



**Foreign, Commonwealth  
& Development Office**



## **MODEL CALLDOWN CONTRACT**

**Framework Agreement with: Integrity Research and Consultancy Limited**

**Framework Agreement for: Global Evaluation Framework Agreement**

**Framework Agreement Purchase Order Number: PO 7448**

**Call-down Contract For: Better Assistance in Crisis (BASIC) Evaluation**

**Contract Purchase Order Number: PO 10049**

I refer to the following:

1. The above mentioned Framework Agreement dated; 12<sup>th</sup> September 2016.
2. Your proposal of 18<sup>th</sup> April 2020.

and I confirm that FCDO requires you to provide the Services (Annex A), under the Terms and Conditions of the Framework Agreement which shall apply to this Call-down Contract as if expressly incorporated herein.

### **1. Commencement and Duration of the Services**

- 1.1 The Supplier shall start the Services no later than 1<sup>st</sup> October 2020 ("the Start Date") and the Services shall be completed by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2024 ("the End Date") unless the Call-down Contract is terminated earlier in accordance with the Terms and Conditions of the Framework Agreement.

### **2. Recipient**

- 2.1 FCDO requires the Supplier to provide the Services to the FCDO ("the Recipient").

### **3. Financial Limit**

- 3.1 Payments under this Call-down Contract shall not, exceed £699,760 ("the Financial Limit") and is exclusive of any government tax, if applicable as detailed in Annex B.

When Payments shall be made on a 'Milestone Payment Basis' the following Clause 28.1 shall be substituted for Clause 28.1 of the Framework Agreement.

### **28. Milestone Payment Basis (Fees only)**

- 28.1 Where the applicable payment mechanism is "Milestone Payment", invoice(s) shall be submitted for the amount(s) indicated in Annex B and payments will be made on satisfactory performance of the services, at the payment points defined as per schedule of payments. At each payment point set criteria will be defined as part of the payments. Payment will be made if the criteria are met to the satisfaction of FCDO.



## Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



When the relevant milestone is achieved in its final form by the Supplier or following completion of the Services, as the case may be, indicating both the amount or amounts due at the time and cumulatively. Payments pursuant to clause 28.1 are subject to the satisfaction of the Project Officer in relation to the performance by the Supplier of its obligations under the Call-down Contract and to verification by the Project Officer that all prior payments made to the Supplier under this Call-down Contract were properly due.

#### 4. FCDO Officials

4.1 The Project Officer is:  
REDACTED

4.2 The Contract Officer is:  
  
REDACTED

#### 5. Key Personnel

The following of the Supplier's Personnel cannot be substituted by the Supplier without FCDO's prior written consent:

REDACTED

#### 6. Reports

6.1 The Supplier shall submit project reports in accordance with the Terms of Reference/Scope of Work at Annex A.

#### 7. Duty of Care

All Supplier Personnel (as defined in Section 2 of the Agreement) engaged under this Call-down Contract will come under the duty of care of the Supplier:

- I. The Supplier will be responsible for all security arrangements and Her Majesty's Government accepts no responsibility for the health, safety and security of individuals or property whilst travelling.
- II. The Supplier will be responsible for taking out insurance in respect of death or personal injury, damage to or loss of property, and will indemnify and keep indemnified FCDO in respect of:
  - II.1. Any loss, damage or claim, howsoever arising out of, or relating to negligence by the Supplier, the Supplier's Personnel, or by any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier, in connection with the performance of the Call-down Contract;
  - II.2. Any claim, howsoever arising, by the Supplier's Personnel or any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier, in connection with their performance under this Call-down Contract.



## Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



- III. The Supplier will ensure that such insurance arrangements as are made in respect of the Supplier's Personnel, or any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier are reasonable and prudent in all circumstances, including in respect of death, injury or disablement, and emergency medical expenses.
- IV. The costs of any insurance specifically taken out by the Supplier to support the performance of this Call-down Contract in relation to Duty of Care may be included as part of the management costs of the project, and must be separately identified in all financial reporting relating to the project.
- V. Where FCDO is providing any specific security arrangements for Suppliers in relation to the Call-down Contract, these will be detailed in the Terms of Reference.

### 8. Call-down Contract Signature

- 8.1. If the original Form of Call-down Contract is not returned to the Contract Officer (as identified at clause 4 above) duly completed, signed and dated on behalf of the Supplier within 15 working days of the date of signature on behalf of FCDO, FCDO will be entitled, at its sole discretion, to declare this Call-down Contract void.

For and on behalf of  
The Secretary of State for  
Foreign, Commonwealth and  
Development Affairs

Name:

Position:

Signature:

Date:

For and on behalf of

Name:

**Integrity Research and Consultancy Limited**

Position:

Signature:

Date:

# BASIC - Better Assistance in Crises



## Annex A - TERMS OF REFERENCE (dated 9 March 2020 – revision 9 September 2020) Better Assistance in Crises (BASIC) Evaluation

### Contents

A	Introduction .....	2
B	Purpose and objectives of the evaluation .....	2
C	Recipient, use and influence plan, and stakeholder engagement .....	3
D	Scope .....	6
E	Methodology .....	7
F	Data collection and analysis .....	9
G	Draft evaluation questions .....	9
H	Data sources .....	10
I	Evaluation outputs .....	11
J	Timeline .....	13
K	Budget and payments .....	13
L	Roles and Responsibilities .....	15
M	Input, qualification and expertise of supplier .....	15
N	Constraints and dependencies .....	17
O	Conflict of Interest .....	18
P	Confidentiality .....	19
Q	Ethics .....	19
R	Branding .....	19
S	Safeguarding .....	19
T	Duty of Care .....	20
U	Background to BASIC Programme .....	20
V	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) .....	21
W	Annexes .....	21

## A Introduction

1. These Terms of Reference are for an evaluation of the *Better Assistance in Crises* (BASIC) programme managed by the FCDO Social Protection Team (SPT) in the Inclusive Societies Department (ISD). The programme of £20.5m started on 30 October 2018 and will end in March 2024. It aims to help poor and vulnerable people cope better with crises and meet their basic needs through more effective social assistance in contexts of recurrent shocks, protracted conflict and forced displacement.
2. The evaluation will assess the performance of BASIC in:
  - Influencing national governments' and development partners' policies, programmes, systems and evidence on the use of social protection approaches in crises
  - Strengthening human and institutional capacities to use social protection approaches in crises
  - Delivering quality programme services to governments, partners, and HMG/FCDO teams
3. The evaluation will also generate learning for FCDO, governments and partners that provide services such as technical assistance, research and capacity strengthening on what works to influence policy, programme and systems-level change.
4. The primary recipients of this evaluation are the FCDO Social Protection Team and suppliers. Secondary and Tertiary users are specified in Section C.
5. The evaluation should commence in September 2020 and evaluate BASIC implementation until March 2024.

## B Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

### Purpose of the evaluation

6. In line with the definition of a performance evaluation, the purpose of this evaluation is to independently assess the effectiveness of the BASIC Programme in achieving desired outputs and contributing towards the desired outcomes and impact.
7. The evaluation will provide a deeper understanding of the quality of the implementation to enable adaptive programming and to inform future programmes design. It will:
  - Provide near real-time evidence to improve BASIC programme processes, ways of working, knowledge exchange and learning, but it is not expected that outcome or impact data would be available early enough in the evaluation to inform significant adaptations to the programme approach during implementation.
  - Provide evidence and learning to FCDO / HMG, governments and partners on how technical assistance and research can contribute to a greater use of social protection approaches in crises.

- Inform the design of future centrally managed programmes (next phase of business planning, e.g. BASIC 2.0) and deepen global evidence and learning on programme modalities that work to effect changes in policy, programmes and systems.

8. An independent performance evaluation is necessary in addition to the regular monitoring of process and outputs delivery by the programme as there are clear evidence gaps in how technical assistance and research (and the way they are combined) can influence behaviour and choices of policy makers and practitioners. Understanding the relevance, quality and value of technical assistance remains weak, and more in-depth study through this evaluation is needed to draw out the impacts of this type of assistance and the combined impacts of technical assistance with research.

#### Objectives of the evaluation

9. The primary objective of the evaluation is learning, with accountability being a second objective. The objectives of this evaluation are to:

- Assess whether, why and how BASIC programme is achieving its stated outputs and outcomes, and progress towards impact; if intended outputs and outcomes were realistic and appropriate, and if there were any unintended outputs and outcomes,
- Identify what is working (and not) and why in promoting a greater use of social protection approaches in crises and policy change and enhanced capacities through technical assistance, research, influencing and capacity strengthening; generate evidence and learning on the effectiveness of the programme (and how it can be improved),
- Provide evaluative evidence that can strengthen the approach to monitoring within and across programme components, with a particular focus on strengthening the programme logframe, and providing practical support to strengthen monitoring of BASIC TAS and BASIC Research.
- Generate learning and evidence on what works from the combination of technical assistance, research, influencing and capacity strengthening in promoting policy, programme and systems-level change in crises, assessing the effectiveness of delivery modalities used in the programme and their combination,
- Learn from the above and make recommendations on what form a future service delivery programme should look like, in particular the next phase of business planning for BASIC 2.0.

#### C Recipient, use and influence plan, and stakeholder engagement

10. The primary recipients of this evaluation are the FCDO Social Protection Team and BASIC suppliers (TAS and Research).

11. The secondary end users are FCDO internal stakeholders such as:

- FCDO Country Offices and teams implementing social protection and humanitarian assistance programmes in crises,
- Governments and partners implementing social protection and humanitarian assistance programmes in countries,
- Inclusive Societies Department (ISD) and other FCDO departments / teams implementing centrally managed programmes delivering technical assistance and research. Learning from the evaluation will contribute to improved programming across ISD (including development of BASIC 2.0) and FCDO.
- FCDO Internal stakeholder groups: internal BASIC reference group, the shock-responsive services group and affiliated groups as listed below

12. The tertiary end users of the evaluation are external technical assistance and research programmes, governments, donors, agencies, think tanks, and consultancy firms involved in social protection and social assistance in crises. As part of the design phase, the most important external end users will need to be identified with an initial list below (see Tables 1 and 2).

13. The findings of the evaluation will need to be disseminated to different groups to share the learning on what works and what does not to influence and shift policy and programmes for greater use of social protection approaches in crises. This applies to both the global and country level influencing carried out through BASIC.

14. Given the variety of end users of the evaluation, all reports should be written in plain English for policy-making audiences who do not have a background in research and evaluation.

Table 1: Indicative evaluation use, influence and uptake plan

End user	Influence objective	Communication channel	Influence enabler
<b>Primary</b>			
FCDO's Social Protection Team	<p>Influence future policy and programming on use of social protection approaches in crises.</p> <p>Influence approach to engaging/influencing country offices and international partners on social protection in crises policy, programmes, systems and capacity.</p>	<p>Co-design and approval of evaluation framework</p> <p>Regular communication on progress and findings of evaluation</p> <p>Succinct findings papers, briefings, presentations and other comms tools on key evaluation and policy questions</p>	<p>Confidence in evaluation methodology and quality</p> <p>Confidence in wider relationships of evaluation team with BASIC suppliers</p>
TAS supplier	Demonstrate what works and why across different technical assistance modalities, their combinations and articulation with research	<p>Consult during design of evaluation framework and methodology</p> <p>Robust analysis and presentation of findings</p>	Confidence in evaluation method and quality

End user	Influence objective	Communication channel	Influence enabler
Research Supplier	Demonstrate what works and why in research and evidence uptake	Consult during design of evaluation framework and methodology  Robust analysis and presentation of findings  Close link of evaluation with BASIC research	Confidence in relationship of evaluation team with supplier's research team
<b>Secondary</b>			
FCDO Country Offices/teams, government and partners	Influence design and implementation of Humanitarian and SP policies, programmes and systems including TA to increase the use of social protection approaches in crises	Effective dissemination of findings on what works	Timely and appropriate communications
FCDO TA Facility and research programmes (other than BASIC) / teams and internal stakeholder groups	Demonstrate what works to make policy and programming shift Influence design and delivery of TA and research programmes	Effective dissemination of findings	Timely and appropriate communications
<b>Tertiary</b>			
External TA and research programmes	Demonstrate what works to make policy and programming shift Influence design and delivery of TA and research programmes	Effective dissemination of findings	Timely and appropriate communications

15. In addition to the evaluation recipients there are a wide range of evaluation stakeholders who will be engaged and consulted at various points of the evaluation process, both in data collection and dissemination of findings. See Table 2.

Table 2: Indicative evaluation stakeholders

Essential target groups	Relevance to evaluation
<b>Internal</b>	
FCDO staff working on social protection and on humanitarian assistance in HQ and in country	Direct and indirect BASIC programme recipients (i.e. those involved in the BASIC programme directly and those that are reached through more indirect means – knowledge exchange and learning events)



Essential target groups	Relevance to evaluation
<b>Internal groups and communities of practice:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Internal reference group for BASIC</li> <li>▪ Shock responsive services group</li> <li>▪ Protracted Crisis Community of Practice</li> <li>▪ Group on Helpdesks and TA facilities</li> <li>▪ Social protection community of practice</li> </ul>	Direct and indirect BASIC programme recipients (i.e. those involved in the BASIC programme directly and those that are reached through more indirect means – knowledge exchange and learning events)
<b>External</b>	
Government policy makers and implementers (national and local level) working on (shock-responsive) social protection policies and programmes, and on humanitarian assistance / DRM	Intended programme recipients, potentially direct through BASIC TA and/or research, recognising some will be more directly involved in programme activities.
Donors and partners in country (WB, UN agencies, NGOs and Civil society, Red Cross/ Red Crescent Movement)	Potentially direct programme recipients depending on the nature of BASIC TA support. Indirect recipients through synergies and coherence of BASIC TA, research and knowledge exchange and learning.
<b>Other development partners globally (in SP and humanitarian linkages), including (not exhaustive):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ External reference group for BASIC</li> <li>▪ ECHO TA Facilities and any other relevant TA facilities (if new emerge)</li> <li>▪ CaLP</li> <li>▪ CashCap</li> <li>▪ World Bank</li> <li>▪ UN agencies</li> <li>▪ Red Cross/ Red Crescent Movement</li> <li>▪ NGOs working in the nexus</li> <li>▪ ODI, OPM, IDS, Climate Centre and other relevant Think Tanks and organisations</li> <li>▪ Grand Bargain workstreams and groups (e.g. GB sub-group on linking humanitarian cash and social protection)</li> <li>▪ Like-minded donors (e.g. from the common donor approach to cash)</li> </ul>	Level of awareness and support for linking humanitarian assistance and social protection.

## D Scope

16. The evaluation will focus on systems change resulting from the BASIC programme components, influencing and activities. This might also need to consider proximate and intermediate indicators of social protection and humanitarian assistance systems, programmes, policies and approaches in crises that will be observable over the life of the BASIC programme. It will not seek to identify changes in the lives of recipients of social protection approaches in crises.

17. The evaluation will look at each of the BASIC components independently and then the synergies achieved (or not) across components. The evaluation will generate

its own evidence on the effects of programme components but will also need to link to any reviews or evaluations planned by BASIC programme suppliers.

18. The BASIC research component might include evaluation of social protection / assistance programme impacts on people's needs, wellbeing and resilience. This might include a focus on the impact of research and / or technical assistance on policy and programmes and the ways in which research and / or technical assistance have influenced change. Whilst the two teams will need to establish a good working relationship, the scope should remain separate, with this evaluation focusing on research as one of the BASIC ways of working.

19. The FCDO SPT will be evaluating its Gender Responsive Social Protection (GRSP) programme at the same time as the BASIC evaluation. Whilst these programmes are separate, they have similarities in delivery mechanisms, particularly the provision of technical assistance to improve social protection policy and programming. The evaluations will be conducted separately but should establish a good working relationship to support broader learning on technical assistance.

## E Methodology

20. The Theory of Change for BASIC (in Annex 1) forms the basis for this evaluation which will be a theory-based evaluation. Evaluation findings will in turn inform and help refine the theory of change and logframe. Mixed methods will be used, generating primary data and drawing on secondary monitoring and evaluation data, to test pathways of change and respond to the evaluation questions.

21. The supplier will develop approaches and methodologies to explore the effectiveness of TAS (including capacity strengthening and knowledge management and learning), of Research and of the synergies between them. These could be one of the following theory-based methods or a combination. It is expected that the methods will be different for TAS and research and potential across actors:

- Process mapping or tracing,
- Contribution analysis, or
- Outcome mapping.

22. The supplier will develop an appropriate evaluation approach, design and methodology to answer the evaluation questions in ways that will provide credible, timely, insightful and substantive evidence to meet the needs of the main audiences. Indicative evaluation questions are listed below, suppliers will refine these questions and the supplier will agree a final set of evaluation questions with FCDO, in consultation with BASIC suppliers. We expect the supplier to explain why their approach, design and methodology is suitable and appropriate to the context and the objectives of the programme, how it will test the theory of change, and robustly measure achievement of programme results.

23. We do not expect that the evaluation will require the collection of primary data from beneficiaries of social protection or social assistance programmes in crises. However, suppliers may want to make the case and set out the rationale for such data collection. This would need to be agreed with FCDO.

24. The evaluation methodology will be finalised during the inception phase and approved by FCDO before moving into implementation. However, bidders are expected to provide enough detail both on how they will address the scope set out for the inception phase and their proposed approach to evaluation implementation. The supplier should include an evaluation matrix which shows how each of the evaluation questions will be addressed, including key data sources and methods. Suppliers should consider whether to use comparison or control groups.

25. The evaluation will look across the breadth of programme interventions and then complement this with deep dives or case studies into specific interventions and activities to better understand change processes. This should be done at the national level – e.g. national policies and stakeholders – and the global level – e.g. influence on social protection and humanitarian assistance networks and global policies. The evaluation will need to distinguish between spheres of programme influence from those directly involved in BASIC activities to those indirectly or more distantly affected.

26. It is too early to determine which countries are suitable for deep dives or case studies given BASIC TAS has started a bit more than a year ago and BASIC research hasn't started yet. Some countries that may be covered by BASIC (TAS and / or research) are listed in Annex 1. Four deep engagement countries will be selected once the BASIC research supplier is in place: such countries will receive a combined package of BASIC TAS and BASIC research.

27. We expect the evaluation to conduct analysis in at least some of the four BASIC deep engagement countries as well as a representative sample of the countries where BASIC is providing either TAS or research alone. We are also interested in evidence of BASIC influencing non-BASIC countries. We expect the evaluation team to have capacity to follow up on anecdotal examples of impact (or explore potential impact) in two non-BASIC countries. This will be a much lighter-touch process than the analysis to take place in BASIC countries.

28. The supplier should develop an approach to country selection for baseline studies, and criteria for country deep dives, and during the inception phase, FCDO and BASIC suppliers will work with the evaluation supplier to refine country selection. The final list of countries will be signed off by FCDO and the evaluation supplier will be expected to confirm acceptance for Duty of care.

29. If circumstances change significantly in any of the countries selected for deep dives / case studies during the evaluation implementation, FCDO and the Supplier will review the situation, and decide whether the evaluation should be conducted in alternative country/ies. FCDO retains the right to approve/reject alternative countries. Changes of costs due to change of country/ies cannot exceed the total value of the Evaluation programme. Changes in countries and associated costs and budgets will require FCDO's approval.

30. Suppliers will recognise – from programme documentation and FCDO (DFID) policy statements – the importance attached to gender, disability and social inclusion. This must be reflected throughout the conduct of the evaluation and addressed sufficiently in the evaluation methodology, findings and lessons.

## F Data collection and analysis.

31. The supplier will receive access to all available project monitoring data and evaluation data that is collected by BASIC suppliers. They will also be responsible during inception phase for working with the BASIC suppliers to ensure robust monitoring – indicators and methodologies – are put in place (or refined) that are both functional to monitoring progress and evaluating the programme.

32. Following the revision of supplier monitoring frameworks we expect the evaluation supplier to draw heavily on the robust and thorough approach to project level monitoring conducted by supplier.

33. A minimal list of methods for information gathering follows but we expect additional and/or innovative methods to be explored in the inception phase:

- a. review of documents (e.g. internal BASIC TAS and research monitoring documents, outputs; policy and programme documents from partners and governments at national and global levels)
- b. in-house surveys to FCDO staff in Whitehall and country offices, and other key partners who have benefitted from BASIC services or requested services (both TAS and research);
- c. interviews and surveys with actors who have benefitted directly or indirectly from BASIC TAS and BASIC research;
- d. in-depth discussions with the suppliers, SPT and a variety of stakeholders, including staff working on other TA facilities, to develop an informed comparative view of these frameworks in relation to BASIC.

34. We will require the supplier to engage with and collect primary data from a broad range of stakeholders, representing different interests, experience and backgrounds. The supplier will develop a robust approach to sampling within their methodology.

35. Suppliers are expected to propose their approach to primary data collection and ensure there is sufficient budget, fieldwork and time allocated. Where in-country work is required we expect the evaluation to work with local evaluators in the most efficient and cost-effective way. The supplier will develop a clear approach to in-country work, including how they will obtain national ethical approval and will manage logistics including policies and practices on duty of care and safeguarding.

## G Draft evaluation questions

36. The evaluation will be split in two phases with the inception phase refining the evaluation questions to be addressed in the implementation phase. The scope of the evaluation is split in questions:

- on the performance of BASIC for accountability reasons, and
- on learning for future programming.

37. Questions are structured following Development Assistance Committee (DAC) [Evaluation criteria](#). The questions below are extensive, although not exhaustive and it is recognised that there is overlap between questions. The supplier may propose

modifications to reduce or merge questions with a clear justification. Where appropriate, questions should include the dimensions of gender, disability and social inclusion and how BASIC support impacts on these dimensions.

38. The supplier will refine and finalise the evaluation questions in Annex 2 during the inception phase, and they will be formally signed-off by FCDO before starting the implementation phase.

## H Data sources

39. The full list of data sources will need to be completed during the inception phase but currently consists of the following:

- BASIC Business case
- BASIC TAS logframe
- BASIC Annual Reviews (first completed in October 2019; second upcoming in October 2020)
- BASIC TAS call-down reports and deliverables
- BASIC TAS Knowledge Management strategy and outputs (starting in December 2019)
- Feedback forms on TAS from commissioning teams
- BASIC TAS KPIs and monitoring
- BASIC Research ToRs, reports and deliverables
- BASIC research KPIs and monitoring data
- Reports and deliverables from other related programmes
- Social assistance in crises programme monitoring and evaluation datasets (depending on country selection)
- Partners and governments policy and programme documents (at global and country levels)
- Primary data to be collected from key stakeholders benefiting directly or indirectly from BASIC TAS and BASIC research (FCDO / HMG, partners, governments, donors etc...) – See Table 2. We do not anticipate that the evaluation will involve collection data from social assistance programmes' beneficiaries. However, if the supplier feels primary data collection from programme beneficiaries is necessary then they should set out a strong rationale and this will need to be agreed with FCDO.

40. Examples of external data sources to be read during the inception phase are:

- European Commission (2019). Social Protection Across the Humanitarian-Development Nexus: A Game Changer in Supporting People through Crises. Summary reference document. Guidance Package on Social protection across the humanitarian-development Nexus (SPaN).  
[https://socialprotection.org/system/files/Guidance%20Package%20SPaN\\_Summary%20Reference%20Document.pdf](https://socialprotection.org/system/files/Guidance%20Package%20SPaN_Summary%20Reference%20Document.pdf)
- Guidance notes: Working with cash-based safety nets in humanitarian contexts: <http://www.cashlearning.org/downloads/calp-humanitarian-pratitioners-guidance-notes-en-web-.pdf>

- UNHCR paper on alignment in refugee settings:  
<https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/5cc011417.pdf>
- OPM Shock-responsive social protection study
  - Toolkit: <https://www.opml.co.uk/files/Publications/a0408-shock-responsive-social-protection-systems/srsp-toolkit.pdf?noredirect=1>
  - Policy Briefs: <https://www.opml.co.uk/publications/shock-responsive-social-protection-systems-policy-brief-series>

## I Evaluation outputs

41. All outputs are expected to be high quality and accessible. Reports should include a well-designed and succinct Executive Summaries of 2-3 pages and innovative approaches to communicate findings (infographics, blogs...) should be proposed.

42. In line with FCDO/DFID's evaluation policy, all evaluation reports will be published together with a management response setting out how FCDO will respond to the recommendations.

43. The outputs listed below for the implementation phase are indicative. We expect the supplier to provide a list of outputs for the implementation in their proposal building on the ones suggested below, including a workplan covering both the inception and implementation phases. This list will constitute the minimum outputs expected for the implementation phase: with suppliers improving or adding to these outputs but not reducing their number or scope. A more detailed view of the outputs for the implementation phase will be agreed with and signed-off by FCDO during the inception period.

44. As the programme evolves, expected outputs for the Implementation Phase can be reviewed at Annual Reviews and at the BASIC programme midline. FCDO retains the rights to review and approve any changes to expected outputs for the Implementation Phase.

45. The midline and endline will be reviewed by FCDO's Evaluation Quality Assurance and Learning Service (EQUALS). All outputs will be reviewed and subject to approval by the FCDO SPT, with selected outputs being reviewed by BASIC reference groups and BASIC suppliers (see governance arrangements).

46. The Supplier will grant FCDO an irrevocable right to publish and re-use the outputs from the evaluation.

### Inception Phase (6 months):

- *Revised logframe and report with recommendations:* on a detailed monitoring framework for the programme and for each partner, working with each partner to strengthen their existing monitoring framework including indicators, methodologies and systems required for tracking progress
- *Methodology developed for the impact indicators in the logframe*
- *Detailed evaluation methodology for the programme:* including assessing the evaluability of the BASIC programme and finalising the evaluation questions

- *Final evaluation work plan, budget and milestone payment schedule:* for the implementation phase, identifying proxies for harder to measure indicators and questions – spanning the entire programme, looking both at the individual components and how well they work together
- *Communications/Use and Influence Plan:* The evaluator should include a communications/use and influence plan in their inception report. This should focus on identifying key audiences and their current levels of interest as well as plans for engagement and how learning and good practices on the effectiveness of TA, its combination with research and its measurement can be best communicated. This should include how to bring BASIC suppliers together to share learning, and how to engage other FCDO teams (SP and non-SP).
- *Inception Report and Stakeholder Mapping:* An inception report should itemise all the elements of the evaluation as specified in the Terms of Reference. It should detail the methodology that will be used for the evaluation. In order to inform details of the evaluation design, some stakeholder mapping will be necessary.

#### Implementation Phase (up to 37 months)

- *Baseline Report:* setting out the initial available data across outcome and output indicators and the baseline situation for the specific evaluation case studies that will be conducted (e.g. country case studies, TA study, ways of working assessments or others as detailed in the supplier's methodology).
- *Midline Report:* providing a review of progress to date and making recommendations for programme adaptations and wider lessons for FCDO and BASIC suppliers. We would expect a substantial, thorough midline report to be completed near the middle of the programme.
- *End line Report:* the final report will be delivered at the end of the BASIC programme with the focus on capturing the longer-term outcomes of efforts to strengthen the use of social protection approaches in crises and providing recommendations on how FCDO, governments, partners and the wider social protection and humanitarian sectors can take this agenda forward. We would like the final report to be delivered after the end of the BASIC programme, with the main focus on capturing the longer-term outcomes, while reviewing other findings with the benefit of further perspectives and evidence which may be captured.
- *A learning series including short, action-orientated briefing papers, and events (webinars, roundtables, seminars, training modules, a set of presentations to FCDO) on a range of themes including:* measurement and evaluation of the effectiveness of TA and its combination with research, lessons in what works to promote an increased use of social protection approaches in crises, influencing governments and national partners etc. (from mid to end of programme). The inception report should propose the themes and timeline for the learning series, with some room for adaptation over the course of implementation. This element of the evaluation will provide more timely assessment of programme performance, including any recommendations for changes in ways of working. Suppliers should outline their initial proposal on the learning series – numbers and times.

## Reporting

- *Brief monthly (inception) and Quarterly (implementation) progress reports.* The Supplier will be expected to provide quarterly progress reports to which specific outputs will be tied. Reports will take the form of a presentation to the FCDO SPT.
- *Annual reports:* FCDO conducts Annual Reviews of all programmes to assess progress against the logframe, ensure that the programme is on track, and consider if any adjustments should be made. The Supplier will be expected to produce Annual Reports using FCDO's standard format to feed into BASIC Annual reviews (due 30 October each year). Annual progress reports will provide detail on progress against agreed evaluation activities, outputs, indicators and milestones, and highlight learning to date and recommendations for adaptation, including (as appropriate) suggested changes to the theory of change based on emerging evidence (deadline end September each year).
- *A final progress report to feed into FCDO's BASIC Programme Completion Report (PCR):* The Supplier will be expected to produce a final report using FCDO's PCR format.
- *Financial reporting:* The evaluation team will be expected to report on VFM measures, and this will be assessed during FCDO Annual Reviews and quarterly reviews. The Supplier will also be required to provide regular, highly accurate financial forecasts and reports (preliminary budgets prior to FCDO's financial year, monthly reports for financial forecasting; quarterly financial reports, annual audited financial statements). FCDO will closely monitor forecasts and spending against budgets, including through a review of spending in quarter three each year. Annual Reviews of the programme will include financial scrutiny.

## J Timeline

47. This evaluation should commence in financial year 2020/2021, in September 2020, and evaluate BASIC implementation throughout the life of BASIC until the end of March 2024.

48. The inception phase will last six months from contract signature. The implementation phase will start immediately following the approval of the inception phase report and will last for up to 37 months concluding at the end of the project in March 2024.

49. There is potential to extend this contract for up to 2 years, subject to programme need, available budget, supplier performance and appropriate approval.

## K Budget and payments

50. The contract value (excluding VAT) will be up to £699,760 including all costs (incl. in-country): management costs, professional fees, travel, duty of care, local taxes and other expenses.

51. There is potential to extend this contract by up to £350,000 (excluding VAT), subject to programme need, available budget, supplier performance and appropriate approvals.



52. Annex 1 outlines current countries of BASIC activities, however the final geographical footprint of the programme is not known. Bidders should propose an approach for country selection and include costs related to in-country evaluation activities. At a minimum this should include 4 country visits, but bidders should propose a flexible approach to this element of the evaluation.

53. Expenses incurred by the supplier will be paid as actual costs incurred.

54. The contract will be performance-based for both inception and implementation phases, and all outputs will be approved by the FCDO SPT. Suppliers should propose a payment schedule, identifying at which milestone each output (from the list in paragraph 46) will be paid. For the implementation phase FCDO reserves the right to withhold up to 15% of output payments if Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are not met.

55. The supplier will propose an output-based price for each of the Inception Phase deliverables (see paragraph 46) in line with the KPIs at table 3 below. The output-based price should cover fees only (with expenses for both the inception and implementation phases reimbursed as actual costs incurred). For inception, if the criteria are not met, payment for outputs not delivered will be withheld until satisfactory delivery of outputs.

56. The table below presents the KPIs proposed by FCDO that will be further refined with the Supplier during the inception phase and approved by FCDO. These will be reviewed as part of the supplier's annual performance review and linked to milestone payments.

57. Table 3: Key performance indicators

KPI1 Management, Delivery and Financial	<p>Milestones/deliverables provided on time to the satisfaction of the client (delivered within 5 days of planned date, approved by SPT after a maximum of two rounds of comments)</p> <p>Accurate and timely submission of expenditure forecast and invoices (within 2 days of planned date and within 5% variance of that quarter)</p> <p>Up to date delivery chain map and risk register (updated within the last quarter, verified at annual review and /or by FCDO SPT spot check)</p>
KPI 2 Customer and Partner relationship	<p>Active engagement with FCDO (monthly/quarterly meetings as agreed)</p> <p>Active engagement with BASIC suppliers (monthly/quarterly meetings as agreed and annual presentation to the KML leads)</p> <p>Active engagement with key stakeholders identified in the evaluation communication and uptake plan (specific</p>

	indicator to be determined at the end of the inception phase once a final communication and uptake plan is approved)
--	--

58. Final milestones will be updated and agreed during the inception phase in line with the workplan and report submissions.

## L Roles and Responsibilities

59. The evaluation team will report to FCDO's SPT. The primary point of contact for the evaluation team is the Senior Responsible Officer of BASIC. The SPT programme manager will be the contact for programme and contract management issues.

60. Governance arrangements will be developed by FCDO during the inception phase, but FCDO SPT will be ultimately responsible for milestone and outputs approvals and enabling participation of country offices. The BASIC internal and external reference groups will be involved as per the to be determined governance arrangements.

61. The Supplier will provide regular updates to FCDO on the progress of the evaluation; brief monthly updates are likely to be appropriate during intensive periods with quarterly or six-monthly updates at other times. These updates should be in the form of a meeting, with minutes provided by the supplier. Suppliers should expect to deliver three formal presentations at FCDO, one for each phase of the evaluation (baseline, midline, endline; noting this is in addition to tele-conferences, as necessary, and other plans for communications). These meetings will be hosted in London but may involve teleconferencing or video conferencing with FCDO country offices. The supplier may use video conferencing for some participation but should budget for core members to attend a minimum of one meeting per phase.

## M Input, qualification and expertise of supplier

62. This work will be carried out by a team of experts, who have solid expertise in conducting evaluations of this nature, and strong sector skills (in particular humanitarian cash and social protection).

63. The team of experts will include the following skills and expertise.

Evaluation methodology and themes:

- A team and team leader with strong track records in delivering robust evaluations in the field of social protection and humanitarian assistance
- The team should have expertise of successfully designing and undertaking monitoring and evaluation in developing and fragile and conflict affected countries, including regional and multi-country programmes, and evaluations across multiple partners
- The team should contain members with expertise in evaluating:

- Social protection programmes and systems that can or seek to respond to shock and /or build people's resilience to shocks
- Humanitarian assistance and linkages with development / social protection
- Technical assistance services;
- Research;
- Capacity building;
- Policy and practice influencing;
- Knowledge management and learning.
- The team should contain members with expertise in conducting evaluations using different approaches and methods, including:
  - Theory based evaluation
  - Synthesis and interpretation of quantitative data sets
  - Qualitative and quantitative primary data collection and analysis
  - Disaggregated data collection and analysis to generate insights into what is effective, why and how in different contexts for different groups
- The team should contain expertise in delivering flexible and responsive evaluations and demonstrate ability to critically reflect upon and respond to emerging findings and the changes to the external environment.

#### Leadership and partnerships:

- Knowledge and expertise of working with DFID/FCDO, developing country governments, development and humanitarian partners, other donors and civil society
- The team and any consortia should reflect substantive and meaningful partnerships with consultancies and/or research institutes and evaluators based in the global south to ensure they are strategically engaged within this scope of work.
- The proposals must clearly outline the roles and responsibilities, including governance and reporting structures between partners.
- Demonstrated ability to provide intellectual leadership, strategic advice and challenge to successfully drive forward complex programmes of work, with expertise in working with a range of partners to use critical reflection and evidence to improve programme delivery.

#### Communications:

- Constructively engaging and working with a wide range of stakeholders with different interests and levels of expertise
- Expertise in developing and delivering timely communication, dissemination and promotion of learning with a wide range of stakeholders (donors, developing country government, UN, civil society) through appropriate channels and tailored products (workshops, web-based activities, accessible and engaging reports, practical guidance etc.), and achieving meaningful uptake and use of evidence;

- Demonstrated ability to analyse a wide range of varied and complex evaluation data and information from a variety of sources and distil this into strategic programming and policy advice for management teams
- Demonstrated understanding of how organizations learn and drive change processes and use of evaluation strategies for assessing organizational change;
- Demonstrate plain English writing skills.

64. It is expected the supplier will have the skills required to produce work that will meet the standards of the Government Statistical Service (GSS) <https://gss.civilservice.gov.uk/>, the Government Social Research Service (GSR) <http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/networks/gsr> as well as DAC <http://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/qualitystandards.pdf> and DFID's standards [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/204119/DFID-Evaluation-Policy-2013.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/204119/DFID-Evaluation-Policy-2013.pdf).

## N Constraints and dependencies

65. We expect that there will be a number of risks and challenges in delivering this work. We have listed a few of the more significant challenges below. Therefore, suppliers should set out how they will identify, mitigate against, manage, and report additional constraints, dependencies or risks during the implementation of the evaluation. A full risk assessment should be conducted by the supplier during inception phase. Ongoing risk management will be needed during the evaluation, with any high or severe risks flagged to FCDO immediately.

- Discontinuity in the programme services delivery: BASIC TAS is currently being delivered by EACDS Lot B which is planned to end in 2021. BASIC Research procurement is under way but not completed yet. Bidders will have to deal with the resulting challenge of developing a baseline and comparable mid-line and end-line.
- Discontinuity in the evaluation team, given the duration of the evaluation.
- Risk of changing policy environments and staff resources in FCDO with potentially scaled-back ambitions and / or different priorities.
- Difficulties in accessing policy-makers, programme staff and other relevant stakeholders to collect data necessary to assess outcomes and impacts.
- High Duty of Care risk in accessing certain countries where BASIC delivers services. See section on Duty of Care.
- The evaluation will accompany programme implementation to generate baseline, mid-line and end-line data on programme contributions to outcomes and also to identify lessons. Ideally, the programme would learn, adapt and course correct during implementation. However, the feasibility of this will depend on the implementation cycles for each programme component, and the time lag for activities to be implemented and to start to lead to desired changes. The supplier will need to propose an approach that recognises this gap in

implementation of BASIC activities and intended outcomes and impacts and design an evaluation framework that can generate lessons within this context.

- Identifying case studies or countries in which to conduct deep dives will depend on (a) having a critical mass of BASIC TAS projects and research and (b) the timely implementation of these, such that case study countries or projects can be identified and followed. As such, the evaluation may need to consider a phased approach to conducting baselines.
- The evaluation will be reliant to some extent on the quality of supplier's monitoring data (TAS and research suppliers). Indicators on quality of TA are largely based on self-reporting or client reporting, and can be subjective and/or qualitative indicators. The supplier will need to work with suppliers to ensure these are the right indicators and are measured as robustly as possible and to identify ways to triangulate measures and/or conduct deep dive assessments into a smaller number of cases to trace results independently.
- The evaluation supplier will need to work collaboratively across BASIC programme suppliers, strengthening and influencing their approach to M&E and also work in close collaboration with any independent evaluations or reviews planned by suppliers (especially within the research component). The bid should outline how the evaluation will engage and coordinate with BASIC suppliers, including supporting their capacity and approach to M&E.
- The programme aims and outcomes – contributing to humanitarian and / or social protection systems change in country and creating a step change in practice across the sector – are high ambition. However, it is important to recognise the scale and scope of TA interventions. These will often be small scale TA projects that look at a specific part of the social protection system or a specific constraint to the use of social protection approaches in crises. Therefore, when assessing impacts the evaluation needs to be realistic and proportionate, being mindful of what the individual TA projects are trying to achieve and their effectiveness in doing that, as well as how and when these smaller scale changes add up to higher order systems change.
- FCDO SPT will procure a new TA Facility in 2020 to provide knowledge and technical advisory services to FCDO teams (and through them governments and other country stakeholders) for the full life of the programme. Delays in procuring and starting the new TA facility may slow down the number and scope of TA projects for FCDO, affecting what the evaluation can look at.

## 0 Conflict of Interest

66. There is a Conflict of Interest between this contract and any contract related to the delivery of other BASIC services (BASIC technical assistance services and BASIC research). Any supplier, expert and sub-contractor involved in the delivery of BASIC services (in the past, currently or in the future) is excluded from bidding for this contract. The selected supplier for BASIC evaluation will be excluded from any tendering and contracting for future BASIC services (technical assistance and research). The supplier should immediately declare any arising issues around Conflict

of interest as they proceed through the work and ensure that appropriate mechanisms are put in place to manage this conflict. Bidding organisations should use the Register of Interests to indicate any potential conflict of interest with this request, including related current work, planned related future work, or related work completed recently.

## P Confidentiality

67. All evaluation personnel are under an obligation not to disclose to any third parties any confidential and commercial information obtained either directly from FCDO or by virtue of their engagement in relation to this contract. Confidential information may be in any form and shall include all information that, due to its character, nature or method of transmittal, a reasonable person would treat as confidential.

## Q Ethics

68. Suppliers will have an ethics policy/code (consistent with but expanding upon FCDO/DFID's [Ethics principles for evaluation and research](#)) and apply ethical clearance protocols, where appropriate. This will explicit how suppliers and sub-contractors will obtain national and organisation ethical approval. Suppliers should set out how they propose to ensure the confidential treatment of project documentation and data collected throughout the evaluation.

## R Branding

69. The evaluation outputs will use UK Aid Branding and BASIC reporting template.

## S Safeguarding

70. FCDO's aim across all its programming is to avoid doing harm by ensuring that their interventions do not sustain unequal power relations, reinforce social exclusion and predatory institutions, exacerbate conflict, contribute to human rights risks, and/or create or exacerbate resource scarcity, climate change and/or environmental damage, and/or increasing communities' vulnerabilities to shocks and trends. FCDO seek to ensure their interventions do not displace/undermine local capacity or impose long-term financial burdens on partner governments, therefore, require partners to lead and robustly consider environmental and social safeguards through its own processes and to live up to the high standards in safeguarding and protection which FCDO requires.

71. The Supplier will produce a robust risk analysis ahead of implementation, including setting out mitigating safeguarding measures. A clear reporting and whistle blowing procedure to ensure reporting of any cases of misconduct to FCDO should be put in place.

## T Duty of Care

72. Overall, we have assessed DoC as high risk because of the contexts in which the programme and evaluation case studies might be conducted and the proximity to unpredictable and risky events such as floods or disease outbreaks. See Annex 3 for an example of risk rating.

## U Background to BASIC Programme

73. Extreme poverty and fragility are closely interlinked: 59% of extremely poor people live in countries affected by fragility, environmental vulnerability or both, and where humanitarian needs are greatest. But the humanitarian system is ill-suited to respond: while crises are most often protracted or recurrent (86% of aid goes to protracted crises lasting three years or more), financing and delivery models are mainly short-term and reactive. Social protection approaches can help address these weaknesses; and help deliver the UK Humanitarian Reform Policy and World Humanitarian Summit commitments, including to more than double the use of cash in crises by 2025. But social protection approaches are underutilised in crises due to limited evidence, knowledge and capacity to guide programme design and delivery, and political economy challenges to reform.

74. Social protection here is defined as a broad range of public, and sometimes private, instruments to tackle the challenges of poverty, vulnerability and social exclusion. Social protection programmes and systems exhibit a wide range of objectives from directly reducing income poverty and other deprivations (such as lack of access to health, education, hygiene, nutrition, protection, shelter, etc.) to promoting human development, access to jobs and basic social services, addressing economic and social vulnerabilities and contributing to pro-poor economic growth. Social benefits under different social protection schemes can be transferred in cash or in-kind and can be contributory or non-contributory depending on where they are financed through a social insurance system by beneficiaries or directly by governments.

75. An IDS Working Paper from 2018 on the scope for integration between social protection and humanitarian response concluded: 'Whether or not more integration will provide more efficient and effective responses to crises depends on the type of shocks and the crisis context, as well as the capacity and coverage of the social protection programme to deliver to additional caseloads. Based on a review of the existing evidence, the paper concludes that important gaps need to be filled with regard to the technicalities of linking short- and longer-term interventions in humanitarian contexts, particularly in relation to mobile populations and refugees, and understanding better the political economy factors that facilitate bridging the humanitarian-development divide.'<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.ids.ac.uk/publications/social-protection-and-humanitarian-response-what-is-the-scope-for-integration/>

76. Some donors and agencies have since then issued guidance<sup>2 3</sup> on how to align humanitarian cash to national social safety nets and how to programme social protection across the humanitarian -development nexus. However, the gaps in evidence and in how to link the technical functions remain. The incentives and disincentives for actors to change policy and align and/or integrate are still not well understood. And not enough testing has been done of different methods of applying social protection approaches in crises to allow cross-country learning and scale-up.

77. *Better Assistance in Crises* (BASIC) has therefore been set-up to help fill these gaps in evidence and practice. It is a Centrally Managed Programme (CMP) funded by the FCD0 Social Protection Team (SPT) that aims to help poor and vulnerable people cope better with crises and meet their basic needs through more effective social assistance in contexts of recurrent shocks, protracted conflict and forced displacement.

78. With a budget of £20.5m for five years, BASIC aims to tackle bottlenecks at global and country level that prevent greater use of social protection approaches in crises, through three inter-related components:

- a) Technical Assistance Services (TAS) (£9.625m): for country support, capacity building, learning, coordination and high-level policy influencing across multiple countries and at global level, and
- b) Research (£10m) that strengthens both global and country-specific evidence on using social protection approaches to respond to crises, in different contexts.
- c) Monitoring and Evaluation (£0.875m) to measure the impact of the programme activities through an independent evaluation.

79. Further information on the programme, including the Theory of Change are detailed in Annex 1.

80. A logframe has been developed for the first year of the BASIC TAS component, see Annex 1.

## V General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)

81. Please refer to the details of the GDPR relationship status and personal data (where applicable) for this project as detailed in Annex 4 and the standard clause 33 in section 2 of the contract.

## W Annexes

Annex 1: Summary of BASIC Programme

Annex 2: Draft evaluation questions

Annex 3: Duty of Care risk rating

<sup>2</sup> EU's Guidance Package on Social protection across the humanitarian-development Nexus (SPaN) <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/sp-nexus/documents/european-commission-2019-tools-and-methods-series-reference-document-no-26-social>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.unhcr.org/protection/operations/5cc011417/aligning-humanitarian-cash-assistance-national-social-safety-nets-refugee.html>



Annex 4: GDPR

Annex 5: Additional documents – attached separately:

- BASIC Research ToRs
- BASIC info sheet external – September 2019
- Grand Bargain workshop report – Linking humanitarian cash and social protection 2019
- Nigeria reports

## Annex 1: Summary of BASIC Programme

1. The BASIC Business Case can be found on devtracker <https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/projects/GB-GOV-1-300467>. The 2019 logframe can be found here: [http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati\\_documents/50245633.xlsx](http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati_documents/50245633.xlsx)

### BASIC Theory of Change

2. The overall BASIC programme intended impact is: “Vulnerable people are better able to cope with crises and meet their basic needs through:
  - More efficient social assistance in crises (earlier, more timely, less fragmented, lower cost);
  - Social assistance in crises more effective in addressing household needs;
  - Diversified, comprehensive and more sustainable funding for social protection approaches in crises (domestic, development, private).”
3. The BASIC programme’s expected outcomes in the Theory of Change are:
  - Improved human and institutional capability and capacity;
  - New or strengthened country plans, policies, programmes and systems designed and implemented;
  - Increased political commitment to and use of social protection approaches in crises;
  - Greater coherence, coordination and synergies between actors and initiatives across the nexus between humanitarian aid and social protection;
  - Evidence used by governments, donors and agencies to inform policies and practice.

### BASIC TAS:

4. BASIC Technical Assistance Services (TAS) aim to deliver high quality support to UK Government, governments and partners across a wide range of development and humanitarian challenges such as programme design, risk and contingency financing, understanding changing systems and strategic integration of humanitarian action and development. BASIC TAS respond to:
  - FCDO Country Office (CO) requests for expertise and support to using social protection approaches in crisis. While FCDO will always be the commissioning party for contractual purposes, BASIC responds to demand from governments and partners in country.
  - Centrally commissioned ToRs on cross-cutting issues. While FCDO SPT will be the commissioning party in such case, BASIC can respond to demand from international actors provided themes are in line with BASIC and FCDO priorities.
  - In the future BASIC will consider responding directly to demand from partners and governments at country and global levels.
5. Funds of £9.625 million have been approved for five years for BASIC TAS from financial year 2018/19 to 2023/24. BASIC TAS are currently delivered through an existing FCDO framework agreement: the Expert Advisory Call Down Service (EACDS) Lot B,

through a consortium of 60 partners managed by DAI Europe Ltd. Support is currently provided through individual EACDS call down contracts for each piece of TAS. Delivery of TAS started in March 2019.

6. The BASIC TAS provide services in the following areas:

- High quality technical assistance to the design and delivery of country plans, policies, programmes and systems
- Capacity building provided for the design and delivery of country plans, policies, programmes and systems
- Creating greater awareness, knowledge, learning and political commitment across countries and agencies on using social protection approaches in crises

7. EACDS Lot B provides services to TA contracts for BASIC. These services include a team that provides operational support to the delivery and quality assurance of call down contracts, and contracts suppliers for the delivery of the TA. Given that the EACDS framework will close before the end of the BASIC Programme, a new delivery mechanism for BASIC TAS will be selected in the course of the programme.

8. BASIC TAS also uses the Humanitarian and Stabilisation Operations Team database (HSOT, managed by Palladium) as a delivery route.

9. While BASIC TAS is demand based, we are developing an approach to develop a coherent TAS portfolio by prioritising demand and supporting the development of long-term plans that deliver on the programme's expected results. BASIC's focus on recurring shocks, protracted conflicts and forced displacement, and its demand-led nature, resulted in the following first batch of countries for technical assistance since March 2019: Yemen, Nigeria, Mozambique and Lebanon (twice).

10. Medium-term TA plans are currently being developed for Lebanon, Yemen and Nigeria, and short-term TA for Afghanistan, and the DRC. A centrally commissioned study on the role of Management Information Systems (MIS) in crises was completed in 2020 with Yemen and South Sudan as case studies. Countries with high potential for transformational impact are prioritised. Transformational potential is currently defined as:

- a country office developing a new multi-year Business Case,
- an opening or government shift in policy towards greater use of social protection or
- significant influencing opportunities with other donors and global actors.

Yemen and Nigeria are likely to be the first countries prioritised for the provision of longer-term TA. Prioritisation might change over the course of the programme to adapt to evolutions in needs, contexts and opportunities.

11. In April 2020, DFID/FCDO and GIZ launched the Social Protection Approaches to COVID-19: Expert advisory services (SPACE). SPACE aims to provide bespoke on-demand support to developing country governments, DFID/FCDO and German Development Cooperation (GDC) programme teams and implementing partners during the preparation, planning and execution of COVID-19 responses and recovery programmes that use social protection approaches (see [flyer](#)). To date, SPACE has provided technical advice to around 25 countries.

12. Based on the transformational potential as well as country office interest and capacity, BASIC will also select up to four ‘deep engagement’ countries and provide them with sustained advisory, research, learning, and policy influencing over longer time periods as required. The four deep engagement countries will be selected and signed off by FCDO, during the BASIC Research Inception Phase. An initial mapping exercise has identified the following potential countries for BASIC Research and to potentially become deep engagement countries: Somalia, Yemen, South Sudan, Iraq, Nigeria, DRC, Jordan, Lebanon, Mali, Niger.

13. So far, BASIC has de-prioritised country contexts where the MAINTAINS (Maintaining Essential Services After Natural Disasters) programme operates. These are: Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sierra Leone, Ethiopia, Uganda and Kenya. MAINTAINS is a FCDO research programme that will develop an improved evidence base on how education, health, social protection, nutrition, and water and sanitation services can adapt and expand in response to shocks such as floods, droughts, cyclones and disease outbreaks. However, BASIC and MAINTAINS teams have agreed to continuously coordinate: if BASIC services are needed, those will be designed and delivered complementarily to MAINTAINS.

#### BASIC Research:

14. The BASIC research component is currently being procured (contract award expected in September 2020) for a total of up to £10m for four years (from contract signature until March 2024).

15. The overall objective of BASIC Research is to deliver and maximise uptake of new policy and operationally-relevant evidence on: *how and when to use social protection approaches in different crises contexts, to deliver more effective and efficient social assistance so that vulnerable people, in particular women, children and people with disabilities, cope better with crises and meet their basic needs.*

16. The research is aimed at influencing policy and informing operational design. Research uptake will mean more evidence based – and therefore more effective – policy positions and development initiatives by FCDO, governments, other donors, and agencies in a range of FCDO priority and other countries.

17. BASIC Research will procure the services of research experts to manage and deliver three research components:

- Component 1 will focus on global questions; it shall use country-level evidence generated through component 2 where relevant and could include learning and evidence generated through practice supported by BASIC TAS and other FCDO and non-FCDO funded programmes. We expect an ambitious and rigorous approach to research, requiring collection and analysis of new data and rigorous use of secondary data.
- Component 2 will focus on country level research responding to policy and operational needs in up to four BASIC deep engagement countries. Research methods will include quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods, including experimental or quasi-experimental research methods where feasible.

- Component 3 will focus on research uptake, through the development and implementation of a research uptake strategy, which will include dissemination of robust research outputs, and learning events through which to share and discuss emerging lessons and research findings. The uptake strategy will be part of the Evidence, Learning and Policy Strategy for BASIC Programme.

#### Coordination with other programmes

18. BASIC will complement and coordinate with other existing and planned FCDO centrally managed social protection programmes and other research investments especially on protracted conflict contexts. DFID's Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme (HIEP) supported shock responsive social protection research has played a catalytic role, but it did not address protracted conflict and forced displacement contexts. FCDO funded joint World Bank/UNHCR research on Forced Displacement, has a small social protection window, but will not provide technical assistance. The MAINTAINS programme is focussing its research on shock-responsive service delivery but will not cover conflict related contexts. The Centre for Disaster Protection is supporting countries to strengthen their disaster planning and get finances in place before disaster strikes. And the Gender Responsive Social Protection Programme is a centrally managed social protection programme, managed by the FCDO Social Protection team, with limited focus on crises contexts.

19. Synergies and shared learning between these programmes are a priority. An internal and an external reference group are being set up for this purpose.

20. Gender and disability are key considerations for BASIC. Providing better assistance in crises can potentially help improve outcomes for women, girls, disabled people and other marginalised groups, but further research is required. Research from more stable contexts, suggests that social assistance can provide major benefits across protection, health, nutrition, education and empowerment objectives. There is a need to research this from more crises contexts and to build sensitivity to these objectives into the design of any programme or policy. BASIC is working closely with the Gender-Responsive Social Protection Programme to share and apply learning, to ensure a strong gender lens to the activities and approaches of this programme.

21. BASIC's aim to increase the use of social protection approaches in crises is strongly in line with the Paris Declaration of 2005, in particular the principles of ownership, alignment, results and harmonisation.

## Annex 2: Draft evaluation questions

### Effectiveness

#### Performance

- When and how do BASIC technical advice and capacity building services lead to policy, programme and systems change? What is effective, and why? What doesn't work and what are the blockages? Of the different types of TA provided what was more effective and cost-effective and why?
- When and how do BASIC research products lead to policy, programme and systems changes? What is effective and why? What does not work and what are the blockages?
- How can TA be delivered in a politically sensitive and appropriate way?
- Is the overall TAS portfolio strategic and effective? Why and how could this be improved?
- If and how is SPT staff contributing to programme effectiveness?
- Does the combination of TAS and research in those countries where both components operate generate synergies and influence and change policy and practice effectively? Which combinations work and why?
- Has each BASIC component and has BASIC achieved its intended outputs and outcomes?

#### Learning

- Given BASIC is primarily operating in crises contexts, how does TA need to be different from stable contexts to be effective?
- What different portfolio approach would need to be taken to improve overall programme effectiveness?
- What other services could be offered in addition to TA and research (e.g. funding of pilots, funding of cash transfers) to improve effectiveness?
- What are good indicators of and methodologies for measuring the effectiveness of TA? This should include appropriate consideration of rubric-based approaches. What lessons are there on the monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of TA?
- How should TA, research and knowledge exchange and learning be leveraged to have maximum influence on policies, programmes and systems at (a) the national level and (b) global level?

### Relevance

#### Performance

- Timeliness and relevance: Does the TA model through each delivery route provide high quality TA in time and in line with demand? Is demand being met and if not why not?

- Is research responding to demand and priority needs? Is research addressing priority operational needs?
- Are TA and research responding to priority issues at national level and at global level?

#### Learning

- What would need to happen to meet demand? Identify what kind of TA and capacity strengthening is most useful to (a) FCDO advisors / team (b) client governments (c) partners and why? and how this should be made available to them.
- Briefly review how the overall operating context within FCDO for knowledge and evidence services has evolved (e.g. more centrally managed programmes) and what that changing context means for how these types of services are framed in the future.
- Are both BASIC components working coherently to deliver joined up policy relevant advice, support and learning for FCDO, national governments and partners at national and global levels? What can be done to improve this?

#### Efficiency

##### Performance

- Assess the overall operations of BASIC TAS including the number of contracts, the range of work, the selection of different suppliers and experts, the services provided by the lead supplier in terms of value for money.
- Assess the overall operation of BASIC Research including the number of research projects, the range of work, the selection of the supplier and different research providers in terms of value for money.
- Have the intended outputs been achieved? Are the outputs proportionate to cost?

##### Learning

- Make recommendations for potential efficiency improvements for future technical assistance models.
- Could economies of scale be achieved by delivering several TA facilities (e.g. delivering several FCDO Social protection TA programmes together) through one supplier?

#### Sustainability

##### Performance

- Influencing global policy: Broader policy and programmatic change globally among wider networks of humanitarian and development partners – what did change? What was effective and why and what didn't work? Where have the greatest shifts taken place?

- Influencing governments (including donors) and partners– have programme components led to any change in policy, programmes and systems that are likely / have potential to be sustained beyond the funding of the project (recognising limitations in timing or evaluation)? Have the programme components led to any change in the human and institutional capabilities of FCDO, governments and / or partners? what works and what doesn't – looking across research, influencing and TA/systems strengthening work? What are the major factors that influenced the achievement (or not) of sustainability in different contexts?

#### Learning

- The contribution of the capacity building output in developing FCDO's own capacity should be explored further to inform any future call-down mechanism of this type.

#### Impact

##### Performance

- What have been the impacts of TAS on policy and programme design and implementation in (a) BASIC TAS and deep engagement countries; and (b) globally?
- What have been the impacts of the research on policy and programme design and implementation in (a) BASIC research and deep engagement countries; and (b) globally, including measuring the effectiveness of research uptake?
- How effective has the combination of TAS and research together been with influencing and providing thought leadership in promoting policy and programme change in crises? This will be measured in the deep engagement countries and globally.
- What has been the impact as per indicators in the logframe(s).

#### Learning

- If and how can we evaluate if social protection approaches in crises lead to better outcomes for affected households than humanitarian approaches?
- How can research and TAS influence the behaviours, policies and operations of national governments, individually and in combination? What can partners / external actors do to enhance this influence? What are the limitations on the influence of external actors, and on the effects that the provision of TAS can have?
- What works to strengthen knowledge exchange and learning across the sector and to drive a step change in global practice? What should future phases of FCDO support to social protection approaches in crises policy and practice focus on?

#### Concluding

- Make recommendations for a technical assistance and research model including other and additional services and capabilities for BASIC and FCDO in the future, based on the findings of the formative questions of this evaluation.



### Annex 3: Duty of Care risk rating – Examples

BASIC operates in a variety of countries as illustrated in Annex 1. The below indicates an example of high duty of care risk country for which BASIC can deliver services.

**FCDO Overall Project/Intervention / Summary Risk Assessment matrix**Location: **Mogadishu/South Central Somalia**Date of assessment: **11 Dec 19**

Theme	FCDO Risk score	FCDO Risk score	FCDO Risk score	FCDO Risk score	FCDO Risk score	FCDO Risk score
	Mogadishu Airport	Mogadishu	Kismayo Airport	Kismaayo	Dollow	Other Parts of South Central Somalia
OVERALL RATING	4	4	4	4	4	4
FCO travel advice	4	4	4	4	4	4
Host nation travel advice	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available
Transportation	3	4	4	4	4	5
Security	3	4	3	4	3	4
Civil unrest	2	4	2	4	4	4
Violence/crime	3	4	2	4	4	4
Terrorism	3	5	3	4	4	4
War	2	2	2	2	2	2
Hurricane	1	1	1	1	1	1
Earthquake	1	1	1	1	1	1
Flood	1	1	1	1	1	1
Medical Services	2	4	3	4	5	5
<b>Nature of Project/ Intervention</b>						

<b>1</b> Very Low risk	<b>2</b> Low risk	<b>3</b> Med risk	<b>4</b> High risk	<b>5</b> Very High risk
			<b>SIGNIFICANTLY GREATER THAN NORMAL RISK</b>	

**FCDO Overall Project/Intervention Summary Risk Assessment matrix**Location: **PUNTLAND**Date of assessment: **11 Dec 19**

Theme	FCDO Risk score	FCDO Risk Score	FCDO Risk score	FCDO Risk score
	Garowe	Bossaso	Galkayo	Other Parts of Puntland
OVERALL RATING	4	4	4	5
FCO travel advice	4	4	4	4
Host nation travel advice	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available
Transportation	5	4	5	5
Security	4	4	5	4
Civil unrest	3	4	3	4
Violence/crime	3	3	5	4
Terrorism	4	4	5	5
War	2	3	3	3
Hurricane	2	2	1	1
Earthquake	1	1	1	1
Flood	2	2	1	1
Medical Services	4	5	5	5
<b>Nature of Project/ Intervention</b>				

<b>1</b> Very Low risk	<b>2</b> Low risk	<b>3</b> Med risk	<b>4</b> High risk	<b>5</b> Very High risk
			<b>SIGNIFICANTLY GREATER THAN NORMAL RISK</b>	

**FCDO Overall Project/Intervention  
Summary Risk Assessment matrix**

Location: **SOMALILAND**

Date of assessment: **02 January 20**

Theme	FCDO Risk score		
	Hargeisa, Berbera	Borama, Burao	Other Parts of Somaliland
OVERALL RATING	4	5	5
FCO travel advice	4	5	5
Host nation travel advice	Not available	Not available	Not available
Transportation	4	4	4
Security	4	4	4
Civil unrest	3	4	4
Violence/crime	3	4	4
Terrorism	4	4	4
War	2	2	3
Hurricane	1	1	1
Earthquake	1	1	1
Flood	1	1	3
Medical Services	4	5	5
Nature of Project/ Intervention			

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

## Annex 4: GDPR

### Schedule of Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects

This schedule must be completed by the Parties in collaboration with each-other before the processing of Personal Data under the Contract.

The completed schedule must be agreed formally as part of the contract with FCDO and any changes to the content of this schedule must be agreed formally with FCDO under a Contract Variation.

Description	Details
Identity of the Controller and Processor for each Category of Data Subject	<p>The Parties acknowledge that for the purposes of the Data Protection Legislation, the following status will apply to personal data under this contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Parties acknowledge that Clause 33.2 Protection of Personal Data and 33.4 (Section 2 of the contract) shall not apply for the purposes of the Data Protection Legislation as the Parties are independent Controllers in accordance with Clause 33.3 in respect of the following Personal Data:</li> <li>• In respect of Personal Data necessary for the administration and/or fulfilment of this contract<sup>4</sup>.</li> <li>• For the avoidance of doubt the Supplier shall provide anonymised data sets for the purposes of reporting on this project and so FCDO shall not be a Processor in respect of data gathered from citizens as part of the research activities as it does not constitute Personal Data.</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Names, addresses, email addresses, phone numbers, gathered from individuals during research programme workshops, training and other events, from citizens participating in interviews, surveys, studies, focus groups or through research programme activities and from individuals engaged through communication, uptake and knowledge management activities.