

Call-down Contract

Terms of Reference

**Monitoring and Evaluation
of Responsible, Accountable and
Transparent Enterprise (RATE)
Programme**

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Purpose.....	4
Objectives.....	5
Deliverables of the Contract.....	5
Timeframe.....	5
Methodology.....	6
Data Sources.....	11
Risks.....	11
Skills and qualifications.....	12
Logistics and procedures.....	12
Evaluation ethics.....	13
Outputs and Reporting.....	14
DFID Co-ordination.....	15
Governance arrangements.....	15
Budget.....	15
The Recipient.....	15
Duty of Care.....	16

Annexes Enclosed Separately

- Annex A: Duty of Care Risk Assessment

1. Introduction

DFID has an increased focus on private sector development as a means to enhance broad based economic development. This involves amongst other things, engaging with business to help their investments contribute to tackling poverty and ensuring that growth is inclusive. Experience has shown us that in some cases the interests of businesses and workers or communities do not automatically go hand in hand and that specific attention is needed to ensure businesses undertake responsible business practices. The social and developmental contribution made by business is clearly influenced in part by companies' decisions about how they manage their supply chains including the safety and well-being of workers, communities and their environment; whether people participate in influencing those decisions and businesses accountability for the consequences of the decisions they make.

The Responsible, Accountable and Transparent Enterprise (RATE) programme focuses on businesses' social and environmental risk management, and transparency and accountability of private sector companies. It is a portfolio programme covering support to a number of different organisations that help businesses' manage environmental and social risks, as well as the design and implementation of human rights impact assessments with private sector companies. It also covers work internally within DFID to ensure more support to responsible business practices across the work that DFID does with private sector companies to support economic development in the countries in which it works.

An evaluability assessment was undertaken for the RATE programme in November 2014. Overall this assessment confirmed that it would be feasible to evaluate the programme, but highlighted the complexity of doing so, given the programme's wide remit and the number of separate organisations and interventions to be supported. The assessment identified a number of potential evaluation questions that could be covered, as well as highlighting a number of important issues to be considered. This included the reliability and robustness of data produced by individual project partners, the potential need for additional surveys to assess portfolio level impacts and realism about the level of influence that individual programme activities could have on firm behaviour and the livelihoods of poor people.

1.1 Background to the Programme

RATE is a £21.8 million programme over five years (2014-2019). The portfolio provides financial support to specialist organisations managing mechanisms that help business to act in line with accepted standards and guidelines; to report voluntarily on their social and environmental performance; and to learn through dialogue and joint work with different partners. Specialist organisations for standards, reporting and joint work have already gained the acceptance of many companies, and are extending their relationships to have greater reach and influence.

Through RATE, DFID will also provide financial support that drives forward businesses' accountability, contributing to the UK's Business and Human Rights Action Plan. Accountability encompasses how companies take poor women and men's views into account; how they acknowledge their social and environmental responsibilities to different groups of people; and how they address obligations to provide remedy. The mechanisms to help businesses be proactive, rather than just reacting when held to account, are less advanced than those for standards and reporting. Examples of accountability mechanisms include human rights impact assessments and company policies on social and human rights impacts; digital and mobile technology to communicate workers' views along supply chains, including

ensuring that women's perspectives are reflected; and new approaches in provision for complaints and compensation at company, sector or supply chain level.

DFID support to these specialist intermediary organisations, and companies at the leading edge of business practice on accountability and human rights, is not the only channel through which change can be achieved at significant scale. DFID supports an increasing number of economic development programmes, led by different parts of the organisation, and teams which lead on policy influencing internally, across HMG and through global forums, on themes including land transparency; agriculture; climate change and deforestation; extractives; jobs; women's economic empowerment. The form which support through RATE to DFID teams might take is not yet fully defined, but is likely to range from formalised agreements (land transparency) and on-going dialogue with policy leads (agriculture); to short-term requests for advice (many).

Programme partners with whom funding agreements have been made to date, include:

- ISEAL, the umbrella organisation for standards systems (Accountable Grant).
- UN Global Compact (Memorandum of Understanding).
- The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, for the UK National Contact Point for the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (Memorandum of Understanding).
- Global Reporting Initiative (Accountable Grant).

The programme will also support a number of other specialist organisations for standards, reporting and joint work, which are yet to be selected.

A theory of change has been developed for the programme identifying the interventions leading to the expected outcome of the programme:

“Businesses are diligent in managing the social and environmental implications of their actions and are accountable for the consequences for poor people”

The impact will be achieved as a consequence of the effects changes in business behaviour have on people:

“Where business activity affects their lives, the safety and well-being of poor women and men in developing countries is improved”

2. Purpose

The overall purpose of this assignment is to establish and implement a robust system to allow accurate monitoring and evaluation of the RATE programme between 2015 and 2019.

Rationale for the M&E contract

In the context of its work on economic development, DFID has an interest in better understanding the impacts of mechanisms through which companies can increase their developmental impact and mitigate any negative consequences. Much of the impact evidence on the areas covered in the RATE programme is limited and in some cases mixed or contradictory. This includes impacts on poor people as well as on companies themselves .

DFID has an interest in assessing to what extent the mechanisms it supports to encourage better social and environmental risk management and greater transparency and accountability actually have a positive impact on poor women and men; and understanding why businesses engage in such mechanisms/practices and whether benefits accrue to them in the short or long term.

3. Objectives

The overall objectives for the monitoring and evaluation work are to:

- a. Provide internal and external learning to DFID and other organisations supporting business environmental and social risk management and transparency and accountability
- b. Contribute to the evidence base on the end results for poor women and men of implementation of such mechanisms and practices by the private sector
- c. Contribute to the evidence base on why private sector companies should engage in more responsible practices

Building on these overarching objectives, the purpose of the mid-term review is to provide information on progress made by the programme in achieving desired outcomes and draw out lessons that can be used to inform programme design going forwards. The purpose of the end of programme evaluation is to assess the extent to which the programme achieved intended outcomes and impacts, and what lessons have important implications for future initiatives.

4. Deliverables of the Contract

DFID will appoint a Supplier to:

1. undertake a light touch review of the portfolio level logframe and sub-component level logframes and reporting mechanisms currently in place, including identifying opportunities to strengthen how gender equality is addressed;
2. design, set up and implement a system for monitoring overall performance of the RATE programme against its logframe to enable accurate annual reporting¹ (this should include some verification and validation of implementing partner results);
3. design and implement an independent evaluation of the RATE programme;
4. design and take forward a series of lesson learning products/events throughout the lifetime of the programme.

5. Timeframe

The assignment will be split into 2 distinct phases:

- Inception phase (1 - 3 months from contract start date)
- Implementation phase (4 months from contract start date to end of March 2019).

There will be a break point at the end of the inception phase. Progression to the implementation stage is dependent upon DFID's approval of the inception report and satisfactory performance of the Supplier.

¹ The Supplier will draw monitoring data from implementing partners and will not be responsible for direct data collection.

6. Methodology

The methodological considerations and expected deliverables to be covered within the 3 components of this contract (i.e. portfolio level monitoring; evaluation; and lesson learning) are detailed below.

6.1 Portfolio level monitoring

Portfolio level monitoring is an on-going activity throughout the contract. Given the programme has a number of different sub-components, a monitoring system which comprises a nested logical framework structure will be set up. This will include an overarching logframe and separate logframes for each sub-component. At present, four sub-components have been agreed² under the RATE programme. The partners implementing these sub-components will collate monitoring data against agreed logframes. Data for the outputs in the overarching RATE logframe will be derived from outcome level indicators monitored and reported against annually by these programme partners. The Supplier will not be responsible for direct data collection, but will collate and quality assure information provided by implementing partners.

Programme outcome and impact level monitoring data will need to be gathered through a mixture of impact level data from implementing partners, and portfolio level monitoring tools for which the Supplier will be responsible which generate outcome level data from additional primary or secondary sources.

The Supplier will:

- Design, gain approval and implement portfolio level monitoring that enables DFID to report annually against programme level outputs, outcome and impact and fulfil annual internal reporting requirements. This should include:
 - o a review of the portfolio level logframe and proposed indicators, making recommendations for improvements to ensure a robust and logical monitoring framework is in place. This will be completed and agreed within a month after start of contract;
 - o a light touch review of sub-component logical frameworks and recommendations for any changes. However, the Supplier must bear in mind that some of these have already been agreed with programme implementing partners and any substantial changes may be difficult to implement (by the end of inception phase);
 - o development of a portfolio level monitoring framework and methodology, which should include some verification of results reported from implementing partners (by the end of inception phase).

Deliver a report annually against the portfolio level logical framework indicators and covering additional commentary that will provide DFID with sufficient information to complete internal Annual Reviews of the RATE programme. The exact content of the report will be agreed during the inception phase with DFID. Reports are to be delivered as per outputs schedule outlined in Section 12.

Given implementing partners will provide monitoring level data for the programme level outputs, the Supplier should propose methodology for monitoring portfolio level performance that represents value for money approach. At outcome and impact level, secondary data sources should be used if at all possible.

² This includes the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI); ISEAL; UN Global Compact; and the UK National Contact Point for the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises.

We expect the supplier to maximise the use of existing data (e.g. monitoring and secondary) and collect primary data (e.g. surveys) to fill gaps. The inception phase should be used to identify the need for primary data collection and suggest appropriate sampling strategies and the most cost-effective innovative tools.

DFID's strategic vision for girls and women is to increase their voice, choice and control. The Business Case for the programme identifies, in general terms, how RATE aims to improve the safety and well-being of girls and women, where business activity affects their lives, i.e. "In some instances, the improvements will specifically respond to challenges faced by women in the workplace. In other cases, where improvements in safety and well-being are general, we will use programme monitoring to ensure that benefits for girls and women are at least equal to those for boys and men." The Supplier should offer advice about proportionate and feasible approaches to monitoring results for women and girls.

By the end of the inception phase the Supplier will:

- Deliver an agreed inception report to include
 - o Portfolio level monitoring plan
 - o Final evaluation design (see details below), and a
 - o Communication, knowledge and dissemination plan.

In adhering to this timetable the Supplier must factor in sufficient time for internal DFID review (see section 10). The Supplier cannot proceed through to the implementation phase until approval of the inception report has been given.

6.2 Evaluation

DFID favours a conceptual framework for the evaluation which tests the programme's theory of change. We anticipate the evaluation will be guided by the following considerations:

- Conducting a literature review and engaging with sector experts to improve the theory of change in light of existing, relevant evidence from academia and practice. Any recommendations for changes or amendments will be agreed with DFID;
- Understanding the context through a thorough review of documents and discussions with different stakeholders;
- Understanding the complexity and complication of collating additional data from private sector players and factoring this into the methodology proposed;
- Anticipating heterogeneity through a differentiated analysis of the outcomes across selected countries and contexts;
- Rigorously analysing the facts (through understanding who actually benefits from the different programme activities, how, why and to what extent); and
- Using a mixed methods approach (through integrating the methods and tools used for collecting and analysing quantitative and qualitative data).

Our preference for evaluation that tests the theory of change does not imply any specific methodological approach. DFID would like to commission an evaluation which can tell us about the impact of the programme. This means choosing from a menu of methodological options, according to the evaluation questions and the feasibility of collecting different types of data in the context of this programme

(including from private sector partners who may be unwilling or reluctant to impart commercial information). However, it also means thinking as robustly as possible about causality and contribution. This is particularly important in the context of the RATE programme where it is unlikely that one single intervention from one single entity alters business behaviour, and in many cases internal drivers such as profit or reputational risk may have played a greater part in triggering business action.

As part of the theory based approach, the Supplier will define a clear set of hypotheses (including the data points and analytical issues) from the Theory of Change that will be tested through the evaluation. The methodology for how the Supplier will do this in the inception phase should be clearly articulated in the proposal.

The Supplier will deliver:

- a mid-term review report (23 months after start of contract). In addition to providing data that tests the theory of change, this report should include recommendations that could be used to inform programme design
- a final evaluation report (by the end of March 2019)

Mixed methods data collection

It is expected that a mixed methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative data gathering and analysis techniques, will be appropriate to respond to the evaluation questions. Quantitative data may be derived from a range of sources including project monitoring and research work and primary and secondary data sources. Qualitative data may be derived from sources such as interviews and focus groups. We are also interested in quantitative measures that facilitate analysis of qualitative information (e.g. ranking, scoring). The Supplier will take primary responsibility for collating any additional data gathering if required. The framework used to analyse both quantitative and qualitative data should be rigorous and sufficiently robust in order to assess the contribution to impact of the programme.

Bidders must clearly state the specific evaluation methodology and approach that they intend to use in order to address the evaluation questions outlined below. This approach will be refined during the inception phase; but the proposal must state the proposed data gathering activities that will be undertaken and the analytical frameworks that will be used to analyse the data gathered.

Evaluation Questions

Drawing from OECD-DAC criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability), it is expected that the evaluation questions will be formulated within the structure of these criteria, (although it may not be necessary to examine questions under each criteria).

The final list of evaluation questions will be agreed during the inception phase of the Supplier's assignment. However, it is anticipated that the evaluation *could* address some of the following questions (these include a mix of Impact (I) and process (P)-focused questions).

Impact

To what extent has the RATE programme resulted in changes to business practices that improve the lives, safety and well-being of poor women and men with whom it interacts which are systemic, scalable and sustainable?

What is the evidence for responsible business activity improving the lives, safety and well-being of poor women and men?

Effectiveness

How effective has the programme been in ensuring human rights impact assessments have been used by business to alter corporate practices? (I)

How effective has the programme been in demonstrating how business (large and SMEs) can benefit from better management of social and environmental risks and increased transparency and accountability? (P)

How effective has the programme been in disseminating how business can benefit from better management of social and environmental risks and increased transparency and accountability? (P)

How effective have individual interventions been in achieving their intended outcome? Have any interventions been particularly effective in benefitting women and girls? If some interventions have been more successful than others, why? Has the combination of interventions been effective? (I)

What are the major factors constraining or enhancing progress towards the intended outcome? (P)

Sustainability

To what extent has capacity and ownership amongst businesses for responsible business been built? (I)

What is the likelihood of business building on and scaling up the work of the programme? (I)

How important is the external context in determining the success of the interventions proposed?

Relevance

To what extent is the approach of supporting intermediary organisations to deepen social and environmental risk management of business a relevant approach for interacting and effecting change in private sector companies? (P)

How, to what extent and why do beneficiaries and stakeholders value the interventions developed through the programme? What do they recommend to improve the interventions and why? Do the views of different groups of beneficiaries and stakeholders differ from each other? (P)

Efficiency

Have resources been used efficiently in order to provide value for money and achieve results. What could be done differently to improve implementation? Has this been a cost effective and cost-efficient investment? (I)

How could value for money have been improved in the programme and costs contained without affecting delivery? (P)

Coverage

How successful has the targeting of the programme been and why? (I)

6.3 Lesson learning/events and information

Given this is a relatively new area of work for DFID and one in which the evidence base is relatively limited, a series of lesson learning events and information pieces will also form an important part of the Supplier's work. The audience for this wider lesson learning will be mixed and likely to include, but not be limited to:

- Internal DFID audience (including in particular DFID Advisers working with and through the private sector)
- Other public sector bodies interested in or supporting business (other donors, other Government Departments)
- Civil society organisations implementing initiatives or interested in environmental and social risk management and transparency/accountability of business
- Private sector businesses interested in better understanding the ways in which their actions impact positively or negatively on poor people
- Private sector businesses interested in understanding the effects on their own businesses of greater environmental and social risk management and increased transparency and accountability.

The Supplier will deliver a regular series of lessons learning events and information notes through the duration of the assignment. Final agreement of the nature of these events will be decided in the inception phase, after discussion with entities implementing sub-components of the programme and DFID. However, the Supplier must make an initial proposition for what these will look like in their proposal.

Lessons learning and dissemination will be an on-going activity throughout the duration of the assignment. The Supplier will:

- Propose and gain agreement for the lesson learning and dissemination strategy, drawing from the evaluation and regular monitoring of the programme (to be included in inception report and delivered and agreed by the end of the inception phase)
- Organise and prepare an annual learning event commencing in 2016
- Deliver information notes, other think pieces to be agreed at regular intervals throughout the duration of the assignment (exact timings to be proposed in the inception report)

6.4 Stakeholders

The sub-components supported under this programme are broad and capture a wide array of civil society and business partners in many different sectors and countries. Each of the entities supported has their own sub-set of stakeholders. Some interact directly with private sector, others directly with civil society organisations, and others with both. These range from specialist bodies providing services to businesses, such as the Forest Stewardship Council, Ethical Trading Initiative or the Better Cotton Initiative, through to large corporate retail businesses sourcing products from developing countries, or businesses interested in tracking, reporting on and

potentially improving their environmental and social risk management and transparency and accountability. Given the broad sets of stakeholders that the sub-components touch, the Supplier will need to propose a carefully balanced methodology that looks at the different aspects of support the programme is covering, as well as making judgements about the geographical coverage of the evaluation itself given budgetary constraints. The Supplier will need to ensure a close working relationship with implementing partners.

In many instances, the intermediaries that are directly supported by the programme, and the businesses they support or the organisations they represent have limited direct contact with poor people. Given that impact on poor people is key for DFID, the Supplier will need to propose an appropriate methodology that allows the views of women and men reached to be reflected, while recognising that access may be challenging, and /or views reported indirectly.

7. Data sources

It is expected that the Supplier will use and generate a range of evaluation sources, including:

- Programme documentation and reports of implementing partners, and analysis of information provided by implementing partners;
- Publicly sourced secondary data and statistics;
- Baseline information and other primary data sources from surveys specifically carried out as part of monitoring this programme;
- Synthesis reports of interviews and focus group records with implementing partners, businesses and other relevant stakeholders; and
- Reports from site visits where these have been undertaken.

All of the partners supported under RATE publish a range of think pieces, guidance notes and impact reports.

8. Risks

The Supplier will be expected to report on risks identified and mitigation strategies in their inception report. Some operational risks of relevance to this contract have been identified as:

- Poor quality data being collected and insufficient reporting by Implementing Partners making it difficult to validate, verify or use to assess progress.
- Implementing Partners not willing to share primary data or poor cooperation between Supplier and Implementing Partners.
- Inadequate preparation to collect midterm and final evaluation data to analyse the impact on beneficiaries within a limited budget.
- Maintaining continuity and corporate memory amongst members of the Supplier M&E team over the duration of the contract leading to loss of knowledge during hand-overs, affecting the quality of the evaluation.

9. Skills and qualifications

The evaluation team must demonstrate strong capacity to conduct monitoring and evaluation work of this type, including evaluation design (including specifically of

theory based approaches), and with a complex set of partners. There should be a designated team leader with strong evaluation skills. It is expected that:

- At least one member of the team must be able to demonstrate strong credentials in private sector development with:
 - solid experience in developing economies
 - strong technical understanding of the theory and evidence gaps for programmes like RATE
 - proven skills for analysing private sector initiatives
- At least one member of the team will have strong communication / knowledge transfer skills, including: presentation of data in visually appealing formats, rigorous summaries of findings and evidence, and robust and accessible syntheses of key lessons.
- The team will need competencies that enable gender equality issues to be addressed.

The team leader will be expected to fulfil the following duties:

- Co-ordinating and monitoring the performance of the various activities of the monitoring, evaluation and lessons learning, taking action to strengthen any weak elements of the inputs provided and products delivered and reinforce strong ones;
- Liaising between different components of the programme on issues related to monitoring and evaluation;
- Being the main point of contact with DFID for this contract;
- Providing intellectual leadership to enhance the quality and direction of monitoring/evaluation across the portfolio;
- Engaging users and policy-makers with the evaluation; when requested by DFID representing the programme in public debate and other media.

10. Logistics and procedures

The Supplier will be responsible for all logistical arrangements for members of the monitoring and evaluation team. No additional office space or logistical support will be provided to the Supplier under this contract in undertaking any aspect of this work.

All activities highlighted in the TOR will be funded under this contract.

The evaluation can include some direct country visits, but these should represent good value for money and an appropriate level of desk based work be incorporated to ensure costs are contained. The Supplier must present a clear methodology for determining the level and scope of country level work and include this in the inception report.

DFID commits to provide to the Supplier within 2 weeks of the start of the inception phase the following:

- An introductory meeting with relevant DFID staff
- Facilitate an introduction to all existing implementing partners
- Electronic copies of all relevant documentation held by DFID relating to the work of implementing partners and other relevant documentation

The Supplier will be responsible for collating all other relevant documentation required to ensure they have a robust understanding of the technical issues covered by the programme.

During the inception phase the Supplier will meet in person or virtually with relevant DFID staff at least monthly. Following the start of the implementation phase, the Supplier will meet at least every 3 months with relevant DFID staff, and more frequently if required.

Internally DFID requires at least 10 working days to review and comment on any products produced by the Supplier.

All key outputs of the evaluation will also need to be quality assured by DFID's externally contracted quality assurance provider – SEQAS. Payments will not be made against deliverables until approval has been given. If an evaluation product is not given approval it will need to be amended and resubmitted before the evaluation can proceed. Any resubmissions of evaluation products or other reports will be at no additional cost to DFID and should be delivered within a maximum of 10 days of receipt of feedback.

The Evaluation External Advisory Group (ref section14) will provide a defined quality control function, including feedback on the main outputs of this contract, especially the evaluation, as well as providing advice on the overall direction and implementation of RATE. Final responsibility for signing off on the main outputs of this contract will be the responsibility of DFID.

DFID will be the ultimate owner of any data collected as part of this contract and will ensure that evaluation outputs are made available as a public good.

11. Evaluation ethics

The Supplier is expected to aspire to provide high quality information and assessment, and to conduct a high quality evaluation process. Ethical considerations are integral to this and the Supplier will be expected to ensure the work is carried out in accordance with good practice principles, including:

- Maintaining anonymity / confidentiality
- Individual responsibilities
- Participation / privacy: Evaluators should provide maximum notice, minimise demands on time, and respect people's right to privacy.
- Respect of cultural values
- Integrity: Evaluators have an overriding responsibility to ensure that the evaluation is independent, impartial, and accurate. This principle should not be compromised.
- Omissions and wrongdoing: The evaluation team should consult with DFID when there is any doubt about if and how issues, such as evidence of wrongdoing, should be reported.
- DFID has zero tolerance on Fraud, Bribery and Corruption (FBC) any instances of, or threats of, FBC against DFID funds must be reported to DFID immediately
- Disclosure: Responsibility for distribution of published material normally rests with DFID or its delegated agent

12. Outputs and Reporting

The following key outputs are expected to be delivered under this contract. All reports should contain actionable recommendations where appropriate. The mid-term review and final evaluation reports should contain an executive summary, detailed methodology, key findings, recommendations and conclusions and be presented in a publishable format to be agreed with DFID.

Output	Delivery date
<p><i>Review and recommendations on logframe</i></p> <p><i>Draft Inception report</i></p> <p>The inception report should include:</p> <p>a. Proposed methodology and plan for portfolio level monitoring</p> <p>b. Final evaluation design, including detailed evaluation methodology and evaluation questions</p> <p>Consideration should be given to risks of implementing the evaluation and how these will be mitigated. The evaluation framework should include the evaluation questions, data sources, analytical approaches and methodologies to be employed, relevant theories of change and ways of working with other key stakeholders, risks and mitigation measures.</p> <p>c. Communication, Dissemination and lesson learning plan.</p>	<p>1 month after start of contract</p> <p>3 months after start of contract</p>
<p><i>Annual reports</i></p> <p>Report annually against programme level logical framework indicators and covering additional commentary that would provide DFID with sufficient information to complete its internal annual review of the RATE programme</p>	<p>1st Report 12 months after start of contract</p> <p>2nd Report 24 months after start of contract</p> <p>3rd Report 36 months after start of contract</p>
<p><i>Draft Mid-term review report</i></p>	<p>23 months after start of contract</p>
<p><i>Draft Final-evaluation report</i></p>	<p>End March 2019</p>
<p><i>Lesson learning notes and learning events</i></p> <p>Lessons learning and dissemination will be an on-going activity throughout the duration of the assignment. The Supplier will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose and gain agreement for the lesson learning and dissemination strategy, drawing from the evaluation and regular monitoring of the programme (to be included in inception report and delivered and agreed by the end of the inception phase) - Organise and prepare an annual learning event commencing in 2016 - Deliver information notes, other think pieces to be agreed at regular intervals throughout the duration of the assignment (exact timings to be proposed in the inception report) 	<p>Tbc during inception phase</p>

13. DFID Co-ordination

This contract will be let through the DFID Global Evaluation Framework Agreement (GEFA). After the contract is awarded, overall coordination of the contract will rest with the Private Sector Department in DFID.

The key responsible officer is the Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) for the RATE programme, to whom all technical issues should be referred. All financial, contractual and administrative issues should be referred to the RATE Programme Manager.

DFID will meet with the supplier on a regular basis to follow up on progress and review work plans at activity and output level.

14. Governance arrangements

An Evaluation External Advisory Group (EEAG) will be established to help guide evaluation and lesson learning for the RATE programme, and contribute to influencing how DFID's private sector development programming addresses responsible business issues. The EEAG will comprise the Supplier; representatives from Private Sector Department in DFID; DFID evaluation lead for private sector development programmes; DFID decision-makers with influence on private sector development programming (e.g. Heads of Profession); and selected stakeholders from business; intermediary bodies which represent business views; and civil society organisations. Membership of the group will be finalised during the inception phase. The EEAG will meet at least once during the inception phase of this contract, and periodically thereafter (twice yearly, or annually). DFID will be responsible for convening the EEAG.

15. Budget

The indicative budget for this assignment is £600,000 - £750,000. This will include all staff costs and reimbursable expenditure. In proposals, transparency about cost drivers will be viewed positively. This will be a milestone based contract and payment will be made against delivery of key milestones (outlined in Section 12: Outputs and Reporting) throughout the duration of the contract.

16. The Recipient

The principal recipients of this service will be DFID. Grantees of the programme will also benefit from the ongoing M&E which will enhance the quality of their monitoring information and help them deliver business-relevant, performance evaluations.

Evidence and lessons generated by the programme will be publicly available, in order to contribute to the global evidence base on what works to promote responsible business.

In addition to DFID and the programme implementers, the principal users of the evidence will be:

- **Other businesses and business-focused support organisations** implementing activities that improve responsible and accountable business practices
- **Policymakers** engaging with business for development impact

17. 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. 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 Call-down 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 may 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 may require the Supplier to operate in conflict-affected areas and parts of it are highly insecure. The security situation is volatile and subject to change at short notice. The Supplier should be comfortable working in such an environment and should be capable of deploying to any areas required within the region in order to deliver the Contract (subject to travel clearance being granted).

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 in the field 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 A of this ToR). They must confirm in their Tender that:

- They fully accept responsibility for Security and Duty of Care.
- They understand the potential risks and have the knowledge and experience to develop an effective risk plan.
- They have the capability to manage their Duty of Care responsibilities throughout the life of the contract.

Acceptance of responsibility must be supported with evidence of capability (no more than 2 A4 pages) and DFID reserves the right to clarify any aspect of this evidence.

In providing evidence Tenderers should consider the following questions:

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

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

Annex A

Duty of Care Risk Assessment (June 2015)

Country	Security Category	Violent Crime and Civil Disorder	Terrorism
Afghanistan	5	4	5
Bangladesh	3	3	3
Burma	2	2	1
Cambodia	2	2	2
DR Congo	4	5	2
China	2	2	1
Egypt	4	3	4
Ethiopia	3	2	3
Ghana	3	3	1
India	2	2	3
Indonesia	4	3	3
Iraq	5	5	5
Jordan	4	2	4
Kenya	5	5	4
Lebanon	4	3	4
Lesotho	2	2	1
Liberia	4	4	2
Libya	4	3	4
Malawi	3	3	2
Morocco	3	2	3
Mozambique	3	3	2
Nepal	2	2	1
Nigeria	4	4	4
Pakistan	5	2	5
Palestine	3	3	4
Rwanda	2	2	3
Sierra Leone	3	3	2
South Sudan	4	4	4
Somalia	5	4	5
South Africa	4	5	3
Sudan	4	3	4
Syria	4	3	4
Tanzania	3	4	3
Tunisia	3	3	3
Uganda	3	3	3
Yemen	4	3	5
Zambia	2	3	1
Zimbabwe	3	3	1

1 Very Low risk	2 Low risk	3 Med risk	4 High risk	5 Very High risk
			SIGNIFICANTLY GREATER THAN NORMAL RISK	