim, howsoever arising, by the Supplier's Personnel or any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier, in connection with their performance under this Call-down Contract.
- III. The Supplier will ensure that such insurance arrangements as are made in respect of the Supplier's Personnel, or any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier are

reasonable and prudent in all circumstances, including in respect of death, injury or disablement, and emergency medical expenses.

- IV. The costs of any insurance specifically taken out by the Supplier to support the performance of this Call-down Contract in relation to Duty of Care may be included as part of the management costs of the project and must be separately identified in all financial reporting relating to the project.
- V. Where DFID is providing any specific security arrangements for Suppliers in relation to the Call-down Contract, these will be detailed in the Terms of Reference.

8 Extension Options

- 8.1 DFID will reserve the right to extend the contract timeframe by up to 24 months. The total value available for any potential extension shall not exceed £386,496.60. The total contract value shall not exceed £1,159,489.80 including all extension options. Approval of any such amendment will be made in agreement between DFID and the potential supplier regarding extension scope, deliverables, outputs and cost.

9. Call-down Contract Signature

- 9.1 If the original Form of Call-down Contract is not returned to the Contract Officer (as identified at clause 4 above) duly completed, signed and dated on behalf of the Supplier within 15 working days of the date of signature on behalf of DFID, DFID will be entitled, at its sole discretion, to declare this Call-down Contract void.

For and on behalf of
The Secretary of State for
International Development

Name:

Position:

Signature:

Date:

For and on behalf of

Name:

[

Position:

Signature:

Date:

Model Calldown Contract Amendment Letter

Department for International Development
Abercrombie House
Eaglesham Road
EAST KILBRIDE
Glasgow
G75 8EA

Telephone: East Kilbride 01355 84 4000
Directline: 01355 84 []

File Ref: []
Date: []

Contract Amendment No: []

CONTRACT FOR: []

CONTRACT NUMBER: []

1. With reference to the contractual letter dated [] (as most recently amended by the letter dated []) whereby your firm [(in association with [])] was engaged to [] and with reference to your letter(s) of [] and subsequent discussion, I confirm that the UK Government wishes to make the following further amendment(s) to the letter of []:
2. These / This amendment(s) relate(s) to []
3. Please confirm in writing by signing and returning one copy of this letter, within 15 working days of the date of signature on behalf of DFID that you accept the amendment(s) set out herein.
4. Please note the provision in the contractual letter that the financial limit of the UK Government's liability to the Supplier under this engagement shall not exceed the sum specified unless the amount of any such excess has been agreed by the Department for International Development in writing before the Supplier takes any action which might result in the financial limit being exceeded.

For and on behalf of the
Secretary of State
for International Development

Name:

Position:

Signature:

Date:

For and on behalf of

Name:

Signature:

Date:

Section 4 Appendix A

Terms of Reference

**Independent Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Unit for
DFID Nigeria's Stamping out Slavery Programme (SoSiN)**

Approximately December 2019 to August 2023

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION	7
2 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	7
3 BACKGROUND	25
4 THE RECIPIENT	10
5 SCOPE OF WORK & REQUIREMENTS	10
6 DATA SOURCES	16
7 REPORTING	17
8 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS	17
9 SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE	20
10 BUDGET	21
11 SCALE	21
12 TIMEFRAME AND BREAK POINTS	22
13 GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS	22
14 CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS	22
15 RISKS, CONSTRAINTS & DEPENDANCIES	23

Annexes

Appendix A of Contract Section 3 (Terms of Reference)
Schedule of Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects

Annex 1 Summary Risk Assessment Matrix

Annex 2 Terms of Reference for the main SoSiN contract.

Annex 3 SoSiN Redacted Business Case

INTRODUCTION

DFID is seeking a Supplier¹ to provide an independent Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Unit from approximately **December 2019 to August 2023** to support DFID Nigeria's Stamping out Slavery in Nigeria programme (SoSiN). Up to £800,000 has been allocated for the establishment of this independent MEL component to help ensure robust monitoring, mid- and end-term evaluations, and support programme learning and adaptation.

DFID Nigeria's new anti-modern slavery programme, SoSiN, aims to improve the evidence base on modern slavery, and develop and test new and innovative approaches to tackling human trafficking, mainly in Edo State, the epi-centre of human trafficking in Nigeria. There will be a focus on prevention, based on changing social norms and attitudes, which have enabled traffickers to operate. Over the period 2018 – 2023, DFID will provide £10m to various organisations to tackle human trafficking:

- Up to £600,000 on accountable grants to CSOs for a pilot and preparatory interventions in the first two years of the programme.
- £800,000 to the UK Home Office for a national communications campaign and other short-term activities. (This is out of the scope for this independent MEL contract, as it is covered by a separate Home Office MEL service provider - although the Supplier will need to be aware of both the activities and the additional MEL).
- An £7.75m competitively tendered programme to be delivered a contractor ('SoSiN Main Supplier')

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

Learning is the primary purpose of this contract. DFID Nigeria wants to effectively evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions to contribute to learning lessons during implementation in order to manage SoSiN robustly and achieve value for money. DFID Nigeria also seeks to contribute to the wider evidence based on interventions that engage with modern day slavery, in Nigeria and elsewhere, which is a key priority for HM Government.

The MEL Unit will also understand and provide suggestions for improving the quality of data generated by the SoSiN programme itself. Such a focus on quality in SoSiN main supplier's own systems will contribute to the learning purpose and at the same time **strengthen accountability between DFID and its implementing partners.**

The specific objectives of the contract are as follows:

- To contribute to the **quality** of the monitoring and learning systems designed by SoSiN's main supplier during the life cycle of the project, through desk-based review of systems as designed and through verification of data collected on a sample basis; and through advice and recommendations to SoSiN.
- To provide **formative** independent theory-based performance evaluation during the lifetime of the programme to inform course corrections by DFID and its partners in the design and delivery of the main supplier SoSiN programme, during its lifetime.
- To provide **summative** independent theory-based performance evaluation in the final year of the main supplier SoSiN programme to contribute to its Programme Completion

¹ The term "Supplier" is used throughout this ToR to represent the company, NGO, or group of companies/NGOs/individuals who might bid for this contract. Tenders can be made by single organisations or groups. (confirm language appropriate for procurement through GEFA)

Report, to the evidence base, and for any decisions for programme or interventions which may follow on from the SoSiN project.

- Share learning and key findings on the 'Learning Platform', developed as part of the main supplier SoSiN programme.

The expected **impact** of the MEL unit is: Improved performance and accountability of SoSiN, and a contribution to the evidence base on modern slavery. The expected **outcome** is:

- Strengthened programme delivery and accountability through a greater understanding of the quality of programme implementation, highlighting of potential risks, and verification and triangulation of results
- Appropriate programme adaptation based on evidence and learning generated across the programme
- Understanding and evidence of the programme's contribution to intended impact and outcomes
- A stronger evidence base for action in modern slavery prevention, and learning platforms operating and informing policy and interventions.

Independent monitoring is expected to provide DFID with a greater assurance of the (output and to some extent outcome level) results being achieved by the SoSiN programme and its downstream partners. This component will comprise a review of the monitoring and learning systems as designed as well as verification and triangulation of partners' monitoring and results data collection as implemented. Insights gathered through independent monitoring will be used by DFID to improve understanding of implementing partners' activities, performance, and the quality of learning and adaptation processes.

Independent monitoring through this contract is **not** designed to replace programme and project level monitoring and learning activity which is the responsibility of the SoSiN main supplier, **nor** will it replace DFID staff conducting regular monitoring visits. Furthermore, the independent monitoring mechanism is not designed to investigate or highlight fraud² and is instead a tool to support the management of overall portfolio and programme risk.

The **independent performance evaluations** are expected to provide evidence of the programme's contribution to intended outcomes and impact, allowing DFID to assess the extent to which investment in this programmatic area generates value. Furthermore, the evaluation will contribute to the evidence and knowledge base on modern slavery by generating learning and evidence on key components of the programme theory of change.

DFID is encouraging bids from teams/consortia with a proven track record of delivering MEL for flexible and/or adaptive programmes, independent monitoring, and mixed-method evaluations testing causal pathways. Technical expertise and experience of carrying out MEL or research on social, attitudinal and norm change is essential, and experience on human trafficking, irregular migration or modern slavery is desirable. It is expected that this service will combine international MEL expertise with local expertise in Nigeria and ensuring strong understanding of the local context and collecting reliable data from a population that is, often but not always, hidden.

² If fraud is suspected the Supplier would have a duty to report it to DFID.

The SoSiN Programme

The Business Case for this programme is Annexed to these Terms of Reference. It outlines a theory of change of the programme which remains current at the time of writing. The **overall goal** of the SoSiN programme is to change or reduce the behaviours, attitudes, and social norms in Edo State, and potentially neighbouring states, that drive or enable human trafficking.

The **impact** of the SoSiN programme is: more effective Government and Non-Government institutions to reduce the drivers and enablers of unsafe migration and trafficking.

To achieve this impact, the SoSiN theory of change identifies three outcomes:

- **Strengthened Edo State Government response to preventing unsafe migration and human trafficking:** more effective and innovative use of resources – human, financial, physical, political and network assets – supports a ‘whole of government’ approach to preventing unsafe migration and human trafficking through social and attitudinal change;
- **Improved coordination, innovation and quality of NGO response to preventing unsafe migration and human trafficking:** better coordinated and more effective civil society tackling the drivers and enablers of human trafficking
- **A stronger evidence base for action in anti-slavery prevention, with learning platforms operating and informing policy and interventions:** the use of evidence and sharing of best practices becomes embedded in ways of working, to deliver improved performance not only in Nigeria, but globally.

DFID’s SoSiN programme aims to test new and innovative approaches to tackling slavery in Edo State. There are four components to the whole SoSiN programme:

- *Component 1:* A competitive contract with a service provider, of up to £7.75m. This will be to provide 1.1 technical assistance to strengthen the Edo State Government’s response; 1.2 civil society challenge fund to provide grant support to CSOs; and 1.3 global partnership and learning.
- *Component 2:* Provision of £800,000 to the UK Home Office to build on their existing relationships at the federal level.
- *Component 3:* *Up to £600,000 accountable grant for one or more CSOs to test and develop pilot interventions over 12 – 18 months on changing behaviours in Edo State.*
- *Component 4:* A £850,000 independent MEL Unit. A separate component to manage project services procured directly by DFID Nigeria. This includes delivery of an independent theory-based impact evaluation comprising baseline, mid-line and end-line assessments; and verification of log-frame results reporting.

The programme uses a deliberate adaptive, testing and learning approach to contribute to strengthening the evidence base on modern slavery and delivering outcomes for beneficiaries. SoSiN intends to test and adapt new innovative approaches and technologies to tackle modern slavery at scale. Depending on the existing relative standards of evidence, outputs may be refined after further scoping. Adaptive programme components will build in rapid feedback loops to test what works and make systematic use of beneficiary feedback to adapt interventions and respond to the specific needs of the most vulnerable and marginalised where possible. This rapid testing will be the responsibility of the SoSiN programme rather the evaluation supplier.

SoSiN will select a number of downstream partners in Edo State, however the number of downstream partners is still unknown. This may include individual CSOs or a consortium. Downstream partners may include international NGOs, local civil society organisations, or social enterprises.

3.13 The programme will be deliberately inclusive in an effort to test and improve the targeting of interventions to the specific needs of those most vulnerable to exploitation. Partners are

requested to ensure that the programme considers gender-related differences in need, and the need to reduce gender inequality. Data will be disaggregated by age, sex and disability (using the short Washington Group questions) where possible and relevant. Beneficiary feedback is to be systematically used by partners to (a) inform intervention targeting, design and implementation, (b) to empower beneficiaries with a voice in decisions that affect them, (c) to strengthen donor and delivery partners' accountability to beneficiaries and (d) allow the measurement of more intangible benefits and pick up unintended consequences of the programme, including safeguarding risks. SoSiN and downstream partners will be required to provide evidence of adequate safeguarding arrangements with policies and mechanisms in place to give assurance on compliance, including ensuring particularly vulnerable and hard to reach groups are protected.

THE RECIPIENT

The **recipient of these services** is DFID Nigeria.

The **primary target audience** for the products from this contract is the wider management and governance structure of the SoSiN programme, and the community of anti-slavery practitioners in Nigeria and globally.

The **secondary audiences** for the products from this contract are as follows:

- I. For independent monitoring and technical advice: potential other donors to the Fund.
- II. For the performance evaluation a wider audience will be relevant including: DFID country offices; other Government departments working on modern slavery; other donors, private sector and civil society organisations working towards eliminating modern slavery; research organisations.
- III. Where outputs are expected to be published the secondary audience would include the UK public.

SCOPE OF WORK & REQUIREMENTS

The work of the Supplier will be divided into two key components further elaborated below, namely:

1. Provision of data quality assurance for the SOSIN interventions.
2. An independent performance evaluation for DFID's investment in SOSIN

The outputs of the contract, to be achieved by the Supplier over the period June 2019 to August 2023 are outlined in detail below. Milestones for component 1 (data quality assurance) will be confirmed at the end of the design phase, pending the selection of partners and co-creation of projects.

The Supplier bid should set out the proposed approaches and methodology that will be used to deliver each component and meet the requirements as outlined below. Bids should consider the scarcity of data and evidence on modern slavery, the challenge of measuring change in a largely hidden population and of establishing causality and drivers, the complex contexts in which interventions are implemented, and potential sources of bias. The use of innovative approaches and techniques to facilitate learning processes and soliciting the views and feedback of beneficiaries (including the most marginalised) and relevant stakeholders is highly encouraged.

The Supplier is expected to present its findings in ways that are accessible to the different intended users. This involves ensuring that reports and information products under this contract are timely, concise, clear and accessible.

The Supplier will be responsible for managing and storing all data it collects in line with ethical and data protection guidelines, including ensuring it meets GDPR requirements.

Component One: Provision of data quality assurance for the SoSiN interventions.

Independent monitoring will involve working with SoSiN and downstream partners. SoSiN implementing partners will from the outset be led to expect and required to support the proposed approach to independent monitoring and will inform and engage downstream partners.

The Supplier will verify and triangulate partner results data at the activity and output level as well as undertake wider data collection and analysis in relation to the project-level theories of change as relevant (e.g. assumptions, testing of evidence links).

The proposed methodology for independent monitoring should integrate qualitative and quantitative techniques to ensure proper triangulation of information. The proposals should set out an approach to verifying the accuracy of reported data and quality of outputs and collecting a wide range of beneficiary and non-beneficiary feedback. This should include:

- I. Verifying partner quantitative results reporting, including opportunities and challenges for data disaggregation by sex, age, disability, location (and other potentially relevant variables such as caste);
- II. Verifying the quality of targeting approaches, programme implementation, and outputs (considering e.g. gender sensitivity and inclusiveness)
- III. Collecting a wide range of beneficiary, non-beneficiary and key stakeholder feedback through the use of key informant interviews, focus groups and other methods (e.g. in relation to relevance, appropriateness, quality of service);
- IV. Capturing and analysing potential unintended consequences of the programme (positive or negative);
- V. Analysing, triangulating and synthesising the information into standardised reports and actionable summaries which include the use of dashboards and data visualisation as relevant.

The use of innovative monitoring and sampling methods and techniques is encouraged, including the potential use of digital data collection methods where appropriate.

It is envisaged that a suite of monitoring tools will be used to meet the needs for independent monitoring services including, but not limited to, field observations, focus group discussions, beneficiary interviews, and key informant interviews. The monitoring approach is expected to include a substantial component of beneficiary feedback, and to explore the perspectives of a wide demographic, including vulnerable groups.³

Proposed approaches to beneficiary feedback must take into account relevant population characteristics (i.e. sex, age, disability and location). In addition, they must ensure that beneficiary engagement is used not only to verify results but also to hold DFID and its partners accountable to affected populations where feasible. Non-beneficiary feedback to triangulate results might include key informant interviews with programme delivery staff, government officials and other key stakeholders as well as those who have not been exposed to the programme.

- 1.1 We expect that monitoring will go beyond simply verifying logframe indicators, and fidelity to established workplans and implementation strategies. It should also embrace complexity, tracking the unpredictable actors and results outside the programme that contribute to the overall objective beyond those originally noted in the logframe.

³ Suppliers will be expected to outline their approach to beneficiary feedback, ethical protocols and data management procedures to ensure data collection does not put staff/field monitors, partners and/or beneficiaries at risk, and ensures DFID's safeguarding standards are met.

The Supplier must produce short, high quality independent monitoring reports after each project monitoring visit which provides actionable recommendations in an accessible manner and will be used to strengthen the programme, using dashboards and data visualisation, as appropriate. Such reporting will also be used as an input to DFID's Annual Review of the programme.

Criteria for sequencing of visits to partner projects and sites will be agreed between DFID and the Supplier during the inception phase (e.g. projects with high risk, high spend). The supplier is expected to undertake one data quality assessment field visits per partner each year. An exact schedule for visits may differ per project and will be determined and agreed based on the number of projects, partners, sites, and other relevant considerations. The latter may include the findings of previous monitoring visits, partner MEL capacity, the start of new activities, and level of risk.

The recommendations from independent monitoring will be taken on board by the DFID programme management team and used as points for discussion with the SoSiN main supplier. The SoSiN main supplier will also be required to respond in writing to the findings highlighted by the independent monitoring. The SoSiN main supplier in turn is expected to share the independent monitoring findings and recommendations with downstream partners. As a result, we expect partners to learn and adapt implementation and strengthen their accountability systems. Where relevant, the insights and lessons from independent monitoring will be shared more broadly within DFID, government officials and with other donors.

The methodological approach, tools and the sampling approach for independent monitoring and wider data collection will be agreed with DFID during the inception phase for this output. What is included as part of the field visits and monitoring reports will also be agreed with the Supplier during the inception period.

With respect this data quality assurance component proposals are expected to address the following elements:

- The Supplier's understanding of the programme design and DFID's requirements for data quality assurance
- An approach to using the inception phase **to build understanding** of the programme's approach to results monitoring
- An outline design for the annual independent monitoring exercise that will meet DFID's requirements (to monitor accuracy, quality, beneficiary feedback, and unintended consequences).
- A description of how findings can be effectively communicated to different audiences (for example using a mock-up or skeleton of reporting)
- A description of the resources, risks and mitigations associated with the suggested design.

Component Two: An independent performance evaluation for DFID's investment in SoSiN

Evaluation purpose and objectives

The evaluation serves the dual purpose of accountability and learning, with emphasis on the latter. Given the anticipated challenges and difficulties in establishing clear attribution, the evaluation aims to assess contribution to stated outcomes and impact.⁴ The evaluation is expected to provide evidence of whether DFID's investment has influenced intended outcomes and impact, allowing DFID to assess the extent to which investment in this programmatic area generates value. Furthermore, the evaluation will contribute to the evidence base on modern slavery by generating learning and evidence on key parts of the programme theory of change. The supplier is expected to use learning from the evaluation and adapt accordingly, and actively seek out key evidence gaps that the evaluation will fill.

The specific objectives of this evaluation are to:

- Assess the programme's contribution to intended outcomes and impact and the prospect for sustainability of effects;
- Identify whether the programme has contributed to any unintended consequences or effects (positive or negative); and
- Generate evidence and learning to inform programme design and implementation to maximize operational effectiveness.

The programme theory of change and log frame will act as the reference point and guide the finalisation of evaluation questions. The evaluation will interrogate the (iterations of the) programme theory of change and investigate key parts of the theory of change, including whether assumptions underpinning the causal pathways hold true. The programme will be evaluated against the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability. Efficiency will not be covered in order to limit the scope of the evaluation and considering that value for money measures will be tracked throughout programme implementation.

Evaluation questions

Specific evaluation questions will be further refined during the inception phase and throughout programme implementation and be dependent on operational evidence needs. They will be agreed in collaboration with DFID and SoSiN. Expected questions are listed below, though we envisage the formative and final evaluations are likely to emphasise different criteria and questions (for example the formative report may emphasise questions related to relevance; the summative report might have more emphasis on effectiveness).

Relevance

- To what extent were iterations of the programme's theory of change relevant given the objectives and target groups?
- How successful was the programme in coordinating and collaborating with other actors in the modern slavery sector to ensure complementarity and additionality?
- How successful was the programme in continually adapting to the context and an evolving understanding of that context?
- What changes would be required to increase the relevance of the programme and interventions?
- Have causes and drivers of modern slavery been successfully identified?

Effectiveness

⁴ DFID defines *Performance Evaluation* as the assessment of "an intervention on the basis of its contribution to development outcomes and impacts within its context". Typically, performance evaluation is primarily concerned with assessing the contribution of a programme to development outcomes and impacts and primarily focuses on questions of its contribution to change - 'has it made a difference?' rather than 'what impact did it have?'. A performance evaluation goes beyond assessing the delivery process to assess the contribution of a programme to observed changes in outcomes and impacts, and to assess whether a programme has achieved its objectives.

- How and to what extent has the programme contributed to a reduction in the drivers of modern slavery in the sectors and communities targeted by SoSiN
 - Including: How and to what extent has the programme contributed to a reduction in the culture, social norms, attitudes and behaviours of modern slavery in the sectors and communities targeted by SoSiN
- How and to what extent has the programme contributed to a reduction in the prevalence
- of modern slavery in the sectors and communities targeted by SoSiN?
- To what extent has SoSiN's portfolio of interventions contributed towards a more effective State Government response to modern day slavery?
- To what extent has SoSiN's portfolio of interventions contributed towards a more effective non-governmental response to modern day slavery?
- To what extent has the programme contributed towards an increased, credible evidence base on the prevalence and drivers of modern slavery, and to the use of that evidence?
- Has the programme enhanced innovative ways of working on modern slavery that could be replicated elsewhere?
- Has the programme demonstrated the 4E's (economy, efficiency, effectiveness, equity) of Value for Money through its preventive approach and as stated in the Theory of Change and Business Case?
- Did the intervention(s) successfully target those most at risk, and the specific needs of the most vulnerable? If no, what prevented this?
- Were there any unintended (positive or negative) outcomes or effects of the programme?
- What changes would be required to increase effectiveness of the programme and interventions?

Sustainability

- To what extent are programme impacts likely to be sustained without further intervention?
- What additional measures need to be put in place to maximise sustainability?

The evaluation should also consider issues such as gender, poverty, disability and other forms of vulnerability that are relevant to the understanding of the success of the project.

Methodology

The Supplier is expected to develop a rigorous evaluation design and methodology during the inception phase. DFID would expect an evaluation design that takes a mixed methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches. Furthermore, the evaluation should combine primary data collection with secondary evidence synthesis and analysis from existing sources (see information on data sources below).

The Supplier will be responsible for proposing and implementing the most suitable approach and methodologies to respond to the proposed evaluation questions and the above-mentioned challenges (e.g. hidden population, difficulty in establishing causality; difficulties in evaluating programmes based on social norms, and highly gendered programming).

An evaluation design which draws on a theory-driven approach such as contribution analysis or realist evaluation could potentially be useful for examining outcomes. DFID would also expect the evaluation to include a political economy analysis or to draw explicitly on political economy analysis principles to ensure it takes sufficient account of the context the SoSiN project is operating within.

Within the overall design it is expected that some elements of outcome achievement (effectiveness) can be evaluated using quantitative methods such as quasi-experimental methods which build

on the quantitative data collected by SoSiN itself (verified by the MEL supplier) and which might be augmented by additional primary collection of quantitative data by the MEL supplier among relevant populations.

The evaluation should adhere to international best practice standards in evaluation, including the OECD DAC International Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, the OECD DAC Principles for Development Evaluation, and DFID's Ethics Principles for Research and Evaluation.

The evaluation team should work in close partnership with other research exercises within or associated with the SoSiN programme (the CLEEN Foundation/Pathfinder research on enablers of trafficking, BBC Media pilots of innovative media approaches to slavery prevention, and the CEDIL Independent research on impact of media programmes on behavioural change), ensuring maximum complementarity between projects.

Bidders are invited to propose an appropriate initial evaluation design and methodology to answer the stated evaluation questions, and also to set out the potential risks and challenges for the evaluation and how these will be managed.

It is likely that the initial evaluation design will need to be adjusted in response to changes in context and with the programme itself. Therefore, the Approach Paper for the final evaluation will be a key opportunity for the Supplier to adjust and finalise the evaluation design.

With respect to this performance evaluation component proposals are expected to address the following elements:

- The Supplier's **understanding** of the context, the broader evidence base, the programme and the evaluation purpose and objectives
- An approach to working DFID and other stakeholders to further **unpack the theory of change and refine the evaluation questions**.
- An indication of the possible evaluation **approach and design** which will combine quantitative and qualitative methods (for example using the principles of realist evaluation) in order to meet the purpose and objectives outlined above. This should include timelines, indicative resource allocations, risks and mitigations.
- Strategies and approaches to ensuring the evaluation can **respond to changes** in the context and in the SoSiN programme.
- An outline approach to communicating effectively to different audiences.

Key tasks and deliverables for the evaluation

The key tasks and deliverables for this TOR are as follows:

Task 1 (Completed at Inception Phase – by January 2020): Upon review of existing programme documentation and meetings with DFID and SoSiN, the Supplier will develop and draft an Evaluation Design Report during the inception phase. The Evaluation Design Report outline will be developed in consultation with the DFID Evaluation adviser. The report should set out:

- Finalised evaluation questions
 - Detailed evaluation framework outlining methodological approach, intended data sources, data collection and analysis, data quality assurance mechanisms
 - A communication and dissemination strategy that focuses on maximizing the utility of the evaluation and ensures that it is embedded in the broader uptake strategy of the MEL unit.
 - A review of the main risks and challenges for the evaluation and how these will be managed
 - Outline of how ethical standards will be applied
 - Draft outline of the interim and final evaluation report
 - An evaluation timeline and workplan with proposed times for revision (the Supplier will be responsible for sequencing this work plan with the other outputs of the MEL unit)

Task 2: To ensure the independence and effective governance of the evaluation, the design will be signed off by the DFID Evaluation Adviser and a Reference Group organised by DFID will provide technical input. The Evaluation Design Report will also be quality assured by DFID's Evaluation Quality Assurance Service (EQUALS). All feedback and response to feedback will be documented by the Supplier in an annex to the final Evaluation Design Report. The Supplier will continue to maintain the Evaluation Design Report as the evaluation develops. It will remain a living document that is updated by the Supplier as necessary and resubmitted to DFID and the Reference Group as necessary.

Task 3: Tools and protocols for data collection and analysis will be shared with and approved by DFID prior to the start of data collection. The Evaluator will be responsible for using a Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations matrix to document data synthesis and analysis.

Task 4: Development of an Interim Evaluation Report (year 2) presenting findings from data collection and analysis activities, recommendations and lessons learned. The findings will be presented by the Supplier during one of the learning forums (output 4).

Task 5: An Approach paper for the Final Evaluation (year 3) that builds upon the broad design (Evaluation Design Document) and learns lessons for the Formative Evaluation, as well as reflecting the changing programmatic and broader contexts.

Task 6: Development of a Final Evaluation Report (year 4). The Final Report should include a description of the evaluation methodology and limitations, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned, as well as a concise executive summary. The report should be accompanied by a presentation and a facilitated session with DFID, SOSIN and other relevant stakeholders to feed back the results. All feedback and response to feedback will be documented by the Supplier in an annex to the final evaluation report. This could potentially include deep dives, such as on gender or behaviour change campaigns etc.

Task 6: develop summarised reports highlighting key findings and recommendations and/or deep dives into subject areas.

DATA SOURCES

The following data are expected to be generated during the programme and should be drawn on by the evaluation team.

- Prevalence measurement baseline and end-line* studies (SoSiN);
- Sector scoping studies and influence mapping (SoSiN);
- Baseline, mid-line and end-line analysis of structural drivers in targeted sectors and individual/community vulnerabilities, including on social norms, attitudes and behaviours, obtained via quasi-experimental methods* (SoSiN);
- Annual survey of key stakeholders/users and case studies to track use and uptake of SOSIN research, learning and evidence products (SoSiN);
- Mid-point check-ins and end-term project reviews* to understand the extent to which different projects have contributed to overall changes at the sector level (SoSiN);
- Project monitoring data (downstream partners);
- SoSiN quarterly progress reports;
- DFID Annual Reviews;
- Deliverables and learnings of the MEL unit.

It should be noted that several of these data and learnings will not be available until the end of the project and that precise timings and quality of the products are not known at this stage. Therefore, the evaluation design such aim to exploit these sources to the extent possible but include strategies for adapting to late or incomplete evidence

Limitations of the existing evidence base on modern slavery – both in terms of prevalence data and concerning the effectiveness of interventions – are elaborated in Section 3.

REPORTING

1.1 The Supplier is required to submit formal reporting against an agreed work plan and attend periodic meetings to discuss progress and future workplans with DFID. The content of the progress reports will be agreed between DFID and the Supplier during inception.

The table below sets progress reports and deliverables within a provisional timeframe, the exact dates of which will be finalised between the Supplier and DFID at the contract award stage and adjusted on an annual basis.

Phase	MEL Year	Half Year	Component	
			(1) Data Quality Assurance	(2) Performance Evaluation
Inception		H1	Inception Report: Approach to quality assurance and advice.	Evaluation Design Document
Implementation	Y1	H2	Data Quality Report 2 months prior to DFID Annual Review	Baseline Assessment of Government and NGO approach to MDS
		H1		
	Y2	H2	1 round of QA visit Data Quality Report 2 months prior to DFID Annual Review	Formative Evaluation Report
		H1	1 round of visit	Approach paper to Final Evaluation
	Y3	H2	1 round of QA visits Data Quality Report 2 months prior to DFID Annual Review	
		H1	1 round of QA visits	Draft Final Evaluation and summary reports
	Y4	H2	1 round of QA visit Data Quality Report 2 months prior to DFID PCR	Complete Final Evaluation and summary reports
		H1		

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Relationship between the Supplier, DFID and partners

Prospective Suppliers should be clear that the SoSiN main supplier is responsible for managing the programme and monitoring progress against the agreed results framework. The SoSiN main supplier is also responsible for coordinating evaluation and learning at the sector and project level. The Supplier is not expected to substitute or replace the partners' own reporting systems. Rather, as detailed above they are expected to complement partners' MEL systems, verify

reported data using a sampling approach and collect supplementary data from beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries and other key stakeholders.

The relationship between the Supplier and the programme partners will be key to the success of the MEL unit. The Supplier will be responsible to put cooperation between the SoSiN main supplier and the MEL unit into a practice. The SoSiN main supplier is responsible for ensuring that downstream partners agree in principle to cooperate with the MEL unit. Ways of working is part of the criteria that bids are reviewed against. It is expected that during the inception phase the Supplier will establish ways of working with the SoSiN main supplier and DFID which support both learning from success/failure, programme adaptation, accountability for results and accountability to beneficiaries. It is recognised that the adaptive nature of the programme will require a close and iterative relationship between the Supplier, the SoSiN main supplier and DFID to ensure that the work of the MEL unit lends itself to informing the iterations of the programme.

Ethical considerations

Significant ethical issues may arise from efforts to monitor and evaluate the situation of those at risk of modern slavery. The Supplier and partners must follow the do no harm approach and DFID's Ethics Principles for Research and Evaluation.

Supplier bids must include reference to how they will identify and manage these considerations, including when dealing with very vulnerable groups in complex environments and with sensitive personal data. Bidding suppliers must provide their own organisational protocols to mitigate ethical and safeguarding risks.

In particular the Supplier should develop a protocol based on international good practice to determine where any research or data collection activities should obtain institutional review board approval and obtain such approval as necessary.

Fraud & Corruption

The supplier(s) will be responsible for conducting due diligence on all potential sub-contractors or downstream partners in line with DFID requirements. DFID has a zero-tolerance approach to corruption. The Supplier(s) will have full responsibility for monitoring and mitigating the risk of fraud and corruption in any required procurement and delivery of evaluation activities.

Delivery Chain Mapping

Before engaging with the private sector, civil society or multilateral partners DFID requires the directorate to map out a delivery chain as part of the tender process. This delivery chain should include all levels from grassroots delivery up to DFID reporting. As a minimum it should include details of:

- The name of all downstream delivery partners and their functions
- funding flows (e.g. amount, type) to each delivery partner
- High-level risks involved in programme delivery, mitigating measures and associated controls.

Small Medium Enterprises

DFID is expected to report to central government on the levels of contracted work being allocated to SME and other sub-contracted organisations. It is now a requirement to provide details regarding the levels of direct and indirect departmental SME spend with major suppliers to the cross-government SME Small Business Policy team working on this initiative.

Transparency

DFID has transformed its approach to transparency, reshaping our own working practices and pressuring others across the world to do the same. DFID requires suppliers receiving and managing funds, to comply with regulations and to release open data on how this money is spent, in a common, standard, re-usable format and to require this level of information from immediate sub-contractors, sub-agencies and partners.

UK Aid Branding

Partners selected to receive funds will be required to use the UK Aid Logo on materials, except in exceptional circumstances which would prevent this (e.g. security concerns).

Software (e.g. apps and online tools) used for collection of data, and fieldwork (e.g. online surveys) will also be required to use the UK Aid Logo unless there is a mitigating issue.

Safeguarding

DFID requires assurances regarding protection from violence, exploitation and abuse through involvement, directly or indirectly, with DFID suppliers and programmes. This includes sexual exploitation and abuse but should also be understood as all forms of physical or emotional violence or abuse and financial exploitation.

- The Supplier must demonstrate a sound understanding of the ethics in working in this area and applying these principles throughout the lifetime of the programme to avoid doing harm to beneficiaries. In particular, the design of interventions including research and programme evaluations should recognise and mitigate the risk of negative consequence for women, children and other vulnerable groups. The supplier will be required to include a statement that they have duty of care to informants, other programme stakeholders and their own staff, and that they will comply with the ethics principles in all programme activities. Their adherence to this duty of care, including reporting and addressing incidences, should be included in both regular and annual reporting to DFID;
- A commitment to the ethical design and delivery of evaluations including the duty of care to informants, other programme stakeholders and their own staff must be demonstrated.
- DFID does not envisage the necessity to conduct any environmental impact assessment for the implementation of the Issue based programme. However, it is important to adhere to principles of "Do No Harm" to the environment.

General Data Protection Regulations

Please refer to the details of the GDPR relationship status and personal data (where applicable) for this project as detailed in Appendix A and the standard Clause 33 in section 2 of the contract.

Duty of Care

All Supplier personnel (including their employees, sub-contractors or agents) engaged under a DFID contract will come under the duty of care of the lead Supplier. The Supplier is responsible for the safety and well-being of their personnel and any third parties affected by their activities, including appropriate security arrangements. The Supplier will also be responsible for the provision of suitable security arrangements for their domestic and business property. DFID will share available information with the Supplier on security status and developments in-country where appropriate. Travel advice is also available on the FCO website and the Supplier must ensure they (and their personnel) are up to date with the latest position.

Do No Harm

- DFID requires assurances regarding protection from violence, exploitation and abuse through involvement, directly or indirectly, with DFID Suppliers and programmes. This includes sexual

exploitation and abuse but should also be understood as all forms of physical or emotional violence or abuse and financial exploitation.

- This programme is targeting a highly sensitive area of work. The Supplier must demonstrate a sound understanding of the ethics in working in this area and applying these principles throughout the lifetime of the programme to avoid doing harm to beneficiaries. In particular, the design of interventions including monitoring and programme evaluations should recognise and mitigate the risk of negative consequence for women, children and other vulnerable groups. The Supplier will be required to include a statement that they have duty of care to informants, other programme stakeholders and their own staff, and that they will comply with the ethics principles in all programme activities. Their adherence to this duty of care, including reporting and addressing incidences, should be included in both regular and annual reporting to DFID.
- A commitment to the ethical design and delivery of evaluations including the duty of care to informants, other programme stakeholders and their own staff must be demonstrated.
- The Supplier is responsible for ensuring that appropriate arrangements, processes and procedures are in place for their personnel, taking into account the environment they will be working in and the level of risk involved in delivery of the contract. The Supplier must ensure their personnel receive the required level of training prior to deployment (where applicable).
- The Supplier must comply with the general responsibilities and duties under relevant health and safety law including appropriate risk assessments, adequate information, instruction, training and supervision, and appropriate emergency procedures. These responsibilities must be applied in the context of the specific requirements the Supplier has been contracted to deliver (if successful in being awarded the contract).
- DFID will not award a contract to a Supplier who cannot demonstrate they are willing to accept and have the capability to manage their duty of care responsibilities in relation to the specific procurement. Please refer to the Supplier Information Note on the DFID website for further information on our Duty of Care to Suppliers Policy⁵.

SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

DFID is encouraging bids from teams/consortia with technical expertise to effectively deliver the stated Terms of Reference. Any potential supplier should ensure that they propose a team with the adequate skills and experience necessary along with the best balance of international/national skills and gender balance to adequately deliver against these terms of reference. As a minimum the proposed team should have:

⁵ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Work-with-us/Procurement/Duty-of-Care-to-Suppliers-Policy/>

The teams/consortia should have proven track record of delivering MEL for flexible or adaptive programmes, independent monitoring, mixed-method evaluations testing causal pathways (e.g. using theory-based approaches).

Technical expertise and experience of carrying out MEL or research on social norms and behavioural change and modern slavery is essential.

The Supplier will be required to be present in the geographic areas either permanently or on a regular basis (NB DFID will not provide office space or support services). Suppliers may want to partner with groups or organisations with an ongoing presence in target countries and relevant experience.

The composition of the team should include a balance of international and national consultants and take into account diversity considerations as well (e.g. age, gender, disability). If required, we strongly encourage organisations to form consortiums to obtain the appropriate diversity and skill mix.

The MEL unit is expected to have a 'firewall' separating those delivering support to strengthen monitoring systems and the team undertaking the performance evaluation to support independence.

BUDGET

The maximum budget currently available for this contract is £800,000 (please note this figure includes all applicable taxes). This will cover all the activities and travel costs of the Supplier.

In their bids, Suppliers should propose a suitable approach and indicative division of the budget for this engagement, including suggested payment dates.

The scope of work described above poses the intrinsic challenge to plan flexibly to undertake and support MEL on a programme which will define the details of each supported intervention during its design phase and beyond. Bidders are encouraged to take these challenges into account and plan accordingly in a flexible way.

SCALE

DFID reserves the right to scale back or discontinue this contract at any point (in line with our Terms and Conditions) if it is not achieving the results anticipated or on grounds of fraud and/or corruption. The Supplier(s) will commit to being fully prepared in the event that any decision is made to scale up (increase) or scale down (decrease) the programme budget, scope of the Programme (i.e. in relation to the Programme's inputs, outputs, deliverables and outcomes during the course of the contract).

DFID reserves the right to scale back or discontinue this contract at any point (in line with our Terms & Conditions), if it is not achieving the results anticipated.

TIMEFRAME AND BREAK POINTS

The contract will commence approximately **December 2019 and is anticipated to run up to August 2023**. The contract with the SoSiN main supplier is currently scheduled to end in August 2023. There will be an **inception period** from December 2019 to January 2020 before implementation starts. DFID will reserve the right to extend the contract with the Supplier in the event that the programme is extended beyond the current period. Approval of any such amendment will be made in agreement between DFID and the potential supplier regarding extension scope, deliverables, outputs and cost.

The contract will contain a break clause after the inception phase at which point DFID will decide if to proceed to implementation with the Supplier. DFID will also reserve the right not to appoint the evaluation partner beyond the inception phase in the event that agreement cannot be reached over evaluation activities, resources, timeline and budget.

GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

The Supplier will report to the DFID Nigeria's SoSiN Senior Responsible Owner (SRO). A Reference Group will be created and organised by DFID Nigeria to provide technical input, and to ensure effective governance and transparency of the MEL unit. When considered necessary, the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) may request the MEL unit to share its findings directly with the PSC. Vice versa, the MEL unit can make representations to the PSC (subject to consultation with the SRO) to flag issues or concerns related to the programme.

Key deliverables under this contract (including inception report, baseline, interim and final evaluation reports) will need to be reviewed and signed off by DFID's Evaluation Quality Assurance Service. The Supplier will be expected to consider technical input provided, e.g. with regards to approaches and tools for MEL for adaptive management purposes.

DFID will agree a work plan with the Supplier during the inception, which will be revisited regularly and adjusted when necessary. DFID will sign off on the design, methodological approach and tools proposed for independent monitoring, partner assessments, the performance evaluation, and learning mechanisms during the inception phase. It is expected that the Supplier will independently manage the implementation plan, but will consult the DFID Evaluation Adviser and SRO before decisions are taken. Regular progress meetings will be held, at least monthly.

DFID will support the selected Supplier in understanding the programme. DFID will also ensure that necessary connections are made between the Supplier, SoSiN (and downstream partners through SoSiN), and relevant DFID Nigeria staff but does not expect to play the role of relationship manager/liaison, nor will we hold any duty of care responsibility for the successful Suppliers of this ToR.

In line with the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), DFID requires partners receiving and managing funds to release open data on how this money is spent, in a common, standard, reusable format and to require this level of information from immediate sub-contractors, sub-agencies and partners. Further information is available from: <http://www.aidtransparency.net/>. The Supplier should submit copies of its supply chain (sub-contractor) invoices and evidence of payment when invoicing DFID for its actual costs of procurement of local services and applicable management fee.

CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS

The services described in these terms of reference will be provided under a single contract. Should the selected bid be provided by a consortium, then the contract will be with the lead Supplier, who will be responsible for the performance and delivery of services provided by consortium members and/or downstream partners.

This will be an **output-based** contract and payment will be based on satisfactory delivery of the outputs. Indicators will be included in the log frame to assess both the quantity and quality of

deliverables. Bidders will be expected to outline the methodology for ensuring the requirement will be delivered on time and in line with agreed costs, with financial risks identified and mitigated. Bidders should also be able to demonstrate a clear and effective financial approach, methodology and plan to deliver key outputs within the prescribed timeframe. Payments should be clearly linked to outputs/milestones within the ToR with an appropriate level of risk being accepted by the Supplier.

DFID will have unlimited access to the material produced by the Supplier as expressed in DFID's general conditions of contract. Data sets produced generated by the Supplier should be made available in the standards and formats required by local partners such as the SoSiN partners and Edo State Government. As a minimum this would be the CSV format with appropriate met data.

RISKS, CONSTRAINTS & DEPENDANCIES

Suppliers should include in their bids the **key risks** that they perceive and how they plan to manage and mitigate them. These risks should be presented in a risk matrix, including the level of risk and how partners plan to identify, monitor and respond to these challenges. Some of the key risks and challenges that DFID has already identified, and which Suppliers are expected to address in addition to other risks, include:

I. Delivery – Challenges include:

- i. Identifying and engaging with populations at risk of modern slavery and responding to their specific needs
- ii. Risk of arrest and/or charges brought by authorities towards persons perceived to be conducting non-sanctioned data collection
- iii. Need to work through local actors on the ground who may not have the skills and tools required to achieve minimum standards of monitoring/ research etc.
- iv. Limited capacity of implementing partners in M&E leading to the risk that data is not reliable, timely or relevant enough to monitor performance.
- i. Lack of complementarity between partners' MEL and the work of the MEL unit, compromising value for money and creating a potential data collection burden on beneficiaries

II. External / Context – Challenges include:

- i. Grant activities disrupted due to events beyond grantees control - e.g., increase in conflict, extreme climate event, changes in government policy
- ii. Programme execution and or SOSIN follow on activities hindered by host government unwillingness to collaborate with or license SOSIN efforts (for example, due to denial of prevalence or objection to SOSIN as a non-local entity).
- iii. Risk of death or injury

III. Data – Challenges include:

- ii. The limitations in available, reliable and comparable data on modern slavery
- iii. Risks to data confidentiality, transportation and security
- iv. Risks of identifying beneficiaries in data analysis and reporting

IV. Safeguards – Challenges include:

- i. Grant activities create negative externalities for example inadvertently "doing harm", such as through displacement of trafficker activities' from one sector and/or location to another (i.e. survivors displaced into different forms of slavery or locations) or deepening inequalities.
- ii. Risk of causing harm to beneficiaries and communities (e.g. social shaming, stigma, trauma), inability to offer support/services in impartial monitor role, managing expectations.
- iii. Risk of psychological distress from working with people with high vulnerability and protection issues (either realised or potential).

BACKGROUND

Context

Modern slavery is still widespread and pervasive - according to the latest global estimates⁶, there were 40.3 million people in modern slavery on any given day in 2016, and this is expected to be an underestimate. Women and girls were disproportionately affected, accounting for 28.7 million or 71 per cent of the overall total. One in four slaves were found to be children. The offences that constitute modern slavery vary and can range from those who are trafficked into sex industry, bound by debt bondage, or in forced labour⁷. The hidden nature of modern slavery makes it difficult to understand the total scope and scale of the problem.

The International Organisation for Migration (IOM) estimates that over 44,000 Nigerians migrants are in Libya, most seeking to travel to Europe. In 2016 and 2017, Nigerians made up the largest single nationality of arrivals through the central-Mediterranean route at 21% and 16% of the total, respectively. Nigerian victims also target other destinations, across West Africa and the Sahel, and to the Middle East. 2017 saw a drop in Nigerians crossing the Mediterranean after a huge increase between 2011 (358 arrivals) and 2016 (27,172 arrivals). However, the recent drop in arrivals, driven by stronger European action in the Mediterranean, has led to a new focus on those enslaved in Libya. CNN, in November 2017, showed Nigerian citizens being auctioned as slaves in Libya; 'owners' can be assumed to be utilising those slaves across North Africa, rather than exporting them to Europe, for example. The reduction may also simply imply changes in routes taken - migration routes, and destinations, are fluid and subject to rapid change. Data from IOM field monitoring centres report 700 emigrants per day were still passing through Northern Nigeria in April 2018.

Edo State is in the central southern part of Nigeria, part of the Niger Delta region. It has an outsize influence on trafficking and slavery: despite having less than 3% of the population of Nigeria, 65% of Nigerian migrants returned from Libya originated from Edo State in 2016, and 57% in 2017. It has been estimated that approximately 70% of remittances to Edo State are from prostitution in Europe. However, this agenda is volatile, and the context is changing rapidly. As a result, the programme needs to be able to respond to changing priorities and potentially new geographies, if necessary.

A lack of actionable and insightful data on modern slavery, and its deeper and more proximate causes, is a major barrier to attracting the type of investment on the scale needed to address it. Specifically, there are very limited studies that have measured prevalence of slavery at a granular level (e.g. sector or community). Such data is needed to influence decision making, target interventions, motivate stakeholders like the private sector, and to monitor and evaluate progress against interventions.

There is also limited robust evidence on what works in reducing modern slavery prevalence⁸. The anti-slavery sector suffers from a lack of clear understanding of what is effective in tackling modern slavery in specific contexts, or what the drivers of vulnerabilities or root causes of modern slavery are in these contexts. Numerous meta-evaluations of existing evidence support the assertion that there are no proven practices for the sector⁹. Anti-slavery efforts to date can be characterised as small-scale, fragmented and limited by funding.

DFID and the UK Government ('HMG') has ongoing programmes focussed on human trafficking and modern slavery in Nigeria. These include the Market Development in the Niger Delta (MADE) programme, which has allocated £3m of funding to build 'aspirational' livelihood opportunities to potential victims of trafficking in high risk areas. In addition, a DFID centrally managed programme has provided £3m of funding to the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) to provide psychosocial and rehabilitation support to returnees, returned from Libya by the Federal

⁶ ILO, 'The Global Estimates of Modern Slavery' 2017
http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@dgreports/@dcomm/documents/publication/wcms_575479.pdf

⁷ Towards a Common Future: Achieving SDG 8.7 in the Commonwealth, Walk Free Foundation, 2018
<https://www.walkfreefoundation.org/news/resource/achieving-sdg-8-7-in-the-commonwealth/>

⁸ Defined as the proportion of people in slavery or at risk of slavery in a given community

⁹ Bryant, Katharine (2016) What works? 'A review of interventions to combat modern day slavery' Minderoo Foundation/Walk Free Foundation.

Government of Nigeria (FGN). The UK Home Office also have an ongoing programme supporting FGN law enforcement and victim rehabilitation systems. Their work also includes a communications campaign run by the FGN and supported by secondees from the UK Cabinet Office Communications Service. The Supplier would be expected to engage with these programmes, have an understanding of progress and learnings and ensure there is no duplication of activities. The Supplier will also be expected to draw a comparison between the programmes, where possible, and draw conclusions about effectiveness and value for money.

The other HMG supported programmes mentioned in the para above each have their own MEL activities. MADE and the Home Office programme both have, or will have, their own independently contracted review consultants or teams, and we would expect the SoSIN MEL provider to take opportunities to engage and collaborate. Other donors and Federal and State actors also becoming increasingly active. The service provider should ensure that their team establishes and maintains full awareness of other relevant programmes and MEL activities. SOSIN's main contract includes a substantial component that will establish a learning platform that will focus on gathering and disseminating evidence and analysis from the programme and globally to build the currently under-developed evidence base. The main contractor, and the MEL contractor, should agree the best form of collaboration to ensure learning flows effectively between them – see para 7.2 below for more details.

DFID's investment in SoSiN complements multilateral, bilateral and regional efforts of the UK to end modern slavery. This includes the *Call to Action to end Forced Labour, Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking*, launched by the UK Prime Minister at the meeting of the UN General Assembly in 2017. The Call to Action sets out specific commitments to address modern slavery at the national and international level and has been endorsed by over 80 countries so far, including Nigeria.

ANNEX A – Summary Risk Assessment Matrix

Project/Intervention title: SOSIN Independent Evaluation Contract

Locations: Benin – Edo State

Date of Assessment: 2nd September 2019

Assessing official: REDACTED

Theme	Risk Score: Edo
OVERALL RATING¹	2
FCO travel advice	2
Host nation travel advice	Nil
Transportation	2
Security	2
Civil Unrest and Violence/Crime	2
Terrorism	-
War	-
Hurricane	-
Earthquake	-
Flood	-
Medical Services	2
Nature of Project/Intervention	2

1	2	3	4	5
Very Low Risk	Low Risk	Med Risk	High Risk	Very High Risk
Low		Medium	High	

¹The Overall risk rating is calculated using the MODE function, which determines the most frequently occurring value

Appendix A: of Contract Section 3 (Terms of Reference)
Schedule of Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects

This schedule must be completed by the Parties in collaboration with each-other before the processing of Personal Data under the Contract.

The completed schedule must be agreed formally as part of the contract with DFID and any changes to the content of this schedule must be agreed formally with DFID under a Contract Variation.

Description	Details
Identity of the Controller and Processor for each Category of Data Subject	<p>The Parties acknowledge that for the purposes of the Data Protection Legislation, the following status will apply to personal data under this contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Parties acknowledge that Clause 33.2 Protection of Personal Data and 33.4 (Section 2 of the contract) shall not apply for the purposes of the Data Protection Legislation as the Parties are independent Controllers in accordance with Clause 33.3 in respect of Personal Data necessary for the administration and/or fulfilment of this contract".
Subject matter of the processing	
Duration of the processing	
Nature and purposes of the processing	
Type of Personal Data [and Special Categories of Personal Data]	
Plan for return and destruction of the data once processing complete.	(UNLESS requirement under EU or European member state law to preserve that type of data)