ITT Volume 3 Terms of Reference

Evaluation design and delivery

Strengthening African Networks for Governance, Accountability and Transparency (SANGAT II) Programme – Phase II

1. Introduction

General Background:

DFID Southern Africa seeks to appoint a supplier to provide evaluation services to the Strengthening African Networks for Governance, Accountability and Transparency Programme – Phase II (SANGAT II). The supplier will design and deliver an evaluation of the SANGAT II programme, tailored to the work of three regional governance networks. This will follow the approach set out in the business cases (SANGAT II and Twende Mbele) and evaluability assessment and guidance note, described further below and attached as annexes 1 (a and b) , 2 and 3 to the TOR. The TOR will include fine-tuning the M&E framework developed in the SANGAT inception phase as well as establishing clear, measurable and reliable baseline data at the outset of SANGAT phase II. The supplier will also provide a small amount of M&E technical support to partners, through the life of the programme, to ensure their monitoring processes are capturing the data required for evaluation.

Note:
DFID is no longer supporting the African Prosecutors Association (APA), one of the networks included in the SANGAT II business case. The Twende Mbele programme, on the other hand, referred to in the evaluability assessment and the M&E guidance, is now a standalone programme, but maintains links with the SANGAT II components with the Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network of Southern Africa (ARINSA) and the Collaborative Africa Budget Reform Initiative (CABRI). The external evaluation will cover these three networks' programmes.

Programme background:

Through the SANGAT II programme, the UK will support three regional networks to improve transparency and accountability in Africa. The intervention has a dual purpose of enhancing regional cooperation to tackle transnational organised crime and corruption, and strengthening national systems of governance for more effective management of public funds.

The UK will provide up to £4,850,000 between September 2015 and August 2018, with funding from DFID Southern Africa's Regional Programme. This programme will continue the support provided to two regional networks during a successful inception year (SANGAT I): the Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network of Southern Africa (ARINSA), and the Collaborative Africa Budget Reform Initiative (CABRI), as well as to the Twende Mbele programme. The South African Department for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation leads this programme in collaboration with the Centres for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR), based at the University of the Witwatersrand.

Programme activities:

The programme will take a regional networking and peer learning approach to tackle common governance challenges in Africa. SANGAT II focuses on increasing transparency and accountability to provide the institutional foundations that will allow for better development outcomes and inclusive growth for the poor. The main activities are:

- <u>Combatting transnational and domestic organised crime, and seizing illegal assets</u> by: strengthening legislation, policies, systems and practices; training investigators and prosecutors; and enhancing information exchange, coordination and cooperation between regional actors;

- <u>Strengthening public financial management (PFM) in a way that counters corruption and supports pro-poor budgeting</u> by: increasing transparent and accountable management of public funds, both in public delivery sectors and in the management of revenues from extractives.

<u>Twende Mbele will tackle</u>common challenges to monitoring and evaluating government performance in Africa. The main activities are:

- Supporting the measurement of progress on implementing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through indicators aligned with National Development Plans; strengthening officials' analytical capabilities to account for government spending; collecting and using evidence to inform decision making; and evaluating government efforts to deliver development outcomes for women and girls, vulnerable and disadvantaged groups.

SANGAT II and Twende Mbele will focus on supporting partners in the region to find local solutions to common challenges. The three networks are led by South African institutions with expertise in combatting transnational crime and PFM, as well as monitoring and evaluating performance, and they have trusted and well established network partners across Africa.

Need for UK support:

UK support is required to strengthen and expand the work that the networks have done during the inception phase. Transnational crime and illicit financial flows (IFFs) are regional challenges that threaten the rule of law, weaken the fabric of the state, inhibit economic growth and the government's ability to generate revenues and deliver public services. Even conservative estimates show that African states lose billions of pounds annually through IFFs – funds that could have been spent on effective development. It is also in the UK's national security interests to combat IFFs and associated transnational crime, including money laundering and people trafficking.

Whilst there are many national efforts to address accountable and transparent governance, these follow traditional approaches largely driven by donors. They also focus on country level solutions without supporting regional solutions to transboundary problems. By contrast, supporting Pan-African regional networks, driven by South African technical expertise and political commitment, responds to national needs, supports regional problem-solving, and is a more sustainable approach for the UK.

Data collection and analysis remains a challenge in many developing countries in Africa. The countries participating in this programme will benefit from strengthening their M&E systems to determine how their interventions can most effectively reduce poverty, foster inclusive economic growth, and deliver better development. Improved data and analysis are needed to measure progress on implementing the SDGs, and to tackle the social and gender inequalities that most countries in the region face.

The publication of data can also help citizens hold their governments to account and demand better services. While there are many national efforts to address accountable and transparent governance, these follow traditional, largely donor-driven, approaches. By contrast, supporting Pan-African networks, driven by South African technical expertise and political commitment, is new and driven by peer learning benefits that national governments have realised.

Impact and outcome that we expect to achieve:

SANGAT II seeks to combat transnational crime and strengthen PFM in participating countries. It focuses on enhancing transparency and accountability in institutions to deliver:

Overall impact: Improved National Governance Systems.

Overall outcome: Effective practices, systems, policies and procedures implemented.

Programme components

Effective action to track, trace and seize the proceeds of corruption and crime will:

- contribute to better resource mobilisation for tackling poverty, for example when the state can accurately estimate expected income in the extractives sector and investigate and prosecute shortfalls;
- reduce impunity for those who abuse office; and
- pay for itself: a proportion of all assets recovered will be ring-fenced to fund maintaining and developing government capacity to disrupt, investigate and prosecute corruption and crime.

Twende Mbele seeks to strengthen government M&E systems and practices as tools for improving government performance and accountability.

At the **outcome** level, we expect the programme to catalyse and embed changes to current M&E systems; countries to adopt these improved systems; and to use them to inform their development policies and programmes.

The programme evaluation will provide region-wide lessons on using networking and peer learning approaches to improving public finance and expenditure. This approach will generate regional knowledge, exchanges of technical operational information, coordination, and transfer of good practice.

Background to Evaluation:

In order to build the evidence base in relation to regional peer networks, in 2014 DFID SA commissioned an evaluability assessment (annex 2) and an M&E Guidance (annex 3) for the SANGAT (and Twende Mbele) programmes. On the basis of this assessment, DFID SA decided that an evaluation of SANGAT II and Twende Mbele is feasible. Though the detailed evaluation design will be delivered through this TOR, the evaluability assessment provided DFIDSA with a credible analysis of the type of evaluation that will be both feasible for a regional intervention of this complexity and can start to answer the questions of most interest to DFIDSA. Evaluation options were developed so that they can be conducted in sequence or as stand-alone evaluative processes. In consultation with EvD, it has been decided that DFIDSA will first conduct a network analysis (process evaluation), followed by a performance evaluation. The planned evaluation stages are:

- network analysis (process evaluation); and
- performance evaluation.

2. Purpose and Objectives

The **purpose** of the network analysis/ process evaluation would be to test two hypotheses: 1) Regional networks are an effective way for multiple actors to learn from each other and build commitment; and 2) Peer-to-peer learning is an effective way of learning.

The **purpose** of the performance evaluation is to consider whether networks have achieved what they set out to achieve, i.e. delivered their outputs and outcomes.

The three **objectives** are as follows:

Objective 1: Conduct Network Analysis/ process evaluation of the two Networks funded under SANGAT II and the network funded under Twende Mbele

The objective of the Network Analysis/ process evaluation is to better understand how regional peer networks deliver value to members and the extent to which they are improving governance outcomes. This will lay the foundations for the outcome evaluation and potential impact

evaluation. The process evaluation will provide deeper understanding of the quality of SANGAT II's and Twende Mbele's implementation to the level of its outputs. Specifically it should assess whether SANGAT II's and Twende Mbele's outputs are relevant and coherent in relation to what was originally agreed, planned and expected in terms of action.

Key evaluation questions for the network analysis would be embedded within three themes:

- Network Vibrancy: How healthy is the network along multiple dimensions (participation, network form, leadership, capacity, etc.)? What role had South Africa played?
- Network Connectivity: What is the nature of relationships within the network? Is everyone connected who needs to be? What is the quality of these connections? Does the network effectively bridge differences? Is the network becoming more interconnected? What is the network's reach?
- Network Effects: What progress is the network making on identifying and achieving its outputs, outcomes and impact? What role does South Africa have in this?

In order to evaluate networks, the complexity and specific characteristics around them must be understood. This would include the need to developing appropriate network metrics around vibrancy, connectivity and effects, and gathering comparable and consistent data across the network and, where appropriate, between the networks. A network's current stage of development has implications for evaluation both in terms of what network metrics will be most meaningful and how much and what kind of progress towards outcomes can be expected. Therefore, network analysis would need to be applied flexibly across the different networks.

It would also be possible to add a theory-based component for the network analysis, if a Network Approach ToC were to be developed setting out the theories by which changes are anticipated. This could be developed at the onset when the baseline of the network metrics are developed. Alternatively, using only the network metrics would enable a network analysis to be conducted, but it would not be theory-based.

The supplier would expand upon the above and design and deliver a network analysis of SANGAT II. The design should use the analysis presented in the evaluability assessment at annex 3 as a starting point.

Objective 2: Design and deliver a performance evaluation of the SANGAT II and Twende Mbele programmes:

The theory-based performance evaluation would be based on the premise that:

- A robust identification and analysis of the external environment is carried out.
- The evaluation will focus at examining the results of individual partners and not at high level statements that incorporate each of their results.

A performance evaluation would consider whether networks have achieved what they set out to achieve, i.e. delivered their outputs and outcomes. It would evaluate SANGAT II's contribution towards its own stated outcomes and impacts within the context that it operates: i.e., effective practices, systems, policies and procedures implemented to a) contribute to better resource mobilisation for tackling poverty, for example the state can accurately estimate expected income in the extractives sector and investigate and prosecute shortfalls; b) reduce impunity for those who abuse office; c) a proportion of all assets recovered are ring-fenced and are now funding improved government capacity to disrupt, investigate and prosecute corruption and crime. The performance evaluation will take place during the intervention's lifecycle. High level evaluation questions are also set out in section 4.

A mixed methods approach would assess whether any observed contribution could reasonably be attributed to the intervention. This would need to be considered for each of the partners individually. This approach should map out the following:

- The causal chain (programme theory of each partner's work). This already exists - see the M&E Guidance Note (Annex 3) for more details.
- Understanding of the political economy context in each of the member countries.
- How to anticipate heterogeneity of results, i.e. differences in social political setting, target groups and the existence of other interventions.
- Incorporation of appropriate approaches such as case studies, process tracing, contribution analysis, and participatory approaches such as outcome mapping. The approach will need to define how any attribution of results to the programme is understood.
- Incorporation of thematic comparative reviews which allow for comparison between the networks – e.g. on VfM and gender as DFID cross-cutting thematic areas; but also areas such as leadership and other aspects of technical assistance (TA).

Evaluating the work of individual partners will need a functioning M&E system in place (see objective 3) that would focus data collection at the output to outcome level, for example outcome mapping. The service provider will need to work with the individual networks to ensure this is in place.

The performance evaluation would follow OECD-DAC guidelines and would be in line with the Paris Principles[1]. The service provider would be expected to involve key stakeholders including relevant government departments in Southern Africa region and civil society groups so there is ownership in the evaluation process. Key partners include the national prosecuting agencies of ARINSA member states, finance ministries in CABRI member states, the South African national Prosecuting Authority, The UNODC and the Foundation for Professional Development. Evaluation advisory input may be sought from South Africa's Department for Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation.

The service provider would expand upon the above and design and deliver a performance evaluation of SANGAT II. The design should use the analysis presented in the evaluability assessment at annex 2 as a starting point.

Objective 3: Provide proportionate technical assistance to ensure that the baseline and M&E systems are robust:

Whilst there is M&E guidance, logframes and theories of change in place for each network (Annex 3), the service provider will need to allocate some technical assistance resources to support the networks in data collection and management. This includes:

---

[1] *There are 5 fundamental Paris Declaration principles: 1. Ownership:* Developing countries set their own strategies for poverty reduction, improve their institutions and tackle corruption. *2. Alignment:* Donor countries align behind these objectives and use local systems. *3. Harmonisation:* Donor countries coordinate, simplify procedures and share information to avoid duplication.*4. Results:* Developing countries and donors shift focus to development results and results get measured. *5. Mutual accountability:* Donors and partners are accountable for development results.

- Fine tuning the M&E framework developed in the SANGAT inception phase as well as establishing clear, measurable and reliable baseline data at the outset of SANGAT phase II.
- Providing a proportionate and targeted amount of M&E technical support to partners, through the life of the programme, to ensure their monitoring processes are capturing the data required for evaluation.
- Regular coordination and liaison with M&E focal points in each network as each stage of the evaluation progresses.
- Targeted remote M&E support to network members (to be cleared with DFID in advance of each request).

It is not expected that objective 3 will require a large and sustained input throughout the programme although there would be a more concentrated investment of time in the inception phase to establish systems. The service provider would use the M&E guidance presented in annex 3 as a starting point.

3. Recipient

The recipient for the network analysis and evaluation will be DFID Africa Regional Department and programme partners of the SANGAT II programme.

Target Audiences for the Evaluation:

- The South Africa National Prosecution Authority
- The Collaborative Africa Budget Reform Initiative
- ARINSA and CABRI member states
- The UNODC
- DFID Staff
- Donor partner agencies
- PFM networks
- Prosecutor's networks
- Academics and civil society focussed on governance reforms
- Asset forfeiture specialist agencies
- PFM specialised agencies
- U4 and other anti-corruption think-tanks
- Partners in the Twende Mbele programme:
  - the South African Department for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation;
  - the Centres for Learning on Evaluation and Results;
  - the partner countries participating in the programme.

The service provider will be expected to produce an accessible summary report or briefing paper/presentation highlighting the evaluation findings and lessons for a wider target audience (as identified above).

4. Scope

During the inception period of funding the supplier will design the network analysis and performance evaluation and will work with DFID, SANGAT II and Twende Mbele partners to develop a baseline and ensure that current M&E frameworks, including logframes, are fine-tuned and fit for purpose. The supplier will be expected to be engaged intermittently throughout the 3 years of the programme. The details of this engagement are laid out in section 7 on timeframe and deliverables below.

Key evaluation questions:

Whilst evaluation question will need to be refined in the inception phase and reviewed at each stage of the evaluation, an indicative list of questions can be found at page 20 of the evaluability assessment. The key high-level questions for the performance evaluation would include:

1. **How effective are the networks in leveraging development outcomes and building regional capacity?**
   a. How do the different partners engage their networks to influence development outcomes?
   b. What were the most effective approaches to building capacity?
   c. To what extent are the outcomes sustainable?

2. **To what extent, if any, do regional peer-to-peer networks have a positive effect on the quality of governance at a national level in participating member states?**
   a. How do different peer-to-peer networks bring about change?
   b. To what extent are the networks sustainable?
   c. What role did context play in achieving these results?
   d. Are there tools and systems in place to measure how budgets impact the most vulnerable in society including women?
   e. Has the money derived from seized assets led to an increase in spending on programmes that benefit the most vulnerable, including women? For example: water and sanitation programmes?

5. Methodology

The service provider will take a mixed methods approach for delivering the objectives set out in section 2. DFID expects that delivering on this TOR will include a combination of desk based and in-country work as well as remote technical support and data gathering from partner focal points. Suppliers are encouraged to demonstrate innovative ways to work remotely and drive down in-country and travel costs. This is particularly important for SANGAT II in that the programme works with member states across Africa - travel to member countries would need to be carefully targeted and strictly based on evaluation needs – for budget purposes bids should include 4 trips in Africa per year (based on no more than 2 evaluators travelling). Suppliers should factor in the fact that each network has an annual general meeting in Africa (on rotation) which would provide an opportunity for engagement and face to face meetings with a range of network partners in one location.

The SP will deliver:

Objective 1: Conduct Network Analysis and process evaluation of the three networks funded under SANGAT II and Twende Mbele as set out in the bid, pp. 26-7. This will start with a participatory method of refining ToCs and logical frameworks for each of the three networks and implementing partners supported by SANGAT II and Twende Mbele. It will then measure the health of the network across multiple dimensions through surveys, key informant interviews (KIIs), and focus group discussions (FGDs) with staff of the three networks and implementing partners, as well as with DFID SANGAT II programme managers and key targeted government officials in each state/country in which the networks operate. The analysis will also include observational analyses of the operations of the networks, as well as analyses of programme documents, reports, and other secondary sources including data from Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index and the World Bank's Anti-Corruption reports and data (including the Actionable Governance Indicators of the World Bank (AGI) data portal) for each of the targeted SANGAT II and Twende Mbele countries in Africa.

The process evaluation approach will be flexible but will also emphasise the development of four to five key standardised performance indicators across the three networks and implementing partners so that each network can be assessed both individually and collectively (i.e., across and between networks). Additionally, the Service Provider will work with the partners and networks to create effective and standard processes, practices, procedures, and systems for their M&E tasks, that also meet DFID monitoring and reporting requirements. This will include the SP's templates such as indicator tracking tables, manuals, and guidelines for utilising best practices in M&E, and how to ensure rigorous, reliable, and valid results for M&E.

Objective 2: Design and Deliver an Outcome Evaluation of the SANGAT II Programme through an outcome mapping (OM) approach, which is a utilisation-focused, participatory, and theory-based approach for evaluations, as set out on pp. 27-8 in the SP's bid. This will include a robust identification and analysis of both the external and internal environments/forces, since both can affect not only programme implementation, but also evaluations.

Objective 3: Support the three networks to ensure their theories of change and M&E systems are adequate to collect and use quality baseline and progress data. This will focus on providing targeted technical assistance and training to the three networks and implementing partners. This will commence with a thorough needs assessment and analysis of the specific TA required by each network and partner. Areas of TA will include data collection, analysis, reporting and management.

TA will also focus on providing advice on how the three networks can

- strengthen their collection of output and outcome data;
- improve the ToCs and logical frameworks for each network;
- ways to strengthen their baseline data design and collection efforts; and
- focus more on gender and other variables (e.g. poverty level, government or non-profit).

The SP will take into account a thorough analysis of the external and internal environments in which the programme operates and a comprehensive understanding of the expectations and constraints (e.g., human and financial) of the client or programme funder.

The SP will schedule quarterly videoconference meetings with key stakeholders (including M&E representative of the networks) to check-in on the progress and address any key challenges or constraints faced each quarter, while also identifying shared methods to surmount these issues.

TA will be tailored and delivered according to the individual needs and existing M&E capacity of each network.

Part of the TA may include training the networks and partners to effectively and efficiently implement the Kirkpatrick Four Levels of Evaluating Training Programmes. Suppliers are invited to use the hypothetical schedule of work and timeline in the evaluability assessment to inform their approach and the methodology they will apply to deliver these TOR. The SP will use the evaluation methodology supplied in the bid and appendices, and this will be expanded upon in the inception and evaluation design stage.

Risks or challenges:

- A key risk is the number of member states involved and the ability of SANGAT II partners to collect and verify data through the life of the programme. This will be mitigated through the refined logframe and baseline ensuring that data is captured from the outset.

- There is a risk that M&E systems are not sufficiently well established or robust to be maintained through the course of the programme.
- There is a challenge that some data may be sensitive and may not be publically available.
- As a regional programme, gathering data and conducting interviews with a wide range of national level stakeholders may be difficult and the SP will need to think of innovative solutions to this problem.
- Each of the three networks will have different M&E systems in place. The SP will need to consolidate approaches to ensure a coherent overall evaluation product.

6. Existing information sources

The following documents would be available to the evaluation team:

1. Strategic cases for the two programmes - Strengthening Regional Governance Networks for Accountability and Transparency – Phase II (SANGAT II); and Twende Mbele ('Going Forward Together' – Strengthening African Monitoring and Evaluation Systems (Annex 1 a and b)
2. SANGAT Evaluability Assessment (Annex 2)
3. SANGAT M&E Framework Guidance Note (Annex 3)
4. SANGAT M&E framework and evaluability assessment – final report (Annex 4)
5. Each Network Partner Theory of Change and Logframe (included in Annex 3)
6. Each Network Partner's updated logframe (where appropriate).

DFID would make other relevant documents available on request where possible.

7. Deliverables and timeframe

The key deliverables for this TOR are as follows:

1. Evaluation inception meeting(s) with network partners and other stakeholders at the outset
2. Inception report outlining approach and detailed workplan
3. Refined logframes for each network with baseline data
4. Design document and evaluation plan for network analysis
5. Network analysis final report and presentation
6. Dissemination event (South Africa)
7. The methodology and work plan for the performance evaluation
8. Performance Evaluation final report and presentation
9. Dissemination event (South Africa)
10. Quarterly 1 page progress reports
11. Hosting (remotely) quarterly evaluation steering committee meetings, providing secretariat functions for these meetings.
12. briefing paper for donors and other stakeholders on SANGAT II - lessons learnt
13. Anonymised datasets of any data collected

The timeframe for delivery will be developed in consultation with DFID by the successful bidder during the inception phase, with reference to the indicative timeframe outlined in the evaluability assessment.

The timeframe:

1. Indicative start date – October 2016
2. Indicative end date for evaluation – October 2019

Please note that for operational reasons, the SANGAT II programme will be managed into a new Facility: Countering Illicit Financial Flows Facility for Africa, once DFID has tendered for a Programme Management Unit (PMU). We expect this to happen in FY 2017/18. The external

evaluation should be completed according to plan, however, Khulisa would be expected to work with a new programme management partner once the PMU is in place.

8. Abilities & Expertise To Deliver This Requirement

The team undertaking this work will need to demonstrate significant experience in the following areas:

Essential

- Experience of designing and implementing evaluations of complex, multi-component programmes and funds – particularly programmes that are regional in scope.
- Proven track record in developing and implementing single M&E frameworks across multiple stakeholders
- Experience and proven innovation in using open source or low cost IT solutions for M&E
- Sector experience in governance programming and/or research,
- Proven track record in using a range of evaluation methods (quantitative and qualitative),
- Using evaluations and evidence as a tool for lesson learning with different audiences
- Experience of network analysis and outcome mapping
- Experience of conducting Theory Based Evaluations.
- Experience applying a gender lens to evaluation.
- Experience in process, performance and impact evaluations.

Desirable

- Demonstrated understanding of relevant evaluation standards and norms, including OECD-DAC standards on evaluation.
- Understanding of Global Development Partnership principles
- Familiar with relevant evaluation codes of conduct and ethics.
- Knowledge and experience of M&E in relation to governance sub-sectors: public financial management; anti-corruption and illicit financial flows; and transnational crime.

Bidders must include **CV's of proposed consultants and their role in delivering this TOR** as part of their bid.

9. Logistics and procedures

DFID Southern Africa will provide the supplier with contact details for all relevant partners; the supplier will be responsible for liaison with partners to arrange all in-country appointments and work. The supplier will be responsible for all consultants' logistics and travel arrangements.

The supplier will liaise with DFID Southern Africa in relation to identifying cost effective ways to host the planned dissemination events and should assume minimal outgoings for this work. Once venues are identified the supplier will be responsible for all liaison with partners, planning and facilitation of these events.

All participants from partner organisations are Pretoria based and will take care of their own travel arrangements. DFID Southern Africa does not expect that any significant in-country costs will be incurred other than subsistence and travel for consultants.

Annual general meeting locations for each network remain to be confirmed but will be in Africa in a location with relatively easy transport links and in a capital city. DFID SA will liaise with the supplier to provide logistical information about these events well in advance. For budgeting purposes the supplier should expect a core team to attend these annual events.

10. Reporting and contracting arrangements

The suppliers will report to the Programme Manager and Regional Governance Adviser for DFID ARD. Suppliers will provide a 1 page quarterly progress report throughout the contract period and will host telephonic evaluation steering committee meetings every quarter.

The contract will extend across the full 3 year period to allow for the engagement of all partners and flexibility to work within busy schedules, however, it is not expected that the supplier would need to deploy resources throughout this time and resources should be used in a way that guarantees maximum Value for Money.

11. Budget

The supplier must provide a budget summary that breaks down all costs in delivering on this TOR separated according to each of the three objectives described above., The budget must include fee rates and any other charges for all personnel involved in the delivery of this TOR, including the exact time that they will be expected to spend on this contract over the contract period. DFID will not meet costs of business class travel; all travel costs expected to be paid by DFID must be budgeted as economy class.

The evaluability assessment provides an indicative budget for the delivery of each component of the evaluation. Bids should use this as guidance but are not obliged to adhere to this budget but rather should make their own assessment of what they would need to deliver this TOR.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) will be agreed between DFID Southern Africa and the contracted supplier during the inception phase. *Break Clauses:*

Suppliers should be aware that there will be three break clauses built in at the contracting stage, as follows:

Break clause 1: After the inception phase.- based upon DFID assessment of the agreed Inception Phase deliverables

Break clause 2: At the successful completion and delivery of the Network analysis final report in the express opinion of DFID

Break clause 3: At the time the SANGAT II programme will be taken on by the CIFFs Facility for Africa based upon DFID's assessment of the suitability of the transfer

12. Duty of Care

The Supplier is responsible for the safety and well-being of their Personnel and Third Parties affected by their activities under this contract, including appropriate security arrangements. They 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. DFID will provide the following: A copy of the DFID visitor notes (and a further copy each time these are updated), which the Supplier may use to brief their Personnel on arrival.

The Supplier is responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security briefings for all of their Personnel working under this contract 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.

Bidders must develop their response on the basis of being fully responsible for Duty of Care in line with the details provided above. They must confirm in their Response that:

a. They fully accept responsibility for Security and Duty of Care.

b. They have made a full assessment of security requirements.

c. They have the capability to provide security and Duty of Care for the duration of the contract.

	DFID Risk Score – South Africa	DFID Risk Score – Malawi	DFID Risk Score – Zimbabwe	DFID Risk Score – Zambia	DFID Risk Score – Mozambique
FCO Travel Advice	1	1	1	1	2
Host Nation Travel Advice	1	1	Unknown	1	Unknown
Transportation	1	3	3	1	3
Security (SS)	4	2	3	1	2
Civil Unrest	4	1	2	1	2
Violence/Crime (SS)	4	2	3	1	4
Terrorism (SS)	1	2	1	1	2
War	1	1	1	1	2
Hurricane	1	1	1	1	1
Earthquake	1	2	1	1	1
Flood	1	2	1	1	2
Medical Services	1	3	2	1	4
OVERALL RATING	**1**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**2**

1 Very low risk	2 Low risk	3 Medium risk	4 High risk	5 Very high risk
Low		**Medium**	**High risk**	

If you are unwilling or unable to accept responsibility for Security and Duty of Care as detailed above, your Response will be viewed as non-compliant and excluded from further evaluation.

Acceptance of responsibility must be supported with evidence of Duty of Care capability and DFID reserves the right to clarify any aspect of this evidence. In providing evidence, Suppliers 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?

For further information please consult the FCO travel advice:

https://www.gov.uk/foreign-travel-advice

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

RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX

Locations: South Africa, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Mozambique

The latest DFID/FCO risk assessment data for other countries that may require visits as part of the delivery of the project that is not mentioned here will be provided.