

Monitoring and Evaluation of the Global Mine Action Programme 2

Terms of Reference

Purpose of document

1. The UK Government Department for International Development (DFID) invites tenders from organisations within our Global Evaluation Framework Agreement (GEFA) to monitor and evaluate the Global Mine Action Programme 2 (GMAP2) which will operate from August 2018 until March 2020. These terms of reference (ToR) describe our requirements.

Introduction

2. In 2015, 1,600 people were killed and 5,000 injured by landmines or other explosive devices left behind following conflict. With international assistance, a total of 29 states are no longer suspected to be contaminated with mines since the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention was adopted in 1997. GMAP2 continues the work of its predecessor programme, GMAP, operating from January 2014 until March 2018, to reduce the humanitarian and development impact of landmines and explosive remnants of war (ERW). The expected results include making safe 150 km² land; enabling 800,000 people to live their lives free from the threat of mines; and helping 100,000 adults and children to understand the dangers of landmines. The programme has three aims:
 - clearance and direct release of contaminated or suspected contaminated land (demining);
 - mine risk education (MRE); and
 - building the capacity of partner countries to manage national mine action programmes
3. These activities save lives, reduce fear and create an enabling environment for development, as land is brought back into productive use and is made safe for the return of those displaced and for resumption of service delivery. GMAP2 will build the capacity of regional and national demining authorities based on their priorities, including improving information and risk management systems, and increase the effectiveness of local management.
4. The current GMAP programme operates in Mozambique, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, South Sudan, Somalia, Burma and Zimbabwe. The focus countries of GMAP2 are Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Angola, Zimbabwe, South Sudan, Somalia, Burma, Afghanistan, Lebanon, Yemen, Iraq, Syria, and Sudan. There may be a future need for additional Mine Action Activities in Sri Lanka. Components of GMAP2 are subject to procurement and may be delivered through more than one supplier. The countries covered by the Service Provider will be confirmed during the inception phase.

5. GMAP2 is programmed through DFID's Conflict, Humanitarian and Security Department (CHASE) under project number 300544. The theory of change is included in these ToRs at Annex A. Please see the business case for further information including a discussion of the theory of change.

Budget and Contract

6. We anticipate a budget of up to £1million for both monitoring and evaluation components. The contract will run from 08 August 2018 to 31 March 2020.
7. Dissemination activities and the secretariat function for the steering committee shall be included within proposal budgets.
8. Monitoring and evaluation will have a 2-month mobilisation phase. Progress to the implementation phase will be dependent on satisfactory performance and delivery of the evaluation framework.
9. Key performance indicators (KPI) will be agreed with DFID before formal contracting. DFID and the chosen monitoring and evaluation provider will agree a clear payment schedule linked to performance milestones. Payment will be quarterly in arrears.
10. Tenderers are responsible for establishing the status of this requirement for the purpose of any government tax in the UK or Overseas. Any applicable taxes must be shown in Pro Forma 3 (Invitation to tender (ITT) Volume 4). Tenderers must either supply a statement confirming they have investigated the tax position and advising no tax is applicable, or provide a figure at pro forma 3 of the tax due under any contract.
11. Subject to the satisfactory performance of the Service Provider, continuing need and availability of funding, the contract may be extended for a period of up to 12 months to cover continuing work in one or more countries which may have been added during the original contract period.

Roles

12. DFID's Conflict, Humanitarian & Security Department (CHASE) will both manage this programme and oversee the overall delivery of UK results targets on demining. Changes to the programme design will not be considered final until approved by DFID.
13. GMAP2 Service Providers contracted by DFID to carry out programme activities will provide data inputs to the Monitoring and Evaluation provider as well as DFID on a quarterly basis at a minimum.
14. Reporting to the GMAP2 programme manager(s), the monitoring and evaluation provider will work closely with DFID's project team and country office advisors to achieve the following objectives:
 - Assess progress of GMAP2 against agreed outputs and outcomes
 - Verify GMAP2 suppliers' reporting

- Report on lessons learnt, gender equality, conflict sensitivity, value for money, financial management, risk, stewardship of assets, monitoring and evidence; and
- Help provide accountability to UK taxpayers.

Requirements

- Proposals should detail how the monitoring and evaluation provider will work closely with DFID's programme team and country office advisors to achieve the following objectives:
 - Review causal pathways and assumptions of theory of change.
 - Assess whether GMAP2 has provided an efficient and effective approach in support of the UK's 2013 Mine Action Strategy
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/260365/mine-action-policy.pdf
 - Consider extent to which programme activities reflect country government priorities
 - Make recommendations for adaptive management
 - Undertake case studies and analysis to provide contextual information to aid decision making
 - Disseminate lessons and good practices to build the global evidence base and inform future mine action programmes, and
 - Present an inception report in no later than 2 months after the start of the contract; an interim report 6 months after programme start; and a summative report in April 2020.
- Proposal should detail how the monitoring and evaluation provider will utilise a range of sources to inform evaluation design and delivery. This may include (but not be limited to):
 - Field visits to project and beneficiary locations
 - Independent or third party monitoring
 - Randomised control trials
 - Local and regional government reporting
 - Triangulation with other data sources
 - Community feedback events
 - Verification by NGOs and CSOs
 - Other donors' monitoring and reports
 - Remote sensing – satellites, drones, GPS

Monitoring requirements

- The Monitoring and Evaluation provide analysis and advice to DFID on the following monitoring components of GMAP2:
 - Results: Whether the programme is on track against intended milestones and targets, and any unintended consequences (positive or negative).
 - Activities: Track the use of funding inputs and resources into how activities are delivered and whether they occur according to a pre-defined work plan.

- Compliance: Ensures delivery is in accordance with local, national government laws, within donor requirements and to ethical standards.
 - Situation/context: Examines the operating environment, monitoring risks and assumptions, as well as political and institutional factors that may influence project progress.
 - Beneficiary: Investigates the experience and perceptions of project beneficiaries, including participation, access and treatment by the project, paying particular attention to vulnerable or marginalised groups in the population.
 - Financial: Tracks the use of input funds for activities and outputs, with attention paid to accurate forecasting of costs and budget monitoring, clear and audited accounting procedures, and adequate safeguards to prevent fraud and corruption.
 - Organisational: Covers the internal capacity of institutions involved with the project and partners to utilise and manage the project funds, undertake activities and delivery expected results
18. The monitoring and evaluation provider must use a logframe to track country and overall progress on a quarterly basis and provide advice on ways to strengthen the programme. This advice will be informed by reports from GMAP2 partners, a single visit to each partner in the consortium within the first 6 months of the programme and ongoing dialogue with the GMAP2 suppliers and DFID. The monitoring and evaluation provider will attend quarterly meetings with the DFID project team to provide advice on issues including, but not limited to:
- Progress against outputs and outcomes
 - Any impediments to achieving milestones
 - Proposed changes to the original project workplan during implementation including on project proposals, amendments and contract addendums
 - Recommendations to reallocate funds to maximise impact
 - Implementation of lessons learnt
 - Value for money
 - Monitoring, and
 - Evidence
19. The monitoring and evaluation provider should propose how it will triangulate GMAP2 suppliers' reporting with information from other credible sources to provide advice to DFID on external context, operational, delivery, safeguarding, reputation and fiduciary risks. This includes an ongoing review of financial management, risk, stewardship of assets, and operational procedures.
20. In addition, the monitoring and evaluation provider must:
- Have the capacity and expertise to visit and advise on mine action projects in Somalia, South Sudan, Zimbabwe, Burma, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Angola, Laos, Vietnam, Syria, Yemen, Sudan and Lebanon (will only be required to visit a maximum of 10 of these countries)
 - Ensure data are disaggregated by age, gender and disability

- Work in a conflict-sensitive way and assess whether implementing organisations are doing the same, and
- Produce visit reports with recommendations which detail how the GMAP2 supplier is ensuring duty of care, compliance, due diligence, and appropriate financial and asset management.

Evaluation requirements

21. Monitoring and evaluation providers must detail in proposals how they will ensure the evaluation speaks to countries new to GMAP programming but also examines evidence of historic benefits in communities where mine action has been taking place over a longer period.
22. The evaluation will be undertaken in line with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Evaluation Quality Standards. The proposal should detail how evaluation design will address the following factors:
 - Selection and balance of interventions
 - Value for money – economy, efficiency, effectiveness, equity
 - Coherence – How the interventions interact with other processes of change and the demining efforts of other donors and the national authorities and whether interventions support development of country governments’ mine action capacity and ownership
 - Conflict -- The Service Provider shall provide, as part of its proposal, a conflict sensitivity strategy which includes an assessment of work in the proposed area and steps to avoid aggravating the causes and consequences of conflict wherever possible.
 - Gender -- The Service Provider shall provide, as part of its proposal, a gender strategy that will detail how the Service Provider shall design, develop and implement the project in a way that takes into account the different needs, priorities, knowledge and capabilities of women, girls, men and boys, ensuring that they participate in, and benefit equally from, the proposed project.
 - Disability -- The monitoring and evaluation provider shall outline in its proposal how it will evaluate whether and how programming activities are made accessible and relevant to people with disability and to what extent mine action planning incorporates views of disability and victim assistance organisations and encourages inclusive employment practices.
 - Inclusion - Impact (if any) of demining on social equity, gender relations, and social exclusion, specifically the extent to which different local stakeholders (local leaders, both men and women farmers, other community members) were involved in the whole site selection and clearance process; and
 - Movement, migration and displacement.

23. Proposals should indicate preferred methodologies, and succinctly relate these to our monitoring and evaluation requirements and the theory of change. In addition, the evaluation of GMAP2 should cover the following potential humanitarian and development benefits of mine clearance, risk education and capacity development:
- Stability: increased opportunity for peaceful long-term development processes
 - Economic development: enhanced employment opportunities in affected communities
 - Infrastructure: routes available for local transport and trade
 - Services: target communities have increased access to basic services
 - Displacement: refugees and internally displaced persons (IDP) are able to return to areas made safe for habitation and work, and
 - National ownership: increasingly capable national mine action authorities able to coordinate and deliver clearance and MRE.
24. Reports should provide sources of evidence, including qualitative and/or quantitative data from affected communities. Gender equality and inclusion of people with disabilities and other marginalised groups should be addressed with disaggregation by sex, age, disability and other relevant factors.

Research Study

25. In addition to examining the immediate impact of this programme, the evaluation will also be designed to consider the long-term benefits to communities of land clearance and risk education, by looking at evidence of historic benefits in communities where mine action has been taking place over a longer period (including but not exclusively that funded by the UK).
26. The study will include a systematic review of all the available evaluation and research studies on the longer term impacts of demining, including as much as possible any locally commissioned research as well as the research commissioned by demining contractors themselves. Country selection for this study would be confirmed in the inception phase.
27. The monitoring and evaluation provider's proposal should detail how the learning gained from this evaluation will be shared with DFID, and how DFID can disseminate learning to country stakeholders and the international community.

Timeline

28. The table below illustrates specific deliverables.

Monitoring Requirement	Timing
INCEPTION	
Design global and country logframes with GMAP2 suppliers. Produce associated logframe report clarifying the definition of output and outcome statements, and the methodology for measuring indicators; and QA milestones and targets for DFID country office sign-off.	August 2018 Logframe report – August 2018

Prepare templates for quarterly progress reports, advice to DFID programme manager, and visit reports	August 2018
IMPLEMENTATION	
Update global and country logframes, advising DFID of progress. Correspond with partner organisations to understand progress and follow up with any questions if needed, include DFID in correspondence unless requested otherwise; triangulate this information with external sources and advise DFID why progress is under or over expectations on a country by country basis; devise a concise, standard format to deliver the final advice to DFID programme manager(s)	Quarterly within 10 working days after completion of each quarter to allow DFID to make timely payment to Suppliers
Advise on remedial action for underperforming projects. Make recommendations for re-programming funds to achieve maximum impact; devise a concise, standard format for a template for advising DFID programme manager	When risks increase
Advise DFID on the suppliers proposed changes to the programme, including changes to workplan, budget lines, staffing and risk mitigation techniques.	On request
Undertake monitoring visits up to 10 GMAP2 countries to check assets; review duty of care; undertake due diligence spot checks and undertake compliance checks	<p>Mainly October 2018–January 2019</p> <p>At least 8 visits between October 2018–January 2019, likely to be single visits to Syria, Lebanon, Somalia, South Sudan, Yemen, Sudan but could be any of the GMAP2 countries</p> <p>At least 2 visits between December 2018 – March 2019, likely to be single visits to Burma or Afghanistan</p> <p>Undertake spot check visits to either Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Zimbabwe, Angola in late 2019 if requested</p>
Prepare draft exit plan covering asset disposal; delivery of finished work, and materials related to work-in-progress; return or destruction of confidential information	December 2019

Evaluation Requirement	Timing
INCEPTION	
Design global and country logframes with GMAP2 suppliers. Produce associated logframe report clarifying the definition of output and outcome statements, and the methodology for measuring indicators; and QA milestones and targets for DFID country office sign-off.	<p>August 2018</p> <p>Inception report – September 2018</p>
Produce an evaluation framework and questions to be agreed with DFID during the inception phase	To be agreed with DFID no later than 2 months after the contract commences
IMPLEMENTATION	
Produce evaluation reports presenting summative findings	Interim report 6 months after the

answering the evaluation questions posed, and containing an executive summary and recommendations. All findings will be disaggregated where possible to allow analysis of findings for different groups.	<p>programme has started</p> <p>Research study – April 2020</p> <p>Draft summative report – beginning of January 2020</p> <p>Summative report April 2020</p> <p>Final report –28th February 2020</p>
--	--

Inception Phase

29. The M&E partner, in consultation with GMAP2 partners and the DFID project team will use the inception phase to develop the evaluation framework and agree evaluation questions. In addition to describing detailed design and methodology, the inception report will focus on the feasibility of data collection, establish a clear rationale for the countries to be selected for case studies, and collect baseline data for these countries (including an overview of local context as it relates to various evaluation components such as gender, conflict and disability and inclusion).
30. Part of this process could include a workshop to bring stakeholders together, including beneficiary representatives. The framework, outcomes, indicators and questions must be agreed with DFID at the end of the inception phase, before implementation can begin. The monitoring and evaluation provider will work out a sampling strategy during the inception phase that can cover a variety of contexts such as:
- Both rural, semi-urban, and urban areas (including areas where cleared land is being used for non-agricultural purposes like factories or tourist facilities)
 - Both areas where demining efforts have focussed on clearing agricultural land and areas where a greater focus has been on clearing key roads and other infrastructure, and
 - Varying levels of security and political stability.

Logframe Development

31. We will expect the monitoring and evaluation provider to develop specific indicators for different contexts. These indicators will be developed in cooperation with advisory leads in country; with the chosen operator; and in accordance with other donors to ensure the international community is using standard indicators to measure progress. Indicators will build on those used in GMAP which are listed below:
- Number of beneficiaries of land release activities
 - Area of land released and in use, or with firm plans for use
 - Percentage of direct beneficiaries surveyed reporting improved livelihood opportunities
 - Percentage of direct beneficiaries surveyed reporting improved access to basic services and/or infrastructure following land release

- Percentage of direct beneficiaries surveyed reported feeling safer after land release or MRE activities
 - Percentage of direct beneficiaries surveyed demonstrating increased understanding of MRE messages, and
 - Mine action programmes are managed, coordinated and regulated more effectively by mine action authorities.
32. The monitoring and evaluation provider will work with the organisations selected to implement GMAP2 to develop a single workable global logframe, and corresponding country level logframes, and to update them on a quarterly basis. The monitoring and evaluation provider will also quality assure the milestones and targets to ensure they are challenging yet realistic and recommend a systematic process for updating milestones and associated rationale.
33. An associated logframe report should also clearly highlight (i) operational risks to delivery; (ii) the methodology for how all the indicators will be measured; and (iii) define the terminology in the output and outcome statements. The development of the logframe could, for instance, include a workshop to bring stakeholders together, including beneficiary representatives. The logframe must be agreed with DFID at the end of the inception phase, before implementation can begin.
34. Logframe development will take into account the needs and capabilities of people with disability and other vulnerable groups.

Exit Strategy

35. The monitoring and evaluation provider shall co-operate to ensure the smooth transfer of responsibilities to any persons or organisation taking over such responsibilities after the contract ends. Three months before contract end, the monitoring and evaluation provider will prepare for DFID's approval a draft exit plan which shall cover:
- Asset management and disposal of all assets procured throughout the lifetime of the programme (this must be in accordance with DFID procedures on asset management and disposal)
 - Delivery of finished work, and materials related to work-in-progress, and
 - Return (or destruction of) all confidential information to DFID before the contract end date.
36. The exit plan should allow up to 60 days after the contract end for the exit process to be completed.

Team profile

37. The monitoring and evaluation teams should include:

Monitoring team	Evaluation team
An experienced team leader familiar with monitoring in fragile and conflict-	An evaluation lead with experience in managing complex evaluations on humanitarian and stabilisation

affected context	programmes in fragile and conflict-affected states
Team members with monitoring expertise in humanitarian or development programmes	Strong evaluation expertise in development programmes; including in theory-based evaluation
A diverse team with respect to equality characteristics, and a mix of local and international experts with first-hand experience delivering mine action programmes in each country GMAP2 operates. This should include, clearance, MRE or capacity development work	
Ability to engage with local, national and international stakeholders, including possessing the relevant language skills and relevant visa-entry requirements for country visits	
Strong analytical skills to present implications of findings for policy and programmes;	
Excellent report writing; and	
Fluent written and spoken English	

Governance Arrangements and Reporting

38. A steering committee will be established to oversee the evaluation, consisting of the DFID senior responsible owner (SRO), a relevant DFID senior manager, a DFID evaluation adviser, and an independent evaluation expert. To avoid a conflict of interest, the steering committee members will not concurrently be employed by any GMAP2 partner. The steering committee will meet twice per year.
39. The Monitoring and Evaluation provider will provide analysis, advice and recommendations to DFID regarding programme performance and achievement of objectives. Changes to programme will not be considered final until approved by DFID.
40. The Service Provider shall also include details of how it encourages inclusive employment practices.

Reporting

41. The monitoring team lead and evaluation team lead should report to the account manager who will hold the relationship with DFID in the first instance.
42. The monitoring and evaluation provider will keep DFID up-to-date with the progress of each GMAP2 project and alert the project team to any significant challenges that GMAP2 suppliers are facing with programme delivery. The primary contact will be the GMAP2 Programme Manager. Progress, lessons and evidence will be collated for all projects within quarterly progress reports, together with partner organisations.

43. The monitoring and evaluation provider will attend quarterly meetings with the DFID project team.

Quality Assurance

44. All evaluation reports will be independently quality assured through the Evaluation Quality Assurance and Learning Service (EQUALS). The summative evaluation will be published. DFID will also publish management responses to these reports indicating the extent to which recommendations will be adopted.

Intellectual Property Rights

45. Any reports or documents prepared or information produced by or on behalf of the Supplier relating to the Contract and all intellectual property rights therein will be the property of the Crown. The Supplier will therefore assign to the Crown all intellectual property rights in such materials generated by the Supplier in the performance of the Contract and waive all moral rights relating to such materials.

Break Point

46. Given the need for GMAP2 M&E to be responsive, flexible and adaptive in some areas, and the potential for scale up or down, the monitoring and evaluation provider's performance, and workplan and budget will be reviewed at key time points and break points will be inserted into the contract to reflect this. Key review stages for the programme and contract will be at the end of the Inception phase (likely to be 2 months from the start of the contract), and at key milestones in the contract. Progression beyond each break point will be subject to the outcome of reviews, satisfactory performance of the monitoring and evaluation provider and agreement to any revised work plans or budgets. In the event that DFID determines not to proceed with the contract as a result of the review, the Contract will be terminated in accordance with the DFID Standard Terms and Conditions.

Risk Management

47. Risks relating to monitoring and evaluation of GMAP2 are described here. More general risks to the programme's success are described in the business case.

Risk	<u>Mitigating action</u>	<u>Likelihood after mitigating action</u>	<u>Impact after mitigating action</u>
External context: Access to certain countries, such as South Sudan or Somalia, is not possible	Country-level risk assessment will be conducted as part of the inception phase. GMAP2 and monitoring or evaluation activities can be switched between countries to maintain overall progress in the event of a deteriorating security situation.	Possible	Moderate

Delivery: Monitoring or evaluation activities are delayed	CHASE will select a partner with a track record of timely delivery. Payments will be made on successful and timely delivery of agreed outputs.	Possible	Minor
Delivery: Data cannot be independently verified	Partners will be expected to use innovative methods to triangulate and check data reports from GMAP2 suppliers.	Possible	Minor
Delivery: Research produces uncritical findings in contexts where people are reluctant to speak out	The research will be led in each country by an experienced international consultant who is both familiar with DFID's requirements and the local political and social context	Possible	Minor
Safeguarding: Staff come to harm in difficult operating environment	Partners will ensure appropriate duty of care arrangements including participation in a UK Government approved hostile environment training course, and adherence to FCO advice. Further details are presented in the duty of care section of these ToRs	Unlikely	Major
Operational: DFID staff turnover results in inadequate oversight of monitoring and evaluation	Following the annual people survey, CHASE takes action to promote high staff wellbeing and morale. Vacancies are filled promptly. Any gap in evaluation adviser input will be addressed through cadre 10% time.	Possible	Minor
Delivery: Evaluation results are improperly influenced by close collaboration with GMAP2 suppliers established through monitoring activity	The monitoring team and evaluation teams will have separate reporting structures. Team leads are to report to the account manager.	Possible	Moderate
Fiduciary: Funds are diverted	Due diligence has already been undertaken on providers in the GEFA framework, who in turn are required to undertake due diligence on downstream partners in the supply chain. Reports of fraud will be promptly escalated and action taken to recover funds.	Unlikely	Minor
Reputational: UK press reporting causes embarrassment to the UK Government	Incorrect stories will be challenged. DFID control procedures will be followed.	Unlikely	Minor

48. The monitoring and evaluation provider will undergo a Delivery Chain Mapping exercise to ensure reputational and delivery risks are identified and managed. This will be managed and reviewed on an ongoing basis, at a minimum at annual reviews but also as and when there are changes in the structure of the programme.

Aid Transparency

49. In line with the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), DFID requires partners receiving and managing funds to release open data on how this money is spent, in a common, standard, re-usable format and to require this level of information from immediate sub-contractors, sub-agencies and partners. The monitoring and evaluation provider should submit copies of its supply chain (sub-contractor) invoices and evidence of payment when invoicing DFID for its actual costs of procurement of local services and applicable management fee.
50. It is a contractual requirement for all suppliers to comply with this, and to ensure they have the appropriate tools to enable routine financial reporting, publishing of accurate data and providing evidence of this to DFID. Further IATI information is available from: <http://www.aidtransparency.net/>

Ethical considerations

51. It is essential that this piece of work is: independent i.e. those conducting the evaluation, for example, must be objective and not connected with the intervention under study; be transparent i.e. results must be publically available; and use robust methodologies which, if replicated, will produce similar results.
52. All monitoring and evaluation must be of high quality and have practical value. The provider will:
- Adhere to ethical research principles around doing no harm, informed voluntary consent for participation, and confidentiality
 - Identify the need for and secure ethics approval for primary data collection and in-depth studies
 - Operate in accordance with international human rights commitments to which the United Kingdom is a signatory, regardless of local country standards, and
 - Respect cultural sensitivities.

UK Aid Branding

53. Suppliers that receive funding from DFID must use the UK aid logo on their development and humanitarian programmes to be transparent and acknowledge that they are funded by UK taxpayers. Suppliers should also acknowledge funding from the UK government in broader communications but no publicity is to be given to this Contract without the prior written consent of DFID. There may be locations where the use of the UK Aid logo will not be appropriate. Any exceptions to the rule above must be discussed with DFID on a case by case basis.

Duty of Care

54. The monitoring and evaluation provider is responsible for the safety and well-being of its staff (as defined in Section 2 of the contract), informants and third parties affected by their activities under this contract, including appropriate security arrangements. The monitoring and evaluation provider will be responsible for the provision of suitable security arrangements for domestic and business property.
55. DFID will share available information with the monitoring provider on security status. On arrival in country, DFID or the British Embassy will provide a security briefing and visitor notes. All staff must register with their own embassy to ensure that they are included in emergency procedures. The monitoring and evaluation provider must ensure appropriate safety and security briefings for all of their staff working under this contract, ensuring that they register and receive briefing as outlined above. Travel advice is available on the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) website. The provider must ensure staff are up-to-date with the latest position.
56. The monitoring and evaluation provider will be required to operate in conflict-affected areas where the security situation is volatile and subject to change at short notice. Travel will be subject to clearance from the UK government. The monitoring and evaluation provider must take account of risks related to the operating environment, ensuring appropriate arrangements, processes and procedures for staff. Staff should participate in a UK Government approved hostile environment training course prior to deployment.
57. The monitoring and evaluation provider will be operating in areas at high risk of earthquakes and should be capable of redeploying as necessary to complete activities.
58. Tenderers must develop their proposal on the basis of being fully responsible for duty of care in line with these requirements and the initial risk assessment matrices prepared by DFID (see ITT Attachments 1-5). They must confirm in their response (ITT Attachment 6) for each duty of care assessment matrix that they:
 - Fully accept responsibility for security and duty of care
 - Understand the risks and have the knowledge and experience to develop an effective risk plan, and
 - Have the capability to manage their duty of care responsibilities throughout the life of the contract.
59. Acceptance of responsibility must be supported with evidence of duty of care capability. DFID reserves the right to ask for clarification of any aspect of this evidence.

Selection Criteria

60. Proposals of around 25 pages are invited to address these terms of reference. They should contain the following sections: Introduction, Methodology, Limitations, Data

sources, Staffing, Timeline, Budget, Deliverables, Engagement with DFID, Ethical considerations, Risks, Dissemination.

61. The tender will follow an open and transparent selection process based on the following criteria:

- Interpretation of these ToR (10%)
- Quality, skills and experience of the team (20%)
- Design and methods (30%), and
- Commercial (40%).

62. DFID will consider bids from organisations or consortia, but not a 'sole-contractor'.

Environmental and Social (E&S) safeguards

DFID works to embed environmental and social safeguards predominantly to ensure that our development and humanitarian interventions do no harm. They are also a key part of ensuring that our outcomes are sustainable, that they provide good value for money and that protect the positive results and transformative impacts for poverty reduction and development that we aim to deliver.

DFID needs to understand the scope of safeguard risks that might need to be considered in a given project, to ensure that risks are identified properly analysed and mitigation measures in place, with clear oversight responsibility for example to safeguard those directly or indirectly involved as beneficiaries or community members of DFID interventions.

Further considerations of particular importance to managing the risk of doing unintended harm to people and/or the environment include (but are not limited to)): social and poverty impact, gender equality, resource scarcity and environmental vulnerability, climate change, institutional environment, the political economy, conflict and fragility.

DFID Suppliers are expected to demonstrate;

- **Top-level commitment:** evidence of top-level organisational commitment to implement E&S safeguards, enhance E&S outcomes, and seek continual improvement. This should ideally take the form of a written statement signed by senior management, shared publically.
- **Appropriate systems and processes:** robust policies and systems in place for identifying E&S risks, implementing E&S safeguards, and monitoring performance relevant to this programme or investment, including regular field supervision and spot-checks.
This should include, where relevant, clear policy and strategy and robust processes and documents such as Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs), [child] safeguarding policies, Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs), Stakeholder Engagement Plans (SEPs), Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs), Occupational Health and Safety Management Plan (OHSMPs) documentation.
- **Adequate resources:** evidence on adequate financial, professional, and institutional resources in place to implement E&S safeguards, coordinate down-stream partner

implementation of E&S safeguards, and seek continual improvement throughout the entire lifecycle of this programme or investment? This should include adequate staff with specialist training and experience (including high-risk issues such as HIV/AIDs, gender based violence, and child protection), and dedicated budgets.

- **Strong track record:** suitability to deliver DFID's contract requirements, including assessment of an organisation's past performances, financial stability and organisational principles and track record of implementing E&S safeguards on similar programming.

Supporting documents

- Annex A: Summary Risk Assessment Matrix
- Annex B: Theory of Change
- Annex C: Evaluability assessment
- Annex D: Business case

Annex A: Summary Risk Assessment Matrix

Project: Global Mine Action Programme II (2018-2020)

Date of assessment: 20 February 2018

Assessing official: Stefanie Nijssen (with input from country offices/Embassies)

	DFID Risk Score					
	Cambodia	Zimbabwe	Angola	Somalia		
Theme				Somaliland	Puntland	South Central
OVERALL RATING	2	3	4	5	5	4
FCO travel advice	2	3	3	5	4	4
Host nation travel advice	None	None	None	None	None	None
Transportation	4	4	3	4	5	5
Security	2	3	4	4	5	4
Civil unrest	2	3	4	4	4	4
Violence/crime	2	3	4	4	5	4
Terrorism	2	1	2	4	5	5
War	2	2	2	3	3	2
Hurricane	2	2	1	1	2	1
Earthquake	2	3	2	1	1	1
Flood	3	3	4	3	2	1
Medical Services	5	3	4	5	5	5
Nature of Project	2	2	2	3	3	3

Theme	DFID Risk Score				
	Burma	Laos	South Sudan	Vietnam	Lebanon
OVERALL RATING	4	2	4	2	4
FCO travel advice	3	3	5	2	5
Host nation travel advice	None	None	None	None	None
Transportation	3	3	4	4	4
Security	2	2	5	2	4
Civil unrest	2	2	5	2	3
Violence/crime	2	2	5	2	3
Terrorism	2	2	2	2	4
War	3	2	4	3	4
Hurricane	4	3	1	4	1
Earthquake	4	2	1	2	3
Flood	4	4	4	4	2
Medical Services	4	4	4	3	3
Nature of Project	3	2	3	2	2

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