

Section 4, Annex A

Call-down Contract

Terms of Reference

Evaluation Manager for

Burma Humanitarian and Resilience Programme (HARP)

Background

General Background

DFID appoints a Supplier (the Supplier) to provide evaluation services to the DFID-funded Burma Humanitarian and Resilience Programme (HARP) from 2017 to 2020. The Evaluation Manager will be appointed to: (i) carry out a Final evaluation of the HARP in 2019; and (ii) provide technical support to DFID internal annual reviews and programme completion report.

Description of Burma HARP

The Burma HARP is a programme up to £108.5m running over five years (2016-2020) that aims to provide humanitarian support to some of the most vulnerable people in Burma and Thailand affected by crises. The main components of the HARP are:

1. Establishment of a HARP Facility expected to run over 4.5 years with a budget of £60m+
2. Contribution to the UN-managed Myanmar Humanitarian Fund (MHF) of up to £10m over 5 years.
3. Provision for contingency funding through an Internal Risk Facility
4. Interim programming to respond to shocks before the HARP Facility was fully operational, £10m

The HARP Facility will support immediate relief and early recovery interventions, improve emergency preparedness, help to reduce future humanitarian needs and build resilience of people in protracted crises. It will also support innovation and learning required for humanitarian responses to be more effective in future in Burma.

DFID will support the HARP Facility to fund UN and international organisations, international and national NGOs and civil society organisations to carry out humanitarian assistance in Burma and for Burmese refugees in Thailand. The outcomes of the HARP Facility are: increased effectiveness of humanitarian action in protracted crises; improved quality and coverage of emergency preparedness and response across the country; and enhanced

focus on addressing the causes of humanitarian needs and building resilience at the individual and community level within humanitarian assistance. The HARP Facility will do this through action under the 5 Pillars of the HARP Business Case:

1. Better support to protect and provide basic services to vulnerable people living in protracted crises
2. Stronger capacity of DFID and partners to meet acute spikes in humanitarian need
3. Better accountability, coordination and coherence of the humanitarian system in Burma
4. Improved approaches to address long term drivers of humanitarian need and disaster risk, such as durable solutions for internally displaced people and actions that build resilience to natural disasters and conflict
5. Better focus on generation of evidence and synthesis of learning on what works well and less well in humanitarian programming in Burma.

Purpose of the HARP Evaluation Manager

The purpose of the HARP Evaluation Manager is to provide independent assessment of the results and impact of the HARP, and to provide technical evaluation expertise to programming within the HARP Facility. The learning from this innovative approach is essential to support decision making during the course of the HARP, for future humanitarian assistance in Burma and for the wider humanitarian community to learn from this approach.

Scope

The scope of the contract is to provide essential and independent evaluation services to the HARP, which will be carrying out humanitarian programming in Burma and in Thailand on the Thai-Burma border. The HARP Evaluation Manager will develop and implement an Evaluation Framework for evaluating the programme at the project and programme levels. The initial Evaluation Framework must be sufficiently flexible to incorporate an unknown future portfolio of projects while ensuring that the evaluation data and analysis gathered can be used for the programme level evaluation.

1. Besides the Evaluation Framework, the HARP Evaluation Manager will be closely involved in the programme throughout its lifetime and will undertake to provide input into DFID Annual Reviews, and a Project Completion Review
2. Lead on design and delivery of a Final Evaluation

Responsibilities

The initial design of the HARP Facility envisaged a Technical Assistance, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning (TAMEL) Facility within the HARP Facility. Subsequent review and engagement with suppliers on the Fund Manager role for the HARP Facility led DFID to decide to separate the

functions that form the role of HARP Evaluation Manager from the responsibilities of the Fund Manager of the HARP Facility, while other functions remain with the HARP Facility Fund Manager.

This also gives the HARP Evaluation Manager a wider role of evaluating the impact of the HARP as a whole, including the HARP Facility component. The Business Case and terms of reference for the HARP Facility Fund Manager are attached for reference. In order to clarify the respective responsibilities of the HARP Facility Fund Manager and the HARP Evaluation Manager the following are noted here:

- **HARP Facility Monitoring Framework:** the HARP Facility overarching Monitoring Framework will be designed by the HARP Facility Fund Manager and DFID. Each project implementer will have its own logical framework to monitor progress against agreed milestones. These will feed into the HARP Facility Monitoring Framework that will be designed by the HARP Facility Fund Manager, and will feed into the overall DFID HARP logframe.
- **Primary evaluation data collection:** The HARP Evaluation Manager is responsible for defining the primary data requirements that are required for evaluation purposes but is not responsible for the collection of monitoring data. Where relevant data is already being collected by partners, the HARP Evaluation Manager will provide support to ensure it is sufficiently robust, and this will be used instead of duplicating data collection. Where data isn't being generated through partner monitoring processes, the HARP Evaluation Manager may be responsible for additional primary data collection to support the evaluation. During the design phase, the HARP Evaluation Manager, DFID and the HARP Facility Fund Manager are expected to work together to agree on any areas where primary data would not be collected through implementing partners nor by the Fund Manager, and agree a strategy and responsibilities for the collection of this data.

The division of responsibilities is summarised below:

	HARP Facility Fund Manager	HARP Evaluation Manager
Primary data collection	Responsible for primary data collection for monitoring under HARP Facility Monitoring Framework	Responsible for any primary data collection required for impact or outcome analysis outside the HARP Facility Monitoring Framework
Establishment of monitoring framework	Responsible for leading the development of the HARP Facility monitoring framework, working with DFID and the Evaluation	Responsible for review of the HARP Facility monitoring framework, including ensuring the capacity to measure outcomes and impact, and the

	Manager	coherence with an overall HARP logframe (including work outside the HARP Facility)
Evaluation	Support the evaluation processes, including facilitation of administration and logistics, field trips and partner meetings	Design and carry out final evaluation of the HARP. Implement communications and dissemination strategy for results.

Evaluation Questions

The evaluation questions will be refined and prioritised as part of the evaluation design phase and following assessment of data availability. The final set of evaluation questions will be agreed by DFID in consultation with the United Nations Office for Humanitarian Affairs (who manage the MHF), the HARP Facility Fund Manager, the HARP Evaluation Manager and other relevant stakeholders.

A preliminary selection of evaluation questions is provided below, which the Evaluation Manager will be expected to help finalise as part of the establishment of the Evaluation Framework. Additional questions may be developed for the individual project-level evaluations. The questions will apply to the HARP Facility portfolio¹ as well as the impact of the HARP on wider humanitarian coordination in Burma and the impact of multi-year programming in the Burma context.

Preliminary Evaluation Questions

- To what extent did longer term approaches to addressing humanitarian needs in protracted crises affect humanitarian outcomes and the value for money of DFID funding?
- To what extent did the MHF and HARP Facility approaches to prioritising engagement with local organisations affect humanitarian outcomes and the value for money of DFID funding?
- Has the preparedness work under HARP including the Internal Risk Facility enabled DFID to respond more quickly and effectively when conditions deteriorate?
- What contribution has the work of the HARP Facility made to changes in the overall humanitarian system? In terms of:
 - Structures and functioning

¹ The performance of the MHF project portfolio will be outside the scope of this work. The Evaluation Manager will consider the contribution of the MHF to the overall HARP objectives and DFID's management of the MHF agreement.

- How data influences decision making
- Better advocacy
- Has the HARP contributed to reducing vulnerability and the drivers of humanitarian need? How do investments in reducing humanitarian need contribute to/compromise delivery of humanitarian outcomes?

These primary questions should be considered around the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development-Development Assistance Committee (OECD_DAC) evaluation criteria, with sample questions under each area below:

Relevance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent was the initial design of the HARP Facility, including the different components, coherent, logical and innovative? • How relevant are the interventions that have been funded to the achievement of the programme's intended outcomes and impact? • How responsive have projects been to changes in context and how well have they adapted to meet different local contexts? • What changes were made to the design and planned activities and outputs of projects as a result of implementation, monitoring feedback and responsiveness to changes in context? • To what extent and how were cross-component linkages made during implementation and how did they contribute to improved project performance and overall programme value? • How did the programme coordinate with, and how does it link to, other current government and donor programmes? • Are there any other interventions that should have been considered?
Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent and how did projects show due regard for value for money, including consideration of the "humanitarian triangle" of speed, quality and cost in emergency response? • Does the programme provide a cost effective approach to provision of humanitarian assistance in Burma compared to alternatives?
Effectiveness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have individual projects achieved their intended results and outcomes? • To what extent and how have individual projects contributed to programme outcomes and impacts, including unintended effects, positive and

negative?

- To what extent has the action of the Facility and its projects been ethically valid and conformed to humanitarian principles and standards, and generally accepted norms, including consideration of the approach to cross-cutting issues?
- To what extent have projects assessed what works, for whom, how, why and under what circumstances?
- How effective is the umbrella programme approach for the delivery of intended outputs, outcomes, and impacts?
- What actions should key actors take to improve the programme and/or its constituent projects based on learning from evidence based analyses of what works, how, why, for who, under what circumstances?

Sustainability

- To what extent are the processes that have been developed and/or strengthened by the HARP Facility programme sustainable over time i.e. institutional frameworks, local NGOs and civil society, women's empowerment and equity?
- What sustainable impact has been achieved through HARP Facility interventions on individual health, nutrition and education?
- What evidence is there of a demonstration effect of research and pilot projects and the dissemination of learning from the HARP Facility.
- What results will have been achieved after the programme has closed in 2020?

Impact

- To what extent and how has the HARP Facility programme contributed to addressing the root and proximate causes of humanitarian need and building resilience in Burma and for Burmese refugees in Thailand?
- To what extent and how has the HARP Facility increased the effectiveness of humanitarian action in protracted crises in Burma?
- To what extent and how has the HARP Facility improved the quality and coverage of emergency preparedness and response in Burma?
- To what extent has the HARP Facility saved lives and reduced poverty and suffering of crisis affected people in Burma and Burmese refugees in Thailand?
- What key insights can be drawn from the HARP Facility programme and its evaluation, to provide meaningful and actionable input into UK policy

with respect to humanitarian action in Burma and elsewhere?

Evaluation Design

The evaluations will take place on three distinct yet complementary levels:

Project Level for HARP Facility projects group (a): an attribution approach to estimating net intervention effect in specific areas of work where this is judged feasible, i.e. impact, which could involve a range of methodological design options or combinations thereof, e.g. phased roll-out, factorial, quasi-experimental, statistical and theory-based. The use of more complex methods will be on a subset of representative projects only.

Project Level for HARP Facility projects group (b): a contribution approach that provides credible causal inference that the projects have made a significant contribution to observed changes in intended results, e.g. through case-studies, and other participatory, equity-focused and gender-responsive approaches.

Programme Level: evidence synthesis approach for an overall assessment of the value of the HARP that takes into account dimensions of value such as the achievement of outcomes and impacts.

The HARP Evaluation Manager will design the Evaluation Framework at the programme level, including an approach to data collection and evaluation at the project level. This Framework should make clear what questions each evaluation looks to answer. It should also make clear how project evaluations can be expected to feed into the overarching programme evaluations. As mentioned above, the Evaluation Framework must be sufficiently flexible to incorporate an as-yet unknown set of individual projects while being realistic about how project-level evaluation data and analysis gathered can be used at the programme level evaluation. As projects are designed and implemented, the Evaluation Framework will be adapted and completed. As part of the design of the Evaluation Framework and input into the Monitoring Framework, the Evaluation Manager will review and if necessary propose refinements to the overall programme theory of change and logical framework.

The evaluation design should take into account any operational sensitivity raised by DFID, the HARP Facility Fund Manager or implementing partners regarding security, suitability and commercial sensitivities for the evaluation. In the event of disagreement between the HARP Evaluation Manager and HARP Facility Fund Manager or implementing partner during evaluation work, the HARP Executive Committee will adjudicate and take the final decision, taking in to account and recording arguments and evidence from all sides.

Ensure coherence with Monitoring Framework

The HARP Evaluation Manager is expected to work with the HARP Facility Fund Manager to understand the monitoring systems, the HARP Facility Monitoring Framework, and to review how the Monitoring Framework can provide the data and evidence necessary for the evaluation of the HARP, along with the other components in the overall HARP logframe. The HARP

Evaluation Manager will be expected to provide input to ensure that HARP Facility monitoring systems and outputs allow for the effective achievement of the each of the expected outputs of the HARP Evaluation Manager contract.

The HARP Evaluation Manager will also work with the HARP Facility Fund Manager and implementing partners during the implementation phase to ensure that adequate baseline data is collected at project and programme level, and that data collected for programme monitoring purposes can be used for evaluation purposes when necessary. Advice to implementing teams should include, but is not limited to:

- Identification of programme monitoring data required from HARP Facility implementing partners to meet evaluation needs and timings;
- Suggested revisions of logical framework indicators, sources and timings where appropriate;
- Suggested revisions to the theory of change of any HARP Facility project based on an assessment of the relevant evidence, where appropriate;
- Discussion of the respective responsibilities for primary data collection, if appropriate, throughout the evaluation period;
- Recommendations regarding the overall data collection system including suggested revisions to project level monitoring systems and any primary data collection needs.

Evaluation approach

The supplier specified an evaluation approach in the tender documents that is guided by the three evaluation objectives identified above and the initial set of evaluation questions identified in the ToR. This approach will be refined during the design phase in consultation with DFID.

It is expected that the final design and proposed methods will reflect the following issues:

- The overall design must be methodologically rigorous and credible when judging both the internal and external validity of the results. It should also show how it will link evaluations at the project level with the overall programme evaluation.
- Measuring and explaining impact is important in part to provide evidence of proof of concept for some of the innovative aspects of the HARP Facility approach. In particular the Evaluation Manager will be expected to provide a practical rather than theoretical assessment of the value of a multi-year approach, contingency funding and the Strategic Capacity Building Facility within the HARP Facility.
- Identifying lessons and the opportunities for replication and scale-up is very important during the life of the HARP Facility. The design should allow generalisation from the project and programme levels as far as

feasible, and should identify key contextual factors expected to affect the effectiveness, sustainability and external validity.

- A clear approach to answering the two VfM related evaluation questions.
- Clear standards for ensuring rigor and credibility.

The HARP Evaluation Manager will ensure the design and application of methods is ethically sound and complies with relevant protocols. As mentioned above, the HARP Evaluation Manager will be expected to show sensitivity to the operational requirements of the MHF and HARP Facility.

Systemic disaggregation of data, including by sex, age and geographical location will be important throughout the monitoring and evaluation work where possible. It is therefore crucial that this be built into programme monitoring right from the beginning.

During the design phase the supplier is expected to refine the initial assessment, provided in the tender submissions, of the risks, challenges and mitigating factors relevant to evaluating the programme using their proposed methodology, and to propose clear management approaches for these risks, challenges and mitigating factors.

As per DFID evaluation policy, the evaluation should adhere to international best practice standards in evaluation, notably the OECD DAC International Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, DFID evaluation principles, and DFID's Ethics Principles for Research and Evaluation.

Evaluation Timing

The Final Evaluation will take place and report in 2019, following a more detailed timetable to be agreed with DFID as part of the Evaluation Framework.

DFID Annual Reviews and Project Completion Report

Throughout the term of this contract the HARP Evaluation Manager will provide input into the DFID Annual Review of the HARP. DFID Annual Reviews look at progress and performance of each component of the HARP against the programme-level logframe.

The HARP Evaluation Manager will be expected to provide written input and analysis to the DFID Annual Review, particularly around value for money questions, including analysing trends, benchmarking and identifying areas of good practice.

DFID methods for carrying out Annual Reviews will include:

- A review of available documentation, such as the current business case logframe or equivalent, progress and financial reports produced covering the review period, minutes of stakeholder meetings, and consultancy reports.

- Field visits and project observation
- Meetings with stakeholders, including project beneficiaries.
- More detailed review of individual projects selected on a risk and impact basis

The HARP Evaluation Manager will incorporate into the Evaluation Framework a proposed approach to providing input into the DFID Annual Review process.

Intended Audience

The intended audience of the Final Evaluation will be primarily DFID Burma, but also of interest to:

- HARP Facility Fund Manager and implementing partners
- Other donors in Burma;
- The Burma Humanitarian Country Team;
- British Embassy Burma;
- DFID and other donors globally;
- UN agencies and NGOs;
- The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) and its subgroups
- Academics.

Outputs

Evaluation Framework

The Evaluation Framework sets out the different aspects of evaluation work through the contract and how these contribute to the objectives of the HARP Evaluation Manager role. The Evaluation Framework is expected to be delivered alongside the Evaluation Design Report.

Review of the HARP Facility Monitoring Framework and MHF KPIs during their development will be delivered during this process.

Evaluation Design Report

The Evaluation Design work is expected to begin immediately upon signature of the HARP Evaluation Manager contract. The Evaluation Design Report should be drafted and submitted by Month 3 of the contract and should set out:

- The finalised evaluation design and methods for the Final Evaluation. This should:
 - Revise and prioritise the evaluation questions in detail based on an assessment of the evidence supporting the Theory of

Change and the requirements of DFID. Each question should be accompanied by: explanatory comments, judgement criteria, quantitative and qualitative indicators, methodological approach to data collection and analysis;

- Propose a final evaluation design and Evaluation Framework for the HARP including recommended evaluation methods to be used, proposed counterfactuals where appropriate, and proposed data collection methods. The design should also specify the specific roles and responsibilities for primary data collection for the HARP Facility Fund Manager, implementing partners and the HARP Evaluation Manager.
 - Define the resource requirements to implement the recommended evaluation design and methods, including plans for contracting data collection or preparatory research as appropriate, and provide budgets and detailed workplans for its completion.
 - Provide a communication and dissemination plan for the outputs of the Evaluations, including the intended process for engaging with and communicating findings to stakeholders at all levels. This plan will be implemented in conjunction with DFID and the HARP Facility Fund Manager.
- An appraisal of the implications of the theory of change of the HARP programme and overall logframe for the evaluation design;
 - An appraisal of the implications of the Monitoring Framework of the HARP Facility for evaluation design and methods;
 - A communication and dissemination strategy, reflecting DFID's Open Access Policy, and specifying the target audiences;
 - A review of the main risks and challenges for the evaluations and how these will be managed;
 - A proposal on the collection of primary data, if appropriate, including details of the division of responsibilities for data collection between HARP Facility Fund Manager, implementing partners and the HARP Evaluation Manager;
 - A proposal on the role of the Evaluation Manager, if any, in the event of a large scale rapid onset crisis during the period of the HARP.
 - Discussion of how to ensure that the design and application of methods will be ethically sound and which relevant ethical standards will be applied;
 - Assessment of the probable quality and credibility of the identified datasets and sources and implications for primary data collection and the evaluation;
 - An outline evaluation workplan for Final Evaluation in 2019, including field missions and costings

Final Evaluation Report

The Final Evaluation is expected to take place and report during 2019. The key deliverables for the final report should include:

- Presentation of Draft Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations to DFID.
- Draft Final Report: The draft final report should include an executive summary, detailed methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations and be presented in a publishable format to be agreed with DFID. The draft final evaluation report will be subject to independent quality assurance by DFID.
- Final Report: The final report should include an accessible communication tool to inform humanitarian policy makers and partners. It should also include a summary of the Evaluation.

It should be noted that all data and metadata are owned by DFID, and the Supplier should ensure in the initial design, and methods that all data is rigorously documented. The HARP Evaluation Manager is required to provide all underlying data to DFID, anonymised and in a suitable consumable format.

DFID Annual Reviews and Project Completion Review

The HARP Evaluation Manager will agree the form of their participation in the DFID Annual Review in advance each year, and submit their input at a mutually agreed date to conform with the timeline of the Annual Review, beginning in 2017.

Governance Arrangements

The HARP Evaluation Manager will report to the HARP Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) within DFID Burma. The Evaluation Manager will also present key findings and strategy to the HARP Steering Committee comprising DFID and UK Embassy Burma and UK Embassy Thailand and DFID Conflict, Humanitarian and Security Team in London, as well as potentially other donors during the life of the HARP Facility. The HARP SRO will manage the day to day interactions with the HARP Evaluation Manager.

The HARP SRO will be advised by a DFID Burma Evaluation Adviser, and if necessary by further evaluation specialists from DFID and external evaluation expert(s). The SRO and Evaluation Adviser will provide advice and comment on the HARP Evaluation Manager's outputs at every stage.

Meetings will be held as required by agreement between the HARP SRO, DFID Burma Evaluation Adviser and the HARP Evaluation Manager. The frequency of meetings will be agreed within the first 2 months following appointment.

Reporting and Contracting Arrangements

Specific reporting and meeting arrangements will be agreed with the HARP Steering Committee and the SRO for the Evaluation Design and Final Evaluation.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) will be agreed between the HARP Evaluation Manager and DFID, within 2 months from contract award. These will ensure that the management of the contract is undertaken as transparently as possible and to ensure that there is clarity of roles and responsibilities between the DFID Team, programme partners and the HARP Evaluation Manager. The HARP Evaluation Manager will need to demonstrate to DFID, at intervals which will be agreed with DFID within 2 months of contract award, its performance against these KPI's.

DFID will evaluate the performance of the HARP Evaluation Manager throughout the life of the programme and at least yearly, as part of DFID's Annual Review of the programme. The Evaluation Manager will be expected to submit progress reports and lessons presented written and orally to DFID annually in-line with DFID's programme cycle as outlined in the requirements section of this ToR. In addition, the Evaluation Manager will provide regular financial reports at intervals agreed with DFID. It is expected that the Evaluation Manager take a proactive approach to notifying DFID of any matters which may require immediate attention.

Milestone-based payments within the first year will be based on the approval by DFID of reports of high standard and which correspond to the requirements of these Terms of Reference.

Logistics and Procedures

The HARP Evaluation Manager will be responsible for all logistic arrangements for members of the Evaluation Manager team. HARP Facility Fund Manager and implementing partners will facilitate convening of meetings and site visits where necessary. All relevant expenses should be covered by the evaluation contract budget.

The HARP Evaluation Manager will need to demonstrate that they have the relevant permissions for their organisation to operate in Burma (and Thailand, where necessary), and have considered any authorisations necessary for any planned access to project implementation locations. It should be noted that DFID Burma cannot facilitate access to project implementation locations.

Timeframe

The contract for the HARP Evaluation Manager will be awarded until December 2020. The contract is designed to end after financing is disbursed to allow a final evaluation of projects to be completed if necessary. DFID may extend the contract for up to 18 months, should an ongoing need for the services exist.

The HARP will run for 5 years (2016 – 2020), and the HARP Facility was established following the awarding of the HARP Facility Fund Manager contract in mid-2016 and operational by the end of 2016. There is a possibility of an extension of the HARP depending on performance and context, and this will be considered during the life of the Facility.

In view of the long time horizon and to allow for changes during the lifetime of the contract, annual review points will be planned. The initial contract will include a break point following the delivery of the Evaluation Design Report and 2017 Annual Review inputs. Progression from one period to the next will be subject to the satisfactory performance of the HARP Evaluation Manager, the continuing requirement for the services and agreement on work plans, KPIs and outputs.

It is expected that the Evaluation Manager will need a staff composition that enables necessary access but also skills and experience to carry out the role. The Evaluation Manager will need to be able to scale up capacity particularly at times of the planned evaluations.

Budget

The proposed budget for the HARP Evaluation Manager is £300,000. The supplier will set out a separate budget for each of the main activities outlined above (Evaluation Framework Design, Annual Reviews, and Final Evaluation), along with an approach and methodology for each. In addition, Suppliers are requested to be very clear about methodology providing a detailed breakdown of costs for the different significant activities to be undertaken during the evaluation.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) will be agreed between the HARP SRO and the contracted HARP Evaluation Manager within 2 months of contract award.

Duty of Care

The Supplier is responsible for the safety and well-being of their Personnel and Third Parties affected by their activities under this contract, including appropriate security arrangements. They will also be responsible for the provision of suitable security arrangements for their domestic and business property.

DFID will share available information with the Supplier on security status and developments in-country where appropriate. DFID will provide the following: A copy of the DFID visitor notes (and a further copy each time these are updated), which the Supplier may use to brief their Personnel on arrival.

The Supplier is responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security briefings for all of their Personnel working under this contract and ensuring that their Personnel register and receive briefing as outlined above. Travel advice is also available on the FCO website and the Supplier must ensure they (and their Personnel) are up to date with the latest position.

Suppliers must develop their Response to this Mini competition on the basis of being fully responsible for Duty of Care in line with the details provided above and the initial risk assessment matrix prepared by DFID. They must confirm in their Response that:

- a. They fully accept responsibility for Security and Duty of Care.
- b. They have made a full assessment of security requirements.

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

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

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

- a) Have you completed an initial assessment of potential risks that demonstrates your knowledge and understanding, and are you satisfied that you understand the risk management implications (not solely relying on information provided by DFID)?
- b) Have you prepared an outline plan that you consider appropriate to manage these risks at this stage (or will you do so if you are awarded the contract) and are you confident/comfortable that you can implement this effectively?
- 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

Transparency Requirement

DFID has transformed its approach to transparency, reshaping our own working practices and pressuring others across the world to do the same. DFID requires Suppliers receiving and managing funds, to release open data on how this money is spent, in a common, standard, re-usable format and to require this level of information from immediate sub-contractors, sub-agencies and partners.

It is a contractual requirement for all Suppliers to comply with this, and to ensure they have the appropriate tools to enable routine financial reporting, publishing of accurate data and providing evidence of this DFID – further IATI information is available from;

[Redacted]