

**Call-down Contract  
Terms of Reference**

**A Monitoring and Evaluation Facility for the  
South Asia Water Governance Programme (SAWGP)**

**1. Introduction**

One billion people across Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, India, Nepal and Pakistan rely heavily on three Himalayan rivers – the Indus, Ganges and Brahmaputra – for their water and energy needs. Despite facing similar problems due to water demand and climate change, regional collaboration between these countries is severely limited. DFID is providing £23.5 million over five years (2012-17) through the South Asia Water Governance Programme (SAWGP) to facilitate regional collaboration over these rivers.

Insufficient trust has led to both under investment and highly nationalistic approaches to water infrastructure and river development. Consequently, significant benefits for resilient economic growth (e.g. hydropower development) and poverty reduction (e.g. efficient water supply for food and agriculture, flood and drought management) are not being realised. Nor are risks due to flooding and other natural hazards effectively managed, suggesting the governments are ill prepared for the extreme events likely to occur under future climate change. SAWGP is helping to improve relations between these countries over their shared rivers. It builds on lessons from the South Asia Water Initiative Phase I (SAWI-I) and seeks to marry technical and deliberative approaches to bring together a broad set of stakeholders to identify, frame and resolve challenges surrounding international rivers. The programme aims to influence national decisions on investments affecting shared rivers in order to promote greater economic resilience in the region.

The **SAWGP logframe**, revised in 2014, outlines three outputs:

1. Dialogue – facilitating opportunities for constructive dialogue within the region
2. Knowledge – building a common understanding of problems and possible solutions
3. Investments – improving the quality of investments in the basins.

SAWGP is delivering these outputs through **four components** each implemented by a different entity with their own monitoring system (please see the Business Case, revised logframe and two annual reviews for more detail):

1. South Asia Water Initiative Phase II (SAWI-II) through a World Bank multi-donor trust fund (MDTF)
2. Work on Mount Kailash by the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) using an accountable grant (AG)
3. Other activities:
  - a. Engaging local civil society
  - b. Building media capacity through an AG with the Third Pole Project (TPP)
  - c. Analysing climate change within the Indus basin
  - d. Providing fleet footed responses such as Chatham House's 2014 survey of water attitudes in the region

#### 4. Independent monitoring and evaluation

Discussions are ongoing regarding extending ICIMOD's work to two new Himalayan landscapes through additional funding. There is also a process underway to extend SAWGP's timeframe by two years (to December 2019). However, this will not alter the existing M&E budget or need for services (monitoring, evaluation and advisory role).

With the current funding of £23.5 million, SAWGP aims to deliver the following **high level results** by 2017:

- US\$500 million of cross-border investments improved by SAWGP activities
- 12 policy processes targeting transboundary challenges informed by SAWGP
- One regional process with a mandate and/or funding for transboundary dialogue post-2017
- 70,000 people benefiting directly from SAWGP related developments

Since starting operation in 2012, SAWGP has established a strong basis for achieving results and scored an A in its second Annual Review (2014). It is already providing technical assistance to improve design standards and unlock finance for several investment projects on the rivers. Alongside the technical assistance, it has influenced four national policy processes including India and Bangladesh's policies on joint management of the Ganges delta, and Nepal's policy on rangeland management which is important for sustaining water availability in downstream India. It has raised US\$26 million in additional funds so far that complement and boost implementation: e.g. by allocating US\$2 million, it raised an additional US\$12 million from the International Development Association (IDA) for glacier monitoring in the Upper Indus. Following support from SAWGP and public discussions on transboundary impacts, 28,000 people have benefited from new sustainable livelihoods opportunities in the river basins.

A key issue for DFID is whether SAWGP funded activities have delivered **value for money** (VFM). Therefore, the M&E approach will have to include scrutiny of this question. DFID understands VFM to relate to both the measures used to assess value for money and the processes used to ensure that the VFM principles are maintained; and regarded it as involving four aspects (more details are given in section G in the SAWGP Business Case):

- Efficiency – The cost of delivery impact results.
- Effectiveness – Any achievements in establishing the institutional and procedural changes required to achieve the results.
- Economy – How the funds been used.
- Equity – Have benefits deriving from the programme been distributed fairly.

## 2. Purpose, objectives and scope

The **purpose** of this work is to understand whether SAWGP and its constituent parts are making a difference in the management of the three Himalayan rivers. If the programme is influencing change then it is to ascertain what that difference is, who is experiencing it, and how was it achieved so lessons can be drawn.

The **objective** is to deliver the following M&E services which must include reporting on and addressing gender in compliance with the UK's 2014 International Development (Gender Equality) Act, and value for money. The primary focus is on evaluating the programme design and the process by which it is implemented:

ITT Volume 2  
(Call-down Contract)

- Design and implement a summative monitoring mechanism for SAWGP. While the implementing partners are already carrying out routine monitoring of their activities it is necessary to bring the individual components together in order to develop a picture of SAWGP's achievements overall. The summative monitoring will pull together the evidence from all the key partners to produce regular progress reports, including setting up baselines and filling gaps where required. This will entail:
  - Reviewing and advising on any necessary improvements to the existing results framework and the SAWGP Theory of Change (TOC).
  - Setting up robust data collection systems which augment existing data collection to ensure that the right information is being generated to assess progress.
  - Identifying how the various SAWG data collection systems can be brought together to provide the right M and E overview for the programme and operationalising this.
  - Advising, and building capacity where needed, amongst implementing partners to ensure consistency across their results frameworks and SAWGP's logframe.
  - Identifying and commissioning work to establish which baseline studies are needed and the appropriate baseline proxies where activities have already started and gaps existing in the monitoring of those activities. This is in order to assess progress against the logframe's indicators.
  - Feeding into the SAWGP Annual review by collating data and providing reporting on annual progress from key partners; advising on methodology for the mid-term and final reviews, and ensuring the correct DFID formats are used.
  - Incorporate a participatory M&E process engaging local communities where possible and appropriate to get feedback from beneficiaries for the work on Mt Kailash (Comp 2), the Civil Society Fund (Comp 3a) and the public narrative work (Comp 3b).
- Devise and commission a series of process evaluations of the key assumptions underpinning SAWGP's TOC. This will entail:
  - First designing an initial formative assessment to determine the validity of the tools and evaluation questions being asked.
  - Then devising the systems and identifying the opportunities for process evaluation that can unearth evidence to strengthen the TOC's assumptions.
  - Devising a robust but sensitive methodology to answer key questions given the delicate nature of the work.
  - Drafting TORs, sharing with them ART and conducting the evaluations once the TORs have been agreed to.

The evaluation's purpose is to assess whether the processes used have helped to achieve SAWGP's outcomes, and whether they were the most cost-effective initiatives. An indicative list of questions related to the 3 Es (economy, efficiency, and effectiveness) are given below, a longer list of questions utilising the DAC evaluation criteria is given in Annex 1:

- Does support for dialogue at different scales lead to better water management?
- Is value for money (VFM) being achieved across various elements of SAWGP?
- It is anticipated that the suppliers will establish light touch and frequent feedback from the implementing partners in order to continually improve the

ITT Volume 2  
(Call-down Contract)

programme's performance. This will ensure sufficient data for qualitative tracking of progress where quantitative analysis is difficult.

- Are the approaches ICIMOD is using for landscape management delivering improved watershed function and livelihoods (for women) concurrently?
  - Do the technical pieces funded under SAWI-II deliver the necessary influence to generate transboundary cooperation and enhanced quality of investment?
  - Does funding of the media through TPP change the public narrative on transboundary rivers, and how sustained is that change? Does it influence policymaking?
  - Does support to local civil society help them engage in multi-scalar dialogues on the management of transboundary rivers? Does the creation of the CSF improve the quality of life of communities with which it interacts?
- Advising SAWGP partners on strengthening their M&E processes by:
    - Devising realistic measures to improve M&E capabilities amongst smaller SAWGP partners, given the range from large multilateral agencies such as the World Bank to small local non-governmental and civil society organisations.
    - And establishing a lesson learning mechanism across SAWGP that draws on the outputs of the monitoring and evaluation by taking into consideration issues such as what other donors are doing in this area, efficiency and who to engage with.
  - Assisting SAWGP partners in ensuring their compliance with DFID processes by:
    - Advising partners which process to evaluate and the systems to use to monitor those processes.
  - Conducting an independent mid-term evaluation (MTE) and end of the project evaluation of the whole South Asia Water Governance programme.
    - Designing the mid-term evaluation in consultation with ART and the SAWGP implementing partners to assess progress towards outcomes and examine how processes/activities link to intended outcomes.
    - Liaising with key partners and providing an in-depth review of progress against the SAWGP logframe and ICF results targets in accordance with the programme's deadlines.
    - Reporting progress in accordance with DFID's corporate needs.
  - Establish clear governance structures for the M&E services by:
    - Creating a steering group for the process evaluations.
    - Developing a Value for Money (VFM) indicator and framework for a VFM metric in comparison with other transboundary river programmes supported by DFID and other donors.
    - The suppliers will ensure that all information related to beneficiaries is kept confidential, in accordance with good data management practices. And they will ensure that their findings are quality assured.
    - Designing a communication plan to disseminate key findings beyond the immediate audience of DFID, co-donors and implementing partners.

The **scope** of this work is to:

- Establish governance structures including a steering group for the process evaluations.
- Design the M&E services in consultation with ART, other donors and SAWGP implementing partners.

ITT Volume 2  
(Call-down Contract)

- Implement the agreed M&E strategy, including annual progress reports.
- Advise on how to strengthen partners' M&E processes as appropriate.
- And conduct a mid-term and end of the project evaluation of SAWGP as a whole.

### **3. Recipient**

The target audience for the evaluation will be actors looking to influence cooperative management of transboundary rivers through programmes that are more process-based:

- Internally, this would include DFID colleagues working on water and climate related programmes.
- Externally, this would include other donors such as Australia, and implementing partners such as the World Bank.

Successful delivery of M&E services will result in multiple users who will benefit from being involved in the process and its outputs:

- DFID and British taxpayers who can be confident that the funds are being spent appropriately and being implemented effectively.
- ART and DFID more widely in understanding the relevance of key processes and outcomes from DFID's engagement in international rivers.
- SAWGP's implementing partners and their sub-partners who will benefit from receiving light touch guidance on how to improve their M&E work.

### **4. Methodology**

The suppliers will design a clear and detailed M&E plan which must be submitted to ART no later than 7 weeks after the contract has been signed. The plan must propose a methodology and analytical framework for the evaluation, and include a mix of quantitative and qualitative tools to assess the results and how they have been achieved. Possible instruments for data collection could include interviews, observations, focus groups, literature survey, case studies, sample surveys, comparative experimental and multi-method field study. The suppliers must share in their inception report concrete sampling strategy and data collection tools.

The suppliers will then consult with ART, implementing partners and co-donors before submitting an amended M&E plan no later than 7 weeks after the contract is finalised. Once the plan has been approved through consultation, the suppliers will implement the plan.

### **5. Evaluation quality standards**

The suppliers will use the following quality standards for evaluations which are in line with the OECD Quality Standards for Development Evaluations:

- Independence and neutrality of the evaluation team. The evaluation team should not be biased regarding the evaluation content and outcomes, nor have a conflict of interest due to a prior involvement with SAWGP.
- Validity of findings. Evaluation findings should be precise and valid; and it should be clear how the evaluation team came to their conclusions.
- Participation of partners. Active participation and engagement of relevant partners is ensured through key informant interviews and focus group discussions, which will be reflected in the evaluation and, inter alia, capture the

ITT Volume 2  
(Call-down Contract)

perspectives and perceptions of partners. To assure that the evaluation is informative and responsive to learning and information needs, key stakeholders will be involved.

- Usefulness of the evaluation and its findings. Evaluation findings should be useful for the following:
  - Providing more in-depth information of the selected area of work for an evaluation of the overall programme.
  - Assessing the potential for up-scaling and replication.
  - Contributing to a systematic learning process among stakeholders, in particular addressing learning and information needs of civil society.
- Gender sensitivity. The evaluation will adopt a gender-sensitive approach in the design of its methodology, conduct of the evaluation and analysis of findings.

Suppliers will also be expected to adhere to DFID's Ethics Principles for Research and Evaluation outlined in Annex 3.

## 6. Key deliverables/Outputs

The successful bidder will be responsible for delivery of all M&E work specified in Section 2. This will include timely production of professionally credible and publically accessible reports on M&E and ensuring that evaluations/reviews are quality assured to meet DFID's technical standards.

The following deliverables are expected, and will be confirmed during the inception phase:

1. An inception report – since the bid documentation is limited to 30 pages, an in-depth report is required no later than 7 weeks after the contract is signed that details how the suppliers will deliver the M&E services in consultation with DFID and partners. The evaluation phase will only commence once the inception report has been approved by DFID. The inception report will cover how the suppliers will respond to Objectives such as:
  - Identification of how the M&E facility will address the three aspects of evaluation:
    - i. Summative monitoring which should involve reviewing the monitoring framework to suggest summative monitoring methodology; identify gaps in information, and suggestions for collecting additional information, including for review of on-granting partners assurance system
    - ii. Process evaluation
    - iii. Advice on capacity building – that includes an outline as to how implementation will proceed in the context of SAWGP specifically.
    - iv. How the supplier will undertake the mid-term and final evaluation.
  - A proposed reporting format that will enable all SAWGP partners to contribute to DFID's annual reports with minimal duplication of work.
  - A methodology for establishing baselines associated with SAWGP's logframes and the partners' results frameworks. Given the delayed commissioning of the programme's M&E, robust proxies for baselines or other appropriate approaches are to be included if feasible.
  - The evaluation objectives and strategy, methodology, approach, scope for the evaluation, and communication plan how stakeholders will be engaged.

ITT Volume 2  
(Call-down Contract)

- Propose a governance mechanism for QA of evaluation.
  - Framework to assess VFM in SAWGP.
  - Clear delineation of responsibilities for SAWGP partners for ART and for the supplier.
  - Agreed process for regular monitoring reports to feed into Annual Reviews and quarterly progress reviews.
  - How the suppliers will liaise with SAWGP's implementing partners and co-donors.
  - A communication plan to disseminate key findings beyond the immediate audience of DFID, co-donors and implementing partners.
2. A formative assessment of evaluation questions and tools delivered within the first 4 months of the contract.
3. Reporting on M&E service delivery –
- a. In the first year, once the Inception Report has been approved, the suppliers will submit brief monthly reports during their monthly meetings with ART on their progress. It is anticipated by the second year these reports will have moved to a quarterly basis if the M&E service delivery is progressing smoothly.
  - b. Annual reports summarising progress in each year will also be submitted and cover all aspects of the M&E services being provided.
4. Summative progress reports on the whole of SAWGP – These reports will feed into SAWGP's annual reviews. As the review is due on 10 December each year, these reports will detail progress against the results frameworks until the end of October, submitting the report in the first week of November. A final progress report in the format of DFID's Project Completion Report (PCR) will be required for the whole period of SAWGP by the end of October in the final year.
5. A mid-term project evaluation report at the mid-point of the project.
6. An end of project evaluation report delivered three months before SAWGP completes.
7. VFM framework including VFM metrics. Case studies as agreed with DFID showing how value for money was achieved in SAWGP in comparison with similar work on transboundary rivers.
8. Data protocol agreements with key implementing partners that include:
- The creation and maintenance of a common data portal
  - Data access rules
  - Provision for offline storage and management of data
  - Common data standards for the whole programme
  - Data provision requirements.

## 7. Constraints

Several factors make SAWGP a challenging programme. It deals with a politically sensitive issue (the management of international rivers in a region already subject to tense national relationships), it is looking to influence change rather than simply build

ITT Volume 2  
(Call-down Contract)

‘taps and toilets’, and it is administratively complex. All bids will have to demonstrate their ability to deliver the M&E services despite these constraints.

*Politically sensitive.* With increasing demand for water coupled with poor management, decreasing availability impels governments to capture more water. This is particularly problematic for rivers shared by two or more countries because the resource flows causing a hydrological interdependency between them. In South Asia, tensions arising from historical relations add another layer of complication.

*Influencing change.* Programmes that build infrastructure or deliver distinct services such as maternal health projects are easier to attribute change to. But changing how decision-makers and other stakeholders view international rivers and modify their behaviour accordingly is harder to attribute to particular programmes. For example, it is hard to discern whether a senior politician changed their outlook vis-à-vis a neighbouring government because they read an article written by a journalist funded through SAWGP.

*Administratively complex.* Through SAWGP, DFID works with multiple partners implementing the components, and it co-finances the World Bank Multi-Donor Trust Fund for South Asia Water Initiative Phase II (SAWI-II) with Australia and Norway. The number of players means multiple and differing institutional timelines such as reporting cycles and financial years that need to be met and coordinated. In addition, the components started at different times. Table 1 illustrates some of the administrative complexities.

Table 1. SAWGP’s components and donors

Component	Implementing partner (IP)	Started	IP’s financial year	Other donors
1. SAWI-II	World Bank	2013	1 July – 30 June	Australia, Norway
2. Mount Kailash	ICIMOD	December 2012		Germany (BMZ)
3. a Civil Society	To be contracted	Designing	N/A	N/A
3. b Regional media	TPP			N/A
3. c Indus		Designing	N/A	N/A
3. d Fleetfooted	Chatham House (CH)	Part designing. CH completed	N/A	N/A
4. M&E		Designing	N/A	N/A

The donors’ financial years and reporting cycles:

- DFID: FY 1 April – 31 March, the SAWGP Annual Review due on 10 December
- Australia (Department for Foreign Affairs and Trade): FY 1 July – 30 June, the Social Development Investment Programme (SDIP) through which DFAT funds SAWI-II reports in September
- Norway (Ministry of Foreign Affairs): FY 1 January – 31 December

An added complication is that while implementing partners such as the World Bank and ICIMOD are collecting data to track progress vis-à-vis their results frameworks, they do not anticipate evaluating their activities. Therefore, the suppliers are expected to work with such implementing partners to ensure their reporting complies with SAWGP’s logframe and M&E needs where possible.



## 8. Implementation requirements

### *Team structure/Skills and qualifications*

Given the complexity of the programme, DFID welcomes bids submitted by consortia of international and local suppliers in order to furnish the skill set and expertise needed to meet the full gamut of monitoring and evaluation services stipulated in these TORs. In selecting partners, the lead suppliers must demonstrate an understanding and ability to manage any sensitivities arising from using suppliers from within the region in different SAWGP countries.

It is **essential** that the successful bidder's skills/team will include but not be solely limited to:

- A balance of skills for monitoring and evaluating complex programmes that includes monitoring frameworks, summative monitoring, and evaluation (expertise and experience in designing, managing and leading process evaluations, relevant methods and approaches including mix of qualitative/quantitative).
- Relevant experience of developing monitoring and evaluation frameworks and indicators for (a) transboundary/multi-country projects, and (b) in water resources, adaptation or climate change.
- Experience of developing M&E for process heavy programmes that assess:
  - Progress on governance structures
  - Influencing change in perceptions
  - Decision making by stakeholders at different scales over international rivers
- Skills in VFM analysis and reviews, and economic analysis as applied to M&E.
- Demonstrable experience and familiarity of working with DFID's M&E systems including logframes, theories of change and results frameworks.
- Experience in advising a range of actors and supporting them in building their capacity on M&E.
- Experience in gender, social and poverty analysis.
- A track record of working with local partners and data collection in South Asia.

It would be **an advantage** if the successful bidder could also demonstrate:

- Expertise in South Asian transboundary water resource management and/or international rivers more widely.

## 9. Budgeting

The M&E experts must be self-supporting and responsible for their own activities. They should not rely on ART or the DFID Country Offices to provide facilities, logistical or administrative support. Therefore, the bids submitted should include all costs relating to designing and implementing the work including Duty of Care (see Annex 2). ART and the relevant DFID Country Offices can provide letters to support visa applications on request if required.

An indicative budget for this project is £350,000 to £500,000 and covers the programme's full duration including any extension period. The budget proposed for the extension phase, for an additional two years up until 2019, is indicative only at this stage

and will form the baseline for extension discussions at a later date. If and when the time extension is granted, the indicative budget set out at this stage will be clarified and agreed at that time. During the inception phase, a more detailed evaluation plan (including prioritised processes to be evaluated, methodology etc) will be firmed up.

## **10. Contract Payment Structure**

DFID's preferred method is to link payments to milestones (payment by results). Bidders should propose a payment plan using payments by results linked to programme outputs that incentivises the achievement of results and value for money. Bidders are expected to:

- Demonstrate how they will maximise VFM while minimising administrative and supplier costs.
- Propose a payment plan based on outputs achieved, which will be subject to negotiation.
- Use public sector rates for travel and subsistence as relevant to each country.

DFID reserves the right to scale-up or scale back the contract to respond to changing requirements. The initial contract will be awarded for a period of 2 years, however DFID reserves the right to extend the contract as necessary due to unforeseen circumstances or where the South Asia Water Governance Programme is extended. Any extension will not exceed 2 years (ending in December 2019) and may be less.

## **11. Timeframe and reporting**

The South Asia Water Governance Programme was approved in 2012 and is currently due to end in December 2017. A time and cost extension is being sought which will mean additional funds (£7.5 million) being allocated to one implementing partner, and the whole programme being extended until December 2019. While there are no guarantees, the SAWGP team anticipates the time extension will be approved given the strong rationale for it. To accommodate the current situation, suppliers are asked to submit 3 costings that cover the following periods:

- The inception phase
- The first stage of implementation that covers the confirmed SAWG programme duration (£23.5m, December 2017).
- The second stage of implementation that covers SAWGP's extension by two years (December 2019) and additional funds for Component 2 (£7.5m)

It is important, however, to note that at this stage DFID can only commit to work that has already been approved, i.e. until 2017. Any further work will be subject to three issues – the extensions being approved, the on-going need for the work, and the suppliers' satisfactory performance.

Presuming the current end date (December 2017) and budget (£23.5 million), the commission's timing is as follows:

- An inception plan to conduct the M&E services, MTE and advisory service outlined above submitted no later than 7 weeks after the contract is signed.
- A formative assessment to be delivered no later than 16 weeks after the contract is signed.
- Provide SAWGP's annual progress report by early November for annual reviews which are due on 10 December of each year.

ITT Volume 2  
(Call-down Contract)

- In the first year, the suppliers will be expected to give monthly updates to ART on progress via monthly meetings. As the work beds in, this reporting will occur at greater intervals but never being less than every quarter.
- The suppliers will provide reports on their progress with audited accounts each year.
- The final report will be due two months before the end of the project to feed into SAWGP's end of project report.
- Invoices requesting payment against deliverables in line with an agreed payment schedule.

SAWGP team within ART:

- Leads for this commission
- Other ART staff involved in SAWGP

The suppliers will report to the Regional Water Resources and Climate Adviser, and the A2 Programme Manager. They will liaise with the Evaluation and Results Advisers assigned to ART. The Regional Water Resources and Climate Adviser will have responsibility for programmatic oversight of the commission, and the A2 Programme Manager will manage the contract administration and payments.

## **12. Break Points**

There will be a break clause in the contract at the end of the inception phase where the supplier will be required to submit an Inception Report. DFID will review this report and if it is satisfactory will confirm the full contract and move to implementation phase.

## **13. Competition criteria**

The successful M&E service provider or its consortium partners should not be involved in implementing other SAWGP components as this may present a case for a conflict of interest. This competition will be evaluated on the basis of a technical 60% and commercial 40% split as detailed below.

### *Technical weighting (60%)*

#### Quality of personnel (20%)

- Quality of the team leader as evidenced by considerable experience of monitoring and evaluating complex multi-country programmes focusing primarily on processes rather than tangibles like infrastructure.
- Quality and appropriateness of team (CVs), for instance, having the appropriate expertise, individual skill mix, and the use of local and international suppliers with suitable capacity and availability. Clear evidence of how team will be structured and work together to deliver the M&E services.

#### Methodology (20%)

- The approach to developing the M&E services as expressed in the Objectives. The bid should identify how the suppliers will utilise the latest thinking in the academic and grey literature on how to monitor and evaluate programmes primarily focused on shaping influence, cooperation and governance between governments and other actors over shared rivers.

ITT Volume 2  
(Call-down Contract)

- Evidence of how the suppliers will respond to the methodology to deliver services, and what evidence do they have of how the team will manage the constraints SAWGP poses as outlined in Section 7 in the TORs. For example, given the absence of baselines in some instances, how will the team develop proxies so the baseline can be simulated to a reasonable degree of accuracy where activities have already started.
- The process the suppliers will use to liaise with ART and SAWGP partners.

*Ability to deliver complex programmes (20%)*

- Demonstrating how their experience will be used to deliver M&E services for a complex regional programme on international rivers in South Asia, and manage any political sensitivities surrounding the issues.
- Experience of engaging with multiple stakeholders at different scales and different roles such as government, NGOs etc; and adapting to changing circumstances such as the whole programme or a component being extended.
- Evidence of effective programme management including financial and progress reporting, and a plan to disseminate results.

*Commercial Offer (40%)*

Alongside their technical expertise, the suppliers' bids will be assessed commercially to ensure value for money is demonstrated throughout the programme.

#### **14. Relevant documents**

*DFID documents on SAWGP:*

- Business case approved in 2012
- Revised logframe approved in 2014
- 2013 Annual review
- 2014 Annual review
- Draft of a SAWGP M&E plan
- A review of SAWGP's evaluability completed in April 2014

*M&E relevant documents prepared by DFID:*

- DFID's How to Note on Evaluating Influence
- Asia Regional Team's Operational Plan

*Documents from key partners:*

- World Bank's SAWI-II results framework
- ICIMOD's M&E framework
- Third Pole's inception report which contains the results framework/logframe

## **Annex 1**

### **Possible evaluation questions**

Though the questions utilise the OECD Development Assistance Committee's (DAC) criteria for evaluation, they are not regarded as being exhaustive and merely given as suggestions. It is expected that the suppliers will determine a robust set of questions to use. The questions seek to understand whether external intervention is useful in politically sensitive regional issues such as international rivers, and whether they can facilitate transformational change.

#### *Relevance*

- While it is assumed that SAWGP exists because the countries bought into its objectives, we would like to take the opportunity to test this assumption if possible by asking the following questions: Did the country-based stakeholders (government, technical experts, civil society) want SAWGP and its constituent components? How were beneficiaries identified? Did the programme embodied their interests and therefore have their buy-in, or was it imposed externally by the donors? Who instigated the idea and how effective was the process of getting buy-in within the countries?
- If the countries and donors shared the objectives, did SAWGP frame them as desired? Or did the country stakeholders want different features within programme?
- Was SAWGP designed so as to address problems relating to international rivers as viewed within South Asia?
- Are there any aspects of SAWGP that could be replicated in other international basins?
- Is SAWGP's existence part of a wider DFID policy of supporting third party intervention in international basins? And if yes, what evidence is there to support this policy, how high-up does the institutional support go, and what lessons have been extracted from previous programmes?
- How did the programme's objectives remain aligned with its partners (country and donors)?

#### *Efficiency*

- How well did DFID's procurement processes work in terms of recruiting suppliers who delivered timely and high quality work? Should certain processes be brought back in house or does outsourcing remain the best in terms of value for money (VFM)?
- Was anything done during project implementation to ensure greater efficiency in the use of resources by DFID and its development partners? How did SAWGP's different delivery channels (multi-donor trust funds, accountable grants, direct procurement) fare in terms of VFM?

#### *Effectiveness*

- How well did DFID's development partners implement the programme? For example, the World Bank's handling of the SAWI-II component?
- Given the political nature of SAWGP, how well were expectations managed within DFID, its development partners and the countries during the design and implementation phases?
- Did the programme achieve its objectives, and what were the barriers and constraints? Did opportunities arise over the programme's life that it used in

ITT Volume 2  
(Call-down Contract)

support of its objectives ie was it fleetfooted and responsive to issues on the ground?

- With its stated objective of supporting regional dialogue over the Himalayan rivers, how well has SAWGP been able to create an inclusive dialogue between and across governments, technical experts and civil society across the seven countries? How did the gender profile of participants change over the programme?
- How accurate were our assumptions underpinning the SAWGP Logframe and Theory of Change? Did SAWGP perpetuate an implicit assumption that 'knowing = doing', and in the process ignore the challenges of getting change on the ground?

*Impact*

- Did the programme provide information and influence how decisions are made at the national level within and between government, technical and community groups? Did the national processes have any influence on regional decision-making processes? If yes, what factors were successful in getting buy-in, and did these lead to transformational change at the different levels? Are technical experts being listened to at the following levels – nationally within governing structures, regionally between governments, and internationally within donor institutions?
- Is there gender awareness amongst our partners and their programme activities, and how did the gender profile of participants in the different activities change over the programme's duration?
- Who is viewed as an 'expert'? Do governments now recognise that communities are experts in their experience of international rivers too because of the programme? If government structures are beginning to recognise that communities are experts too, has it made any difference to the communities, for example, by being included in decision-making?
- Is there a material difference in the knowledge base and interaction between actors within these basins and countries over shared waters?

*Sustainability*

- Will the governments remain involved in bilateral and regional dialogue processes? Will they keep funding the Abu Dhabi Dialogue (ADD) or other regional dialogues? If the programme has successfully linked civil society to government structures within the countries, will they be able to sustain that link?
- Have country level concerns been raised and addressed within the programme?
- How will the work conducted under SAWGP continue once DFID's funding ends in 2017 (or 2019 if extended)? What evidence is there that the countries will look to self-finance all or some aspects of the work? Similarly, what interest is there within DFID or its external partners to continue the work?
- If similar programmes like SAWGP are to be replicated, what lessons regarding sustainability of large regional multi-agency programmes can be drawn?

## **Annex 2**

### **Duty of Care**

The Supplier is responsible for the safety and well-being of their Personnel (as defined in Section 2 of the Framework Agreement) and Third Parties affected by their activities under this Call-down 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. Where appropriate, DFID will provide the following:

- All Supplier Personnel will be offered a security briefing by the British Embassy/DFID on arrival. All such Personnel must register with their respective Embassies to ensure that they are included in emergency procedures.
- 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.

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).

This Procurement will require the Supplier to operate in conflict-affected areas and parts of it are highly insecure. Travel to many zones within the region will be subject to travel clearance from the UK (and possibly national) governments in advance. 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).

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.). The Supplier must ensure their Personnel receive the required level of training to be able work in hostile environments prior to deployment.

Tenderers 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.

ITT Volume 2  
(Call-down Contract)

- 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.

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

- 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)?
- 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?
- 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?
- 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)?
- 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?
- Have you appropriate systems in place to manage an emergency / incident if one arises?

Further information on Duty of Care is provided in the Supplier Instructions (Volume 1 of the Mini-Competition Invitation to Tender Pack).



ITT Volume 2  
(Call-down Contract)

**Risk Assessments for Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, India, Nepal and Pakistan**

Date of Assessments: April 2015

Risk	Afghanistan	India	Nepal		Bangladesh		China		Bhutan	Pakistan
	No date		Kathmandu & Pokhara	All other parts of Nepal	Except Chittagong Hill Tracts	Chittagong Hill tracts	China (excluding Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous region)	Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous region		
DFID overall rating	5	(Low Risk)	2 (Low)	2 (Low)	2	3	1	3	1 (Low)	
FCO travel advice	4	2	1	1	2	3	1	3	1	
Host nation travel advice	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	3	n/a	
Transportation	4	2	3	4	3	3	1	1	1	
Security	5	2	2	2-3	3	3	2	3	1-2	
Civil unrest	4	2	2	3	2	4	1	3	1	
Violence/crime	4	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	1-2	
Terrorism	5	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	1	
War	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Hurricane	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	
Earthquake	4	3	4	4	2	3	2	3	n/a	
Flood	1	3	2	2	2	3	2	1	n/a	
Medical Services	4	3	2	3	3	3	1	2	2	
Nature of Project/Intervention		2	2	2	2	3	1	3	1	
1 Very Low risk			2 Low risk	3 Med risk		4 High risk		5 Very High risk		
						SIGNIFICANTLY GREATER THAN NORMAL RISK				

ITT Volume 2  
(Call-down Contract)

**Risk assessment for Pakistan: March 2015**

Theme	DFID Risk Score	DFID Risk Score	DFID Risk Score	DFID Risk Score	DFID Risk Score	DFID Risk Score	DFID Risk Score	DFID Risk Score	DFID Risk Score
	Kyber-Pakhtunkwha: Charsadda, Kohat, Bannu, the city of Peshawar and districts south of Peshawar	Tank, Lakki and Dera Ismail Khan,	Swat, Buner and Lower Dir	Kalesh Valley, Bamoboret Valley, Arandu District to the south and west of Chitral	Federally Administered Tribal Areas,	North and West Balochistan	Quetta	Sindh – Karachi Sindh Province; Nawabash and parts of Interior Sindh to the north of Nawabash	Punjab – Lahore – Islamabad
FCO Travel Advice - Overall Rating	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3
Host Nation Travel Advice	Not Available (NA)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Transportation	3	4	3	3	4	5	4	3	2
Security	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	3
Civil Unrest	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	2
Violence/crime	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	3
Terrorism	5	5	5	5	5	4/5	5	5	4
War	2	3	5	2	3	3	3	2	1
Hurricane	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
Earthquake	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
Flood	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3

ITT Volume 2  
(Call-down Contract)

<b>Medical Services</b>	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	2	2
<b>Nature of Project Intervention</b>									

**Annex 3**  
**DFID Ethics principles for research and evaluation**  
Final July 2011

DFID expects the research and evaluation it funds to adhere to the highest standards of integrity. To facilitate this it has drawn up these Principles on ethical practice in research and evaluation. All research and evaluation conducted or funded by DFID (wholly or partially) is expected to uphold these Principles. These Principles should be read in conjunction with DFID's Ethics Guidance for Research and Evaluation.

**Principles**

- 1. Researchers and evaluators are responsible for identifying the need for and securing any necessary ethics approval for the study they are undertaking.** This may be from national or local ethics committees in countries in which the study will be undertaken, or other stakeholder institutions with formal ethics approval systems.
- 2. Research and evaluation must be relevant and high quality with clear developmental and practical value.** It must be undertaken to a sufficiently high standard that the findings can be reliably used for their intended purpose. Research should only be undertaken where there is a clear gap in knowledge. Evaluations might also be undertaken to learn lessons to improve future impact, or in order to meet DFID's requirements for accountability.
- 3. Researchers and evaluators should avoid harm to participants in studies.** They should ensure that the basic human rights of individuals and groups with whom they interact are protected. This is particularly important with regard to vulnerable people. The wellbeing of researchers/ evaluators working in the field should also be considered and harm minimised.
- 4. Participation in research and evaluation should be voluntary and free from external pressure.** Information should not be withheld from prospective participants that might affect their willingness to participate. All participants should have a right to withdraw from research/ evaluation and withdraw any data concerning them at any point without fear of penalty.
- 5. Researchers and evaluators should ensure confidentiality of information, privacy and anonymity of study participants.** They should communicate clearly to prospective participants any limits to confidentiality. In cases where unexpected evidence of serious wrong-doing is uncovered (e.g. corruption or abuse) there may be a need to consider whether the normal commitment to confidentiality might be outweighed by the ethical need to prevent harm to vulnerable people. DFID's fraud policy will apply if relevant.

6. **Researchers and evaluators should operate in accordance with international human rights conventions and covenants to which the United Kingdom is a signatory, regardless of local country standards.** They should also take account of local and national laws.
7. **DFID funded research and evaluation should respect cultural sensitivities.** This means researchers need to take account of differences in culture, local behaviour and norms, religious beliefs and practices, sexual orientation, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity and other social differences such as class when planning studies and communicating findings. DFID should avoid imposing a burden of over-researching particular groups.
8. **DFID is committed to publication and communication of all evaluations and research studies.** Full methodological details and information on who has undertaken a study should be given and messages transmitted should fully and fairly reflect the findings. Where possible, and respecting confidentiality requirements, primary data should be made public to allow secondary analyses.
9. **Research and evaluation should usually be independent of those implementing an intervention or programme under study.** Independence is very important for research and evaluation; in fact evaluations in DFID can only be classified as such where they are led independently. Involvement of stakeholders may be desirable so long as the objectivity of a study is not compromised and DFID is transparent about the roles played. Any potential conflicts of interest that might jeopardise the integrity of the methodology or the outputs of research/ evaluation should be disclosed. If researchers/ evaluators or other stakeholders feel that undue pressure is being put on them by DFID officials, such that their independence has been breached, this should be reported to the Head of Profession for Evaluation who will take appropriate action.
10. **All DFID funded research/ evaluation should have particular emphasis on ensuring participation from women and socially excluded groups.** Consideration should be given to how barriers to participation can be removed.