

## Terms of Reference

### ***Performance evaluation of the Syria Strengthening Governance Structures Programme***

**DFID Syria**

#### **Contents**

Introduction .....	1
The Recipients and Audience of the Evaluation .....	2
Security Situation and Implications for Methodology .....	3
Purpose .....	3
Scope .....	4
Objectives .....	6
Evaluation Type .....	6
Evaluation questions .....	7
Cross-cutting issues .....	8
Design and Methodology .....	8
Data Available .....	11
Process .....	11
Timelines and Outputs .....	11
Inception report .....	12
Implementation .....	13
Presentation of Topline Findings .....	13
Final Reports .....	13
Workshops with Key Stakeholders and the Implementing Partners .....	14
Payment .....	14
Reporting .....	14
Security Risks to the Project .....	15
Duty of Care .....	16
Risk management .....	18
Context and Background .....	18

#### List of Annexes

- Annex 1 DFID Duty of Care risk assessment for Syria

#### **Introduction**

1. The Department for International Development (DFID) seeks an evaluation team with extensive skills and experience in the design and implementation of high-quality evaluations in fragile and conflicted-affected states (FCAS), to conduct a performance evaluation of the Syria Strengthening Governance Structures Programme. This is an exciting opportunity to develop an innovative methodology/design to address the significant challenges of evaluating programme outcomes in the changing and challenging context of Syria. DFID are very interested in hearing from suppliers with creative solutions. As the evaluation

team requires significant experience in the design and implementation of high-quality evaluations and the development of innovative, robust methods, as well as an ability to conduct to high-quality research in Syria, it may be appropriate for suppliers to form consortia to bid for this contract.

2. The Strengthening Governance Structures (SGS) project will be implemented in moderate-controlled and contested areas of Syria. It will strengthen provincial and local governance structures with a view to providing effective services to Syrians. The programme's inception phase is due to start in October, 2016. The inception phase for the evaluation of SGS should run simultaneously. DFID would like the evaluation team to collect some baseline data to inform the evaluation early in the programme's implementation phase and expects this will be the first of four data collection cycles in the evaluation's lifecycle. Suppliers should develop proposals for an evaluation based on the programme parameters and draft theory of change (as per the terms of reference – see annex A), and draft evaluation questions in these terms of reference (ToR). Suppliers should also propose an appropriate approach to finalising the evaluation design and questions during inception phase (as the programme's methodology and theory of change is refined). At the time of writing these ToR, the implementing partner(s) for the SGS programme has/have not been selected.

## **The Recipients and Audience of the Evaluation**

3. The primary recipients of the evaluation are the UK's Syria CSSF team and the European Commission (EC).

### **Primary audience:**

- Funders of the programme – Her Majesty's Government (Syria CSSF including representatives from DFID, FCO (Foreign and Commonwealth Office) and MoD (Ministry of Defence), and the EC.
- Implementing Partners (tbc) and beneficiaries of the programme

### **Secondary audience:**

- DFID staff designing programmes in fragile and conflict affected states
  - Other donors and organisations (including United Nation agencies and non-governmental organisations) active in the non-humanitarian response in Syria and other fragile conflict affected states
4. The evaluation team will be expected to present findings to the implementing partners and the project funders (the UK Syria CSSF and the EC) following each of the four data collection stages. DFID, in consultation with the EC and the implementing partners, will provide the successful bidders with a list of invitees.

5. Due to the sensitivities of the crisis within Syria, aspects of the evaluation may remain confidential for security/ethical reasons. Therefore, if required, a restricted annex of the report will be produced and shared with EC, the Syria CSSF and the implementing partners. In accordance with our commitment to transparency, the non-restricted elements of the report will be published on the DFID or HMG website.

## **Security Situation and Implications for Methodology**

6. The Syria crisis is taking place in a complex political, geographical and humanitarian environment which presents a number of challenges to the evaluation which the team will need to be prepared to work with. We expect tender documents to carefully consider the feasibility of the design of the evaluation. It if is deemed unfeasible to collect reliable data to answer the proposed evaluation questions in this ToR, then this will be considered when refining the evaluation questions during the inception phase.
7. This means that in relation to the collection of primary data the bidders will have to consider carefully:
  - a. Risks to staff collecting data inside Syria (we expect that all data collection staff will be Syrian - international staff should not enter Syria to take forward this evaluation).
  - b. Suspicion of data collectors by beneficiaries and therefore unwillingness to provide information to any staff inside Syria.
  - c. Syria is an active conflict zone where there are a large number of armed actors and the conflict lines are continually shifting.
  - d. The sensitive nature of some of the topics that the evaluation is interested in may put respondents and data collectors at risk and/or lead to constraints in being able to collect reliable data.
  - e. Challenges in selecting research participants within the project communities that represent the diversity of the community and the views within the community, including women and vulnerable groups.
8. Taking the above considerations into account, the evaluation team should think creatively and propose an appropriate methodology and solutions about how data can be collected and quality assured to a high standard.

## **Purpose**

9. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the performance of the SGS programme throughout its lifecycle and to better understand what outcomes (both intended and unintended) the SGS programme is contributing to. The findings will help to inform future programming decisions in DFID's Syria Team and across the Syria CSSF. The evaluation should also assess which contextual variables appear to facilitate or prevent progress towards achieving project outcomes.

10. The UK's cross-departmental Syria CSSF team and the EC are the primary stakeholders for this evaluation. The SGS programme's implementing partner(s) will also be important stakeholders. The evaluation should enable the team to make evidence based decisions in response to the following questions:
- Does the SGS programme appear to be making progress in achieving its stated outcomes?
  - Are there any recommendations on how the programme can be adapted to improve effectiveness and progress towards meeting outcomes (especially as the context in Syria changes)?
11. The answers to these questions will help inform strategic decision making by the Syria CSSF Team around the funding and design of programme cycles, for example, does the programme need to better reflect the needs of women and vulnerable groups, and how could it do this?
12. DFID teams working in fragile states are secondary stakeholders of this evaluation. The evaluation should provide some evidence to support teams to make evidence-based decisions in relation to the following question:
- What combination of external factors and elements of the intervention may be required to maximise the potential for piloting or implementing in full this programme in other (comparable) fragile states?
13. Due to the poor access to likely SGS project locations within Syria, the SGS programme will also be included under the Syria CSSF Independent Monitoring Programme. This independent monitoring programme will focus on monitoring of activity and output components in the programme's result chain to support DFID and the programme's implementing partner(s) to take corrective action (where required) and to support accountability. This may, for example, include some monitoring of basic services delivered by local and provincial councils receiving support through the SGS programme.
14. The performance evaluation will primarily focus on the assessment of programme outcomes. The evidence base for this type of intervention in active conflict zones is poor. As such, the evaluation has **primarily a learning purpose**. At the end of the evaluation lifecycle (coinciding with the end of programme's lifecycle) the evaluation should be able to produce evidence-based recommendations around whether this type of programme works in active conflict zones. The evaluation should also make recommendations around future support to governance and service delivery in Syria.

## Scope

15. The scope of the evaluation is as follows:
- a. It is envisioned that the SGS programme will run from October, 2016 to October, 2019. The evaluation should cover this whole period and the evaluation lifecycle should reflect the programme lifecycle; some

baseline data should be collected at the start of the programme and outcomes should be assessed on an annual basis and at endline (enabling the evaluation team to assess whether the theory of change was valid). It should, however, be noted that the context in Syria is likely to change over the programme's lifecycle and the programme may also need to adapt to reflect this. The evaluation design should be sufficiently flexible in recognition of this.

- b. As the design and methodology of the new programme are still to be finalised, it is not known how many communities the programme will work within. DFID expects, however, that the SGS programme may cover approximately 50 communities in moderate-controlled and contested areas of Syria, and work with 3 or 4 provincial councils. The evaluation should aim to evaluate the components of the programme working with both local and provincial councils, and cover at least 20% of SGS communities in its design. DFID expects a maximum of half of the communities to be included in the evaluation. Suppliers should make an initial proposal on how many communities they plan to include in the evaluation based on what they perceive is feasible and desirable based on the available budget and the ability to gain a diversity of respondents and viewpoints within and across the communities.
- c. Ideally the evaluation would track a number of SGS communities over time to understand what changes have occurred, and to assess the contribution of the SGS programme to these changes. It should be recognised, however, that access to communities inside Syria can change quickly. As the operating environment changes, the programme may need to expand into new areas, or be suspended from others. This should be considered in the design; and any risk this presents to conducting a robust evaluation should be mitigated.
- d. The evaluation team should select SGS communities for the evaluation that aim to be broadly representative of all SGS communities and should develop a sampling criteria to reflect this. In doing so, the evaluation team should balance this requirement with the preference for sampling communities where access is more likely to be maintained (although this is of course still difficult to predict). Initial sampling criteria for communities might include: geographical area (governorate), access (both within Syria and from outside of Syria), rural/urban and level of conflict. Once the evaluation team has been selected, DFID and the programme implementer(s) will share further information on the list of likely locations/these criteria. In the meantime to support bids, a list of locations of the current Tamkeen programme. will be made available to suppliers via the DFID Supplier Portal together with other ITT documentation. Whilst it is unclear the extent to which these locations will fall under the SGS programme it will demonstrate the potential coverage of the SGS programme. Following selection of the evaluation team, DFID will consult with the evaluation

team to help ensure that the selected communities are as representative as possible whilst also feasible locations for fieldwork.

16. The following cycle and issues are **outside of the scope** of the evaluation:

- Assessing the SGS programme and its contribution towards the following:
  - inclusive growth and economic resilience at the community level
  - the impacts of service delivery on the health and wellbeing of citizens
  - the impact statement in the overall Syria CSSF theory of change
  - communities outside of the project locations
- All UK support to Syria beyond the SGS programme both within and outside of the Syria CSSF, e.g. humanitarian aid, Civil Defence, Security and Justice, the Syria Recovery Trust Fund and the Assistance Coordination Unit. As part of the multi-country Syria Crisis Response, the UK has allocated over £1.1 billion to implementing partners. This includes £578 million allocated to humanitarian partners working in Syria.

## Objectives

17. In order to make informed decisions listed under the purpose section, the evaluation has four objectives:

- a. To track progress of the SGS programme against its stated objectives at outcome level, and broader DAC criteria, where relevant.
- b. To assess if there is evidence of any unintended consequences of the SGS programme within the communities it operates.
- c. To improve understanding around which elements of the intervention work well and why. To understand which elements of the intervention fail to fully deliver and why.
- d. To improve understanding around the external context in which programme delivery is successful. To understand the external context in which the programme fails to fully deliver.

## Evaluation Type

18. The evaluation will assess the contribution that the SGS programme will make towards outcomes (both shorter and longer term outcomes) over the programme's lifecycle (including at endline). It can thus be described as a **performance evaluation**.

19. This evaluation will be conducted at key points during the programme's implementation (baseline, at the end of the implementation year, and at the end of programme). At the end of each implementation year the programme should therefore aim to make **some summative conclusions** about the completed phases. It is likely that the programme will have to adapt to a changing context

over its lifecycle meaning that expectations around achievement of outcomes and the theory of change may also change. The evaluation design should therefore be sufficiently flexible to reflect potential changes.

20. The evaluation will take a **theory-based approach**. It will aim to further develop and test the theory of change for the intervention, assess the extent to which the intervention has worked, and understand how it may have worked (seeking to understand the linkages in the theory of change), and assess external factors (context) influencing the intervention (and if they made a significant contribution). The evaluation will not be verifying inputs, activities and outputs, but as a theory-based evaluation will need to consider monitoring data (including from the Syria CSSF Independent Monitoring Programme) around delivery at these levels, for example, if activities did not take place as planned then it is unlikely that the results chain and envisioned outcomes will have occurred.
21. The evaluation is not an impact evaluation and as such will not be expected to use rigorous scientific methods to arrive at robust statements of attribution at the impact or outcome level through randomised control or the comparison to a counterfactual group. However, the evaluation will provide a depth of analysis that establishes the importance of the programme in enabling results to be achieved at the outcome level.

## Evaluation questions

22. In their proposals, suppliers should provide an initial evaluation design based on the evaluation questions below. It should be noted, however, that these are preliminary evaluation questions based on the draft SGS theory of change. The theory of change will be refined during the SGS programme inception phase and the evaluation questions will be updated based on the refined theory of change.

Outcome level
E.Q.1. What difference has the SGS programme made to the capacity of local councils to identify, plan and deliver basic services?
E.Q.2. What difference has the SGS programme made to the coordination and sharing of information around services at local and provincial levels?
E.Q.3. What difference has the SGS programme made to the capacity of provincial councils to identify, plan and deliver basic services at the provincial level?
EQ.4. What difference has the SGS programme made to the ability of women to participate in and influence decision making around basic services?
E.Q.5. What difference has the SGS programme made to engagement and coordination between local councils and civil society/communities?
Impact level
E.Q.6. To what extent is there evidence that the SGS programme is contributing to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making local services more accessible, better quality and sustainable (revenue generating)</li> <li>• More effective linkages between central, regional and local levels?</li> <li>• Improved transparency in and accountability of delivery of basic services to communities and greater inclusion of community voices in the selection of</li> </ul>

services?
<b>Contextual Factors</b>
E.Q.7. What are the key factors (internal and external) which have influenced progress in achieving the stated outcomes?

23. The evaluation should explore “how” and “why/why not” in relation to the questions above.
24. Reflecting the contextual question evaluation question (E.Q.7), the evaluation should produce a context analysis of the relevant external factors to the delivery of outcomes. This is important for increasing external validity so that the findings can be used appropriately in the changing Syria context and in other fragile and conflict affected states. The analysis should consider local conflict dynamics and the local political economy in SGS communities and seek to understand how these have impacted the programme and how the programme may have impacted them.
25. In responding to the evaluation questions, the evaluation team should assess whether there is evidence that the SGS programme is supporting an increase in accountability, transparency and participation in the planning and delivery of basic services. If peacebuilding components are added to the SGS programme during its lifecycle, DFID may request that evaluation question assessing peacebuilding outcomes are included in the evaluation.

## **Cross-cutting issues**

26. The role of women and vulnerable groups, for example, internally displaced people and disabled people, should be given significant consideration when refining/responding to the evaluation questions and developing the evaluation methods and tools. The evaluation team should consider disaggregating data by relevant groups, as appropriate.
27. The evaluation team should also consider how data will be collected from women and minority groups and what this means for the composition of their research team. Suppliers should be aware of the risks (especially to women) of travel inside of Syria and have a plan to mitigate these appropriately.

## **Design and Methodology**

28. Evaluation providers should demonstrate how their proposed methods will:
- a. Meet recognised international standards such as the OECD-DAC Quality Standards. In answering the evaluation questions, the evaluation team should in particular consider the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of support provided through the SGS programme. For example, how effective is the programme in achieving its outcomes, how relevant is the programme to the context (across Syria and in individual communities), and how sustainable are outcomes likely to be (including any capacity built)?
  - b. Do no harm and be conflict sensitive

*'In situations of conflict and fragility, donors can do harm in almost as many ways as they can do good. Any intervention, policy or position can have unintended consequences. We need to take care to maximise our positive and minimise our negative impacts.'*

For further guidance please consult

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/67696/summary-note-briefing-papers.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67696/summary-note-briefing-papers.pdf)

29. Interested suppliers are invited to propose an evaluation design and methodology. This should include:

- A clear design including proposed methods, tools and techniques
- Reference to international standards that will be used
- A draft evaluation framework (based on the draft evaluation questions)
- A proposed timeline, including reference to how many days are allocated to each activity within the evaluation
- Transparency over design limitations including those around making wider inferences, and the extent to which evaluation objectives can be met
- A proposal around number of communities in the sample and on how the study participants will be selected within communities to ensure sufficient diversity
- Details on how the evaluation team will quality assure the evaluation from start to finish
- Details on how the evaluation team will ensure that ethical standards will be upheld throughout the evaluation
- An analysis strategy including proposed techniques on data processing, analysis and interpretation, and how the evaluation team will assess the contribution of the SGS programme to achievement of outcomes and triangulate different sources of data
- A dissemination strategy

30. DFID envisions that the evaluation will mostly (if not entirely) use qualitative methods for primary data collection. However, proposals should state which methods, tools and techniques the evaluation will use to help address the challenges of collecting reliable data, especially on more challenging issues. It should draw on existing data sources where available. In consultation with DFID and the SGS programme implementing partner(s) the evaluation team will make a sound assessment as to which project locations it is feasible to collect data within. Given the challenges of collecting robust quantitative data in Syria, large scale primary data collection of quantitative data is neither feasible nor desirable for this evaluation. Suppliers should spell out with adequate detail the approach and methods which they believe will most effectively and efficiently meet the purpose of the study within the time and budget available. The successful supplier will take forward a short inception phase (4-6 weeks) where they will refine their proposal in consultation with the DFID technical lead, the evaluation steering group, and other relevant stakeholders.

31. DFID expects a design that is sufficiently robust for the decisions outlined in the purpose to be made with confidence. Given the constraints on the collection of

quality data and the changing environment in which the programme operates, we expect a design that is appropriately flexible and pragmatic.

32. DFID recommends that proposals incorporate the following in their methodology. However, we are open to additional and alternative recommendations from suppliers. Some approaches may be less appropriate for baseline data collection.

- Desk-based review of existing documentation, reporting and reviews of the SGS programme, complemented by interviews with key HMG staff (to note that limited reporting will be available at baseline)
- Qualitative interviews with the implementing partner(s) and their Syria-based staff working on the programme
- Qualitative interviews with local council and provincial council members in selected locations
- Primary collection of data at the community level in selected locations (including with key stakeholders such as local CSOs and other service providers)
- Key informant interviews with third parties with knowledge of the programme, if relevant
- A political economy analysis (or components of) to understand powerful local stakeholders, service delivery providers and conflict dynamics. Proposals should demonstrate how this will be used to respond to evaluation questions.
- External data on governance in Syria. The evaluation team should assess the quality and relevance of any such data and be clear on its limitations.

33. The use of experimental and quasi experimental methods is challenging in this context, and we are therefore not expecting them to be included in the proposal for this evaluation. The use of comparison or control communities may be considered but giving the changing context may not be suitable for this evaluation.

34. There are significant challenges to ensuring the development of high quality data collection tools and the collection of robust data in Syria, especially due to very limited access to locations within Syria creating increased challenges for quality assurance. Bidders should outline how both internal and external validity could be maximised within the given constraints, and how they propose to develop tools and monitor data collection within Syria. Innovative ideas to overcome challenges will be especially welcome.

35. We expect proposals to include details on how data will be collected, stored and managed securely, especially in view of security risks and the proximity of armed actors to project locations. DFID will own all data generated by the evaluation and will receive full datasets.

36. Proposals should also include details of the analysis strategy; which analysis techniques the evaluation team will apply, how will they try to assess contribution of the SGS programme through the analysis and how they plan to triangulate different sources of data.

37. The evaluation must adhere to the ethical evaluation policies of DFID ([www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/67483/dfid-ethics-prcpls-rsrch-eval.pdf](http://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67483/dfid-ethics-prcpls-rsrch-eval.pdf)), and proposals should include reference to any further ethical considerations in light of the ongoing conflict in Syria.
38. Proposals should consider conflict sensitivity in the design and implementation of the evaluation, and how the evaluation team can mitigate potential risks of worsening the conflict locally and of the conflict affecting the evaluation.

## Data Available

39. Given the challenges of primary data collection in Syria, it is important that the evaluation team reviews existing data and uses for triangulation purposes, where possible, to respond to evaluation questions.

Throughout the evaluation lifecycle available data is likely to include:

- SGS implementer data collected for monitoring and reporting purposes
- Data from the Syria CSSF Independent monitoring programme that will aim to visit approximately half of all SGS locations once a year (and all locations at least once throughout the SGS programme) and will include assessment at activity and output level (and potentially input level).
- Data and findings from other third parties around the evolution of local governance in Syria. The quality of such data may be mixed and should be assessed by the evaluation team.

## Process

40. DFID and the programme implementer(s) will seek to facilitate access to stakeholders who have direct links with the programme and those who play a political role, but it is likely that the evaluation team will have to make direct approaches to other stakeholders and beneficiaries who are within the scope of the evaluation. Proposals should also include details on plans to identify respondents at community level; trying to ensure that respondents are as representative of communities as possible, whilst recognising constraints, especially in relation to security.

## Timelines and Outputs

41. We expect the inception phase to be complete and signed off within 12 weeks after the contract is signed. To ensure that timelines are adhered to, DFID will expect to approve the inception report within two weeks of delivery; minor amendments pending.

The table below sets out some broad proposed timelines for the evaluation, including a more detailed timeline for the inception phase/baseline. Proposals should include a more detailed proposed timeline for the evaluation based on what is feasible in order to be able to deliver the evaluation to a high quality. Proposed workplans should include the number of days allocated to each activity.

Proposals should also state how many team members will be working on each activity.

<b>Evaluation Activity</b>	
<b>This report provide indicative dates that will be agreed with the supplier during the inception phase.</b>	
Inception phase	July 2017 – mid September, 2017
Inception report signed off	23 <sup>rd</sup> September 2017
Development of tools, and data collection for baseline	September - Late November 2017
Baseline report finalised and presentation of findings to key stakeholders	December 2017
Development of tools, and second round of data collection	July 2018 – Early September 2018
Presentation of findings to key stakeholders and report finalised	Early December 2019
Development of tools, and third round of data collection	July 2019 – Early September 2019
Presentation of findings to key stakeholders and report finalised	Early December 2019
Development of tools, and data collection for endline	March 2020 – Early May 2020
Presentation of findings to key stakeholders and final endline report	July, 2020

### **Inception report**

42. The evaluation team is responsible for designing the evaluation, working closely with DFID’s technical lead and the evaluation steering group to ensure that the evaluation framework and design meets DFID’s needs and standards. In developing the bids, potential suppliers should establish the feasibility of their proposed design. Once contracted, the successful bidder will then be able to refine the design and some amendments may be made if the original proposed design is no longer feasible under changing circumstances.

43. The evaluation provider will include a set of questions to be answered, using the evaluation questions put forward in this ToR as a starting point. The Inception Report will contain the following and will be submitted to DFID no longer than 6 weeks after contracting:

- Refined methodology including detailed sampling plan
- Finalised evaluation framework
- Final Work plan, including a clear allocation of days per activity
- Quality assurance plan
- Comprehensive risk register
- Communications plan
- Analysis and reporting plan

44. To avoid unnecessary resource being allocated towards completion of the inception report, the inception report should aim to expand upon the supplier's original proposal as much as possible.
45. During the evaluation's inception period, the communication plan shall be further developed by the evaluation team in agreement with DFID. Given the security situation in Syria, good communication between the evaluation team and the programme implementer(s) is essential.

## **Implementation**

46. The implementation cycle will take place in Syria (data collection) and most likely in neighbouring countries such as Turkey and Jordan where the programme implementers are likely to be based as well as organisations with the ability to collect data within Syria. Implementation is likely to include four different phases (baseline, end of cycle 1, end of cycle 2, and endline). Each cycle will include the development and finalisation of data collection tools, data collection, and analysis and interpretation of data. Although DFID expects that similar tools can be used throughout the evaluation cycles. The evaluation team will be required to share updates with the evaluation's steering group and to be regularly in contact with the technical lead during each evaluation phase. At the start of each evaluation cycle, the steering group, the evaluation team and the programme implementer will discuss what has changed/will change in the programme design in order to inform the evaluation.
47. Given the adaptive nature required for this evaluation, the supplier's performance, and the evaluation's workplan and budget will be reviewed at key time points and break points will be inserted into the evaluation's contract to reflect this. Progression beyond each break point would be subject to the outcome of as such reviews and agreement of any revision to workplans and budgets.

## **Presentation of Topline Findings**

48. To help inform decision-making around programme funding and programme design, towards the end of each evaluation cycle the evaluation team will present topline findings from the evaluation to DFID and other key stakeholders. During the inception phase DFID and the supplier will discuss and agree upon a timeline for this (at baseline), based on what is feasible in terms of allowing sufficient time for preliminary analysis and what is appropriate to help inform DFID decision making.

## **Final Reports**

49. For each evaluation cycle the evaluation team will submit a final report. As DFID initially propose four cycles; a total of 4 final reports will be produced. The main body of this report will be no longer than 30 pages; DFID expect it will be shorter at baseline. The endline report (at the end of the SGS programme lifecycle)

should reflect findings across the whole evaluation lifecycle. In addition there will be a 2-4 page executive summary. If necessary a restricted annex will be produced (no longer than 10 pages). DFID will provide clear instructions on what should be restricted. Data classified as restricted will include that which pertains to specific locations and could put partners at risk. DFID will retain the copyright for the reports and data produced as part of this contract.

### **Workshops with Key Stakeholders and the Implementing Partners**

50. As reports for each evaluation cycle are being finalised the evaluation team will take forward a workshop on lessons learned with implementing partners, the Syria CSSF and the EC (and potentially other key stakeholders). A total of 4 workshops are expected over the evaluation's lifecycle. The workshop reporting baseline findings is expected to be shorter than the other three.

### **Payment**

51. DFID expects to link payments under this contract to performance and outputs i.e. 'Payment by Results'. DFID would expect payments to achieving agreed deliverables and resultant Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) - e.g. on budget, on time, positive client feedback on services provided - that are objectively assessed on an annual basis.

52. As an essential aspect of the inception phase, the Supplier is expected to develop in collaboration with DFID KPIs which can be monitored to demonstrate value for money and performance of the contract

53. Payments will not be made against deliverables until DFID's approval has been given and DFID is fully satisfied with Supplier's performance.

### **Reporting**

54. The supplier will be expected to submit a short narrative report on key activities undertaken, challenges and lessons learned at the end of each implementation phase. Financial reporting is also likely to be required every quarter and/or at key stages in the evaluation's lifecycle. Such requirements will be agreed prior to the contracting of the evaluation.

### **Evaluation Governance Arrangements**

55. The evaluation will be supported by the following governance arrangements:

Role	Responsibilities
DFID Project Manager DFID's technical lead (Evaluation Adviser)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensuring that appropriate resources are committed to the evaluation</li> <li>2. Dealing with contractual issues</li> <li>3. Ensuring the information necessary for the evaluation is made available to the evaluators and facilitating contact with key stakeholders and implementers, where appropriate (this includes ensuring sharing of data from the Syria CSSF Independent Monitoring Programme)</li> <li>4. Sharing security information with the evaluator, as appropriate</li> <li>5. Liaising with the evaluation team to ensure that the evaluation timetable is kept to timelines</li> <li>6. Submitting evaluation documents to SEQAS, where appropriate</li> <li>7. Obtaining DFID's management response to evaluation findings (in particular the endline report)</li> <li>8. Working closely with the evaluation team to refine the evaluation's design during the inception period)</li> <li>9. Reviewing and inputting into tools, data collection and analysis plans (as appropriate)</li> <li>10. Publishing evaluation findings, as appropriate</li> </ol>
Evaluation team	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensuring the evaluation stays on track, meets its objectives, and is delivered on time and within budget</li> <li>2. Quality assuring the development of tools and data collection, analysis and interpretation</li> <li>3. Duty of care of all on the evaluation delivery team</li> </ol>
Evaluation Steering Group	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensuring delivery of a high-quality and policy relevant evaluation</li> <li>2. Quality assuring the final report (in conjunction with EQUALS)</li> <li>3. Assisting in the interpretation of the emerging evidence, as required</li> <li>4. Providing advice on how to proceed in the event that circumstances on the ground change</li> <li>5. Consulting with the evaluation team on any changes required in the design of the evaluation throughout the evaluation's lifecycle (as context and/or programme changes)</li> </ol>
External quality assurance (EQUALS)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quality assuring the evaluation's final reports (and potentially the inception report)</li> </ol>

## Security Risks to the Project

56. The SGS programme will be managed in Syria, an active conflict zone. This means that a very high level of care needs to be taken to ensure the protection of those implementing inside Syria and in neighbouring areas who could, due to

working on a UK Government funded project, come under attack from actors in the conflict.

## **Duty of Care**

57. Duty of Care is a legal obligation and under DFID's policy on Duty of Care, the lead supplier is responsible for the Duty of Care of all supplier personnel (including employees, subcontractors and agents) including making the appropriate security arrangements to protect their safety and wellbeing. Suppliers 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 of the contract. Proposals should demonstrate how suppliers are capable of taking responsibility for duty of care within the contract. The Supplier is responsible for the safety and well-being of their Personnel and Third Parties affected by their activities under this Terms of Reference. They will also be responsible for the provision of suitable security arrangements for their domestic and business property.
58. DFID will share available information with the Supplier on security status and developments in-country where appropriate.
59. The Supplier is responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security briefings for all of their Personnel working under this Terms of Reference and ensuring that their Personnel register and receive briefing as outlined above. 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.
60. This Procurement will require the Supplier to operate in a seismically active zone and is considered at high risk of earthquakes. Minor tremors are not uncommon. Earthquakes are impossible to predict and can result in major devastation and loss of life. There are several websites focusing on earthquakes, including <http://geology.about.com/library/bl/maps/blworldindex.htm>. The Supplier should be comfortable working in such an environment and should be capable of deploying to any areas required within the region in order to deliver the Contract (subject to travel clearance being granted).
61. This Procurement will require the Supplier to operate in conflict-affected areas and parts of it are highly insecure. The security situation is volatile and subject to change at short notice. The Supplier should be comfortable working in such an environment and should be capable of deploying to any areas required within the region in order to deliver the Contract (subject to travel clearance being granted).
62. 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 (such as working in dangerous, fragile and hostile environments etc.).

63. Bidders must develop their Tender on the basis of being fully responsible for Duty of Care in line with the details provided above and the initial risk assessment matrix developed by DFID (see Annex 2 of this ToR). They must confirm in their Tender that:

- they fully accept responsibility for Security and Duty of Care.
- they understand the potential risks and have the knowledge and experience to develop an effective risk plan.
- they have the capability to manage their Duty of Care responsibilities throughout the life of the contract.
- Duty of Care for any field visits including all aspects of travel and accommodation will be fully assessed.

64. Acceptance of responsibility must be supported with evidence of capability (no more than 2 A4 pages) and DFID reserves the right to clarify any aspect of this evidence. In providing evidence Tenderers should consider the following questions:

- a) Have you completed an initial assessment of potential risks that demonstrates your knowledge and understanding, and are you satisfied that you understand the risk management implications (not solely relying on information provided by DFID)?
- b) Have you prepared an outline plan that you consider appropriate to manage these risks at this stage (or will you do so if you are awarded the contract) and are you confident/comfortable that you can implement this effectively?
- c) Have you ensured or will you ensure that your staff are appropriately trained (including specialist training where required) before they are deployed and will you ensure that on-going training is provided where necessary?
- d) Have you an appropriate mechanism in place to monitor risk on a live / on-going basis (or will you put one in place if you are awarded the contract)?
- e) Have you ensured or will you ensure that your staff are provided with and have access to suitable equipment and will you ensure that this is reviewed and provided on an on-going basis?
- f) Have you appropriate systems in place to manage an emergency / incident if one arises?

65. For further details please see DFID's policy on Duty of Care: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/137565/DFID-duty-of-care-suppliers-note.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/137565/DFID-duty-of-care-suppliers-note.pdf) and latest DFID Duty of Care risk assessment matrix in Annex 1.

## **Risk management**

66. The supplier will be expected to set out their understanding of the most important anticipated risks, with an explanation of their mitigation strategies in a full risk register.
67. As part of this careful management of sensitive data and support for those handling this data will need to be taken forward and there should be a sound process for doing this.

## **Context and Background**

68. There are significant security risks of working within Syria and in neighbouring areas. DFID places the utmost importance on security and assessment and mitigation of risk in this context. The successful bidder will demonstrate how they will manage security throughout the contract and ensure that resources are appropriately allocated to security and risk management. Please see the Duty of Care and Risk Management section of this ToR for more details.
69. The UK has committed funds from the Syria Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF) Strengthening Governance Structures (SGS) project. The project is a follow-on project to the *Support to Emerging Local Governance in Syria* project (hereon referred to as “Tamkeen”). This is strengthening governance systems at local level and introducing best-practice approaches in areas such as procurement and community-engagement. It will run until November 2016. Tamkeen was designed at a time when Local Councils (LCs) in moderate-opposition areas of Syria were nascent. For this reason, project activities have been channelled through separate groups, called Tamkeen Committees (TCs). Established by the project, the TCs generally comprise civil society representatives, LC members and community notables. The aim has been for good governance demonstrated by a TC to be replicated by an LC, with the intention of project activities transitioning to the LC as and when possible, and for communities to begin demanding better governance from their elected representatives.
70. In its final phase, Tamkeen aims to operate in 38 communities in four provinces (though changes in the security environment may mean not all communities are accessible) across Syria – Rif Damascus, Aleppo, Idlib and Dara’a, and with three Provincial Councils (PCs) – Idlib, Aleppo and Rif Damascus. It will pilot the handing over of TC responsibilities to LCs in three communities.
71. SGS will build upon the success of Tamkeen, but will focus on strengthening LCs directly. In particular it will aim to increase the capability of LCs to respond to demand and provide services to citizens in a participatory, transparent, and accountable manner. The nature of support will vary depending on the capacity of the LCs, evidence of their performance thus far, the stability of communities from conflict and lessons from the pilot referred to in the paragraph above; the programme should also take a holistic approach in each community, ensuring the

engagement of other stakeholders besides the LC, in order to ensure inclusion and participation.

72. The available programme budget for SGS will be up to £35M from 2016/17 to 2019/20. The programme will be co-financed by the European Commission (EC). The European Commission will be involved in this evaluation and has been consulted in the development of these terms of reference.

73. The principle focus of SGS will be on strengthening governance structures in moderate opposition parts of Syria. The capacity of local and provincial councils to serve their communities has been developing over time, but remains weak, and can lack transparency and accountability. Increasing their capacity will both provide models for governance within post-conflict Syria, and deliver services to Syrians.

74. The **Outcome level** statement of the Strengthening Governance Structures project is:

Provincial and Local Councils have the capacity and processes to provide or oversee key services which meet community needs (including needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups), and have improved linkages to coordinate delivery between provincial and local levels.

In brief, this will be achieved through:

- Strengthening the capacity to provide services of about 50 Local Councils, and 3-4 Provincial Councils (PCs);
- Strengthening the links between LCs and PCs, and, in turn, the links they have with provincial technical directorates (henceforth referred to as Provincial Directorates (PDs)); and
- Strengthening community participation and oversight.

The programme's methodology will be finalised during the inception phase (due to start October, 2016). Please see SGS terms of reference for the programme's draft theory of change and further details on the parameters of the programme (ITT Annex A).

## Annex 1 - DFID Duty of Care risk assessment for Syria

Date of assessment: 19 May 2016

Theme	DFID Risk score
-------	-----------------

Country/Region	<b>Syria</b>
<b>OVERALL RATING<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>5</b>
FCO travel advice	5
Host nation travel advice	n/a
Transportation	5
Security	4
Civil unrest	3
Violence/crime	3
Terrorism	4
War	5
Hurricane	1
Earthquake	3
Flood	2
Medical Services	5
<b>Nature of Project/Intervention</b>	<b>5</b>

1	2	3	4	5
Very Low risk	Low risk	Med risk	High risk	Very High risk

---

<sup>1</sup> The Overall Risk rating is calculated using the MODE function which determines the most frequently occurring value.