



APPENDIX A - CALLDOWN CONTRACT – FORM OF AGREEMENT

Framework Agreement with: Ecorys UK Ltd (Ecorys)

Framework Agreement for: Global Evaluation Framework Agreement

Framework Agreement Purchase Order Number: PO 7448

Call-down Contract For: Human Development Evaluation, Learning and Verification Services (DELVe)

Contract Purchase Order Number: PO 10030

I refer to the following:

1. The above-mentioned Framework Agreement dated **9 September 2016**;
2. Your proposal of **8 January 2020**, subsequent clarifications dated **13 February 2020, 20 February 2020, 5 May 2020** and re submitted proposal dated **20 May 2020**.

and I confirm that DFID 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 **10 August 2020** ("the Start Date") and the Services shall be completed by **31 December 2027** ("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 DFID requires the Supplier to provide the Services to the **Human Development (HD) Team in DFID Nigeria** ("the Recipient"). Additional audiences in Nigeria will be other stakeholders in the Human Development suite of programmes (including Government partners, other development partners and DFID's implementing partners).

3. Financial Limit

- 3.1 Payments under this Call-down Contract shall not exceed **£8,819,641.86** ("the Financial Limit") and is exclusive of any government tax, if applicable as detailed in Annex B.

Milestone Payment Basis



3.2 REDACTED

4. DFID Officials

4.1 The Project Officer is:

REDACTED

4.2 The Contract Officer is:

REDACTED

5. Key Personnel

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

REDACTED

6. Sub-contractors

6.1 The following of the Supplier's sub-contractors have been approved for the purpose of fulfilling this contract and cannot be substituted by the Supplier without DFID's prior written consent:

**Preston Associates
ITAD**

7. Extension Options

7.1 In agreement with the Supplier, DFID reserves the right to extend the contract for up to a further 24 months beyond the end of the Call Down Contract should the DFID Nigeria's Partnership for Learning for All in Nigeria (PLANE) and DFID Nigeria's flagship health programme (Lafiya) programmes be extended beyond 2027. Any options to extend will be reviewed subject to satisfactory performance of the supplier, the continuing need of the services and agreement on work-plans and budgets for the proposed extension period.

8. Contractual Break Point

8.1 The continuation of the DELVe programme will be subject to DFID and Treasury (HMT) approval after March 2024

8.2 Evaluation, learning and verification services will be required for the lifetime of the Human Development programmes. Both PLANE and Lafiya will be subject to major reviews in 2023 which will determine whether and in what form they continue to 2027. The requirements for DELVe service may therefore be adjusted in response to any changes made to these programmes which may include but may not be limited to; termination and / or service and scope reduction.



9. Additional Documents to be included in the Contract

9.1 REDACTED

10. Reports

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

11. Duty of Care

- 11.1 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:
- 11.2 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.
- 11.3 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 DFID in respect of:
- 11.3.1 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;
 - 11.3.2 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.
- 11.4 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.
- 11.5 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.
- 11.6 Where DFID is providing any specific security arrangements for Suppliers in relation to the Call-down Contract, these will be detailed in the Terms of Reference.

12. Payment Plan and Budget

12.1 REDACTED

13. Call-down Contract Signature

- 13.1 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 DFID, DFID will be entitled, at its sole discretion, to declare this Call-down Contract void.



For and on behalf of
The Secretary of State for
International Development

Name:

Position:

Signature:

Date:

For and on behalf of
Ecorys Uk Ltd

Name:

Position:

Signature:

Date:

DFID Nigeria Human Development Evaluation, Learning and Verification Service (DELVe) Terms of Reference.

Table of Contents

Table of Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	2
A. Overview	3
B. Human Development in Nigeria	4
C. The Current DFID Nigeria Human Development Portfolio in Nigeria	7
D. Purpose, Objectives and Scope.....	13
E. Deliverables	16
F. The Recipient and Audiences.....	20
G. Proposed Methodology	21
H. Availability of Datasets and Evidence	29
I. Governance and Management Arrangements	32
J. Budget.....	36
K. Skills and Experience Required	36
L. Management and Reporting Arrangements.....	37
M. Risks and Constraints to the Evaluation	38
N. Duty of Care	38
O. General Data Protection Regulation	40
P. List of Annexes	40
Business Cases	40
Lafiya.....	40
PLANE	40
SUNMAP	40
DFID Ethical Guidance for Research, Monitoring and Evaluation	40
Initial duty of care risk assessment matrix prepared by DFID Nigeria.....	40
Schedule of Processing Data and Data Subjects	40

Table of Acronyms and Abbreviations

AG	Accountable Grant
BESDA	The World Bank's Better Education Sector Delivery for All
BHCPF	Basic Health Care Provision Fund
BMGF	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
DCA	Delegated Cooperation Agreement
DELVe	DFID Nigeria Human Development Evaluation, Learning and Verification Service
DFID	UK Department for International Development
EFO	Externally Financed Output
EQUALS	DFID's Evaluation Quality Assurance and Learning Service
ERICC	DFID Nigeria's Education Research in Conflict and Protracted Crises
FCO	The UK's Foreign and Commonwealth Office
FME	Nigeria's Federal Ministry of Education
FMH	Nigeria's Federal Ministry of Education
GEFA	DFID's Global Evaluation Framework Agreement
GFATM	The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria
GPE	Global Partnership for Education
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
Lafiya	DFID Nigeria flagship health programme (<i>Lafiya is a Hausa word related to health, or healthy</i>)
LGA	Local Government Area (the administrative level below State)
LINKS	DFID Nigeria's Partnership to Engage, Reform and Learn
MNCH2	DFID Nigeria's Maternal, Newborn and Child Health phase 2 programme
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NEI+	USAID's Northern Education Initiative Plus
NENTAD	DFID Nigeria's North East Nigeria Transition to Development programme
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPHCDA	National Primary Health Care Development Agency
NTD	Neglected tropical diseases
PERL	DFID Nigeria's Powering Economic Growth in Northern Nigeria (not an acronym)
PLANE	DFID Nigeria's Partnership for Learning for All in Nigeria
SOML	Save One Million Lives programme
SUNMAP2	DFID Nigeria's Support to National Malaria Programme phase 2
TB	Tuberculosis
UBEC	Nigeria's Universal Basic Education Commission
USAID	The United States Agency for International Development
VfM	Value for Money



A. Overview

The Purpose of the DELVe Contract

1. DFID Nigeria seek a range of independent evaluation, learning and verification services it needs to manage the DFID Nigeria Human Development Portfolio. These services will achieve both learning and accountability purposes.
2. Programmes in the portfolio are:
 - **Lafiya** (£235m, 8 years, 2019-2027) which is DFID Nigeria's flagship health portfolio;
 - **Partnership for Learning for All in Nigeria**, (PLANE - £170m, 8 years, 2019-2027) which is DFID Nigeria's flagship education programme; and
 - The **Support to National Malaria Programme** phase 2 (SUNMAP2 - £50m, 6-years, 2017-2022) which is a programme to reduce Nigeria's malaria burden.
3. Two programmes (Lafiya and PLANE) will each require an **independent performance evaluation**. Alongside this, all three programmes require **verification of the accuracy of reporting and quality of delivery of results** reported by programme implementers to DFID¹.
4. There are several reasons for seeking to achieve these purposes through a single contract. The theories of change overlap to some extent so DFID Nigeria see value in the separate evaluation designs being informed by one another. In a practical sense we expect to achieve better value for money by taking a common approach to the design and implementation.
5. Evaluation, learning and verification services will be required for the lifetime of the Human Development programmes up to December 2027. Both PLANE and Lafiya will be subject to major reviews in 2023 which will determine whether and in what form they continue to 2027. The requirements for DELVe service may therefore be adjusted in response to any changes in the programmes. The continuation of the DELVe programme will be subject to treasury approval after 2023. This may include a contract extension by a further 2 years should the PLANE and Lafiya programmes be extended beyond 2027.

The Structure of these Terms of Reference

6. The remainder of these terms of reference are structured as follows below. A complete contents table is provided above.
7. Section B provides **broad context** about the state of human development in Nigeria, and the geographic areas where the DFID Human Development (HD) portfolio will operate. It describes historic DFID programming as well as relevant programming by DFID and other actors.
8. Section C describes **the three programmes that will be the focus for DELVe**. These are Lafiya, PLANE and SUNMAP2.

¹ DFID recognise that accuracy of reporting and quality of delivery are quite distinct. The rationale for this is discussed in the Section D on Purpose and the details in on Methodology in Section G.

9. The terms of reference then describe **the requirements of DELVe**. Section D elaborates on the specific purpose, objectives and scope. Section E proposes the deliverables in the form of a table. Section F describes who will be the audience and recipients of those services. Section G goes into more detail about the proposed evaluation questions and methodologies that will meet the objectives.
10. The terms of reference then turn to the **management aspects**. Section I sets out the management and governance arrangements, Section J the budget and Section K the skills requirements. To inform bids, there is a description of risks and constraints to the evaluation, and duty of care requirements. The Business Cases for each of the three programmes form the annexes to these terms of reference.

B. Human Development in Nigeria

General Context

11. Nigeria is a large country, with a complex federal government structure and with a government reliant on oil revenues. It is governed by a Federal Government, 36 State Governments (grouped into six geopolitical zones), and 774 Local Government Areas (LGAs). The state governments are administratively autonomous, but heavily reliant on centrally collected and distributed oil revenue. Falling oil revenues, coupled with high interest repayments and a large population, means limited public revenue per capita.
12. Nigeria has a protracted crisis in the North East, and conflict in other parts of the country. The Boko Haram insurgency, now in its ninth year, has led to the loss of over 35,000 lives and displacement of 1.7 million people in Borno, Yobe and Adamawa. Infrastructure has been destroyed and commerce, agricultural production and livelihoods have been significantly affected. Nutritional status in the North East is beyond emergency levels in some areas – up to 3 million are facing critical food insecurity. Fresh displacements emerge when hostilities intensify – over 130,000 people have been displaced in 2018. Other conflicts persist in the country. Since 2001, ongoing conflict between farmers and herders has led to over 60,000 casualties.

Human Development Challenges in Nigeria²

13. The scale of the human development challenges in Nigeria (and especially in Northern Nigeria) cannot be overstated. Nigeria has a **large and growing population, which could lead to demographic dividend or disaster**. In the Human Capital Index, Nigeria's ranks low at 152 out of 157 countries. Nigeria's Human Capital Index is also significantly lower than the average for its region and income group and is also the lowest ranked middle-income country. Nigeria has the largest number of primary aged children out of school in the world, the second highest total maternal mortality (10% of global burden) and second highest total child mortality (12% of global burden). One in three Nigerian children is chronically malnourished and there is no evidence that malnutrition rates are declining. It is estimated that 30% of Nigeria's 192 million people are of school age. With a fertility rate of 5.5 and low contraceptive use, the population is projected to reach 400 million people by 2050. Population growth is likely to be highest in the poor, insecure North where fertility rates are as high as 8.9. Urbanisation is likely to continue.

² For more detail, see paragraphs 1-14 of the PLANE Business Case, 1-11 of the Lafiya Business Case and 12-14 of the SUNMAP2 Business Case

14. This could lead to a **demographic dividend** whereby Nigeria could transition to a higher middle-income country in 40 years, if it invests in family planning, education and progressive economic policies. However, without this investment in human capital, there is a risk of high unemployment, an uneducated workforce, inadequate basic services, insecurity and high dependency ratios. This will increase unemployment, drive inequalities, reduce stability, increase migration and exacerbate the drivers of conflict.
15. Challenges faced in building Human Capital in Nigeria include:
 - **Marginalisation**, driven by poverty, geography, gender and disability
 - **Supply side inputs that are not adequate** to meet needs: schools and health care facilities are overcrowded, in bad condition, and critical materials are not routinely available
 - **Lack of well qualified and competent teachers and health workers**
 - **The lack of sufficient investment** in service delivery is partly due to lowest revenue to GDP ratio in the world.
 - **Government systems** that suffer from unclear institutional mandates and poor accountability for results
 - There are challenges with **budget release and expenditure** and corruption is a serious concern
 - **Monitoring systems** are often not robust
 - **High fertility rates**, including teenage pregnancy and birth
 - Service delivery has significantly worsened in areas affected by **conflict**
16. Challenges in building human capital are inter-related. The DFID Nigeria Human Development Team are playing their part in responding to these challenges through a suite of three programmes that are designed in parallel and with overlapping theories of change: PLANE, Lafiya and SUNMAP2.
17. DFID Nigeria is focussing its efforts on fewer states to achieve greater impact and backing reform minded states where we can have traction³. PLANE, Lafiya and SUNMAP2 will nest within DFID Nigeria's overall country strategy and geographic footprint – known as the “3+3+1 strategy”. This geographic footprint was determined based on several factors including rates of poverty, population and the political potential for reform. “3+3+1” means focussing support for **3 states** (Kano, Kaduna and Jigawa), **3 regions** (North-East⁴; South West and South-East/South South) and support to the Federal level.

North West Region: Kano, Kaduna, Jigawa

18. **Kano and Kaduna have the largest public primary school systems in Nigeria.** Teacher knowledge is low in all three states. In Jigawa, almost half of children in grade six are still unable to read a word in English. Many children are out of school and girls are disproportionately affected: a significant proportion of adolescent girls are married. Education inputs are insufficient and not matching growing populations: in Kaduna, the pupil to classroom ratio for pre-primary and primary was 67:1 in 2014-15 and rose to 91:1 in 2016-17. In the North of Nigeria, approximately one third of Muslim children attend Quranic school only (although increasingly these schools are open to integration of literacy and numeracy alongside Quranic education).

³ As well as the detail found here, please see PLANE Business Case Paragraphs 5-14, and Lafiya Business Case Paragraphs 12-41

⁴ Specifically, Borno and Yobe states for the purpose of the Human Development portfolio



19. **This region has some of the highest mortality rates in Nigeria:** in Kano one in five children die before the age of five. Numbers of unimmunised children are also high: Kano has the highest number of unimmunised children in Nigeria. Jigawa has a modern contraceptive prevalence rate of 1.1%, and a fertility rate of 8.5. Northern states have a severe shortage of skilled health workers (particularly female) in the country: in Jigawa, there are around 8 nurses per 100,000 population.
20. **There are positive signs in governance and financing of service delivery** in both health and education in these states.

North East Region: Borno and Yobe

21. **The highest proportion of children out of school are in the North East:** in Borno, approximately 71% of primary age girls are out of school. Since the start of the insurgency, more than 700,000 children aged 6-17 have been displaced. Education has been affected by deliberate attacks by armed groups: from 2012 to 2016, more than 600 teachers were reportedly killed in attacks and in Borno 1/5th of schools have been damaged, destroyed or occupied.
22. **Health indicators in Borno and Yobe are low.** Fertility rates are high, child health and nutrition indicators are poor: wasting rates are over 17%.
23. **The government has limited capacity** to provide service delivery owing to a range of factors including the insurgency.

South East and South West Regions

24. In Southern Nigeria, **increasing numbers of children who are attending (low cost) private schools:** In Lagos, state private schools now cater for over 1.4 million children. These schools are often not regulated. Support is needed in regulation and coordination of the non-state sector and increasing the quality of public schools. In respect of health services, Lagos State faces substantial **technical challenges associated with malaria** pre-elimination and elimination.

DFID's Historical Work on Human Development

25. DFID's current Human Development portfolio draws heavily on lessons learned from previous work in the health and education sectors. The Lafiya and PLANE Business Cases summarise more about where the work was done and some highlights of achievements.
26. DFID Nigeria's previous programming in health includes⁵:
 - Supporting service delivery for maternal and child health care
 - Building capacity of health care training institutions
 - Increasing the numbers (of particularly female) health care workers in Northern states
 - Procurement of family planning commodities
 - Supporting efforts to decrease the prevalence of specific diseases (e.g. Malaria)

⁵ See Lafiya Business Case, paragraph 47 for further details

27. DFID Nigeria's previous programming in education includes⁶:

- Improving the quality and use of education data, planning and budgeting,
- Building capacity in teacher professional development
- Improving learning outcomes through supporting provision of Hausa early grade teaching and learning
- Improving community engagement in school management
- Supporting innovative approaches in supporting non-state education including improving the market for low cost private education
- Education in Emergencies support is being provided in Borno and Yobe including an innovative pilot of Teaching at the Right Level in formal and non-formal contexts⁷
- Improving the evidence base of what does and does not work to improve teacher effectiveness and learning outcomes in Nigeria⁸

C. The Current DFID Nigeria Human Development Portfolio in Nigeria

Overview

28. DFID Nigeria has three main programmes in Human Development in Nigeria which will fall under the scope of DELVe. These include two eight-year programmes in education and health, and a programme to support malaria prevention and treatment. These programmes have been bundled together by DFID Nigeria for the purposes of independent evaluation, learning and verification due to the complementary aims and synergies of these programmes. The programmes work together to support improved human capital in Nigeria.

29. These are summarised in the table below.

	Lafiya	PLANE	SUNMAP2
Years	2019-2027	2020-2024	2017-2022
Budget	£235 million	£45 million	£50 million
Geographic Scope	Borno, Jigawa, Kaduna, Kano and Yobe + Federal	Borno, Jigawa, Kaduna, Kano and Yobe + South West and South East Regions + Federal	Kano, Kaduna, Jigawa, Yobe, Lagos, Katsina
Delivery Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract with one lead supplier • Accountable Grant with NGO • MOU with UNFPA • MOU with World Bank 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract with one lead supplier • Accountable Grants with NGOs • Delegated Cooperation Agreement with USAID • MOU with World Bank 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract with one lead supplier • Small Accountable Grant

⁶ See PLANE Business Case, Section A3 for further details

⁷ See Knowledge for Development Evaluation learning Review (K4D 559)
<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/123456789/14563>

⁸ *ibid*

Requirement from DELVe Contractor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification • Evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification • Evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification
--	--	--	--

30. In the first instance DELVe should be prepared to collect data for evaluation purposes from all geographical areas set out above (save for Katsina since it is only being targeted by SUNMAP2) and to deliver independent verification services across all places. DFID Nigeria however reserves the right to change the geographic focus of the programmes during their lifetimes.

Lafiya

31. Nigeria has some of the greatest burden of health challenges globally. It has the second highest total maternal mortality (10% of global burden), second highest total child mortality (12% of global burden) and some of the highest burdens of malaria, HIV, TB, neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) globally. The Government of Nigeria currently spends proportionately less on health than nearly every country in the world – in 2016 the health spend was 0.6% of GDP and 4.2% of total government expenditure. This has the potential to get worse, with Nigeria facing a demographic crisis – Nigeria has an estimated population of 192 million, a fertility rate of 5.5, a modern contraceptive prevalence rate of 10%, and is projected to overtake the US as the world's third most populous country in 2050 with over 400 million people.
32. Over the past 20 years, DFID has supported a range of health programmes and it is estimated that between 2011 and 2015 DFID Nigeria programmes saved 75,550 child lives under-five years and saved 4,800 maternal lives.
33. DFID's new health portfolio (Lafiya)⁹ will be DFID Nigeria's flagship health programme, which proposes to invest £235 million over eight years in order to save lives, reduce suffering and improving economic prospects for the poorest and most vulnerable in Nigeria. It is estimated that this programme will avert 4,250 maternal deaths and 50,741 under-five deaths, at a cost of £128 per disability-adjusted-life-year averted. It is aiming to invest over 20% of the programme (over £50 million) on targeted family planning interventions, and the remainder on strengthening health systems to deliver a range of health interventions including family planning and malaria.
34. The planned **impact** of Lafiya is lives saved, suffering reduced, and improved economic prospects for the poorest and most vulnerable in Nigeria, through a stronger and more resilient public and private health system.
35. The **intermediate outcomes** of the Lafiya portfolio are:
- Encouraging Government of Nigeria to **increase resources** invested in health (through advocacy, community accountability; and data to inform government prioritisation)
 - Improving **effectiveness and efficiency** of public and private basic health services (through innovative financing mechanisms, strengthening health system and working with private sector to deliver affordable health services for the poorest populations)
 - **Increasing modern contraceptive prevalence** (through addressing social norms, demographic impact analysis, and support to family planning commodities and services).

⁹ See also the Lafiya Business Case and ToR for the contract

36. The outcomes outlined above for the Lafiya portfolio will be achieved through the following **outputs**:

- Output 1: **Advocacy and accountability** – Civil society advocacy and community accountability to increase demand for affordable basic health services
- Output 2: **Data for delivery / health prioritisation** – Using data to improve awareness and prioritisation by senior leadership in Government of Nigeria of basic health services
- Output 3: **Support to Basic Health Care Provision Fund (BHCPF)** - Improve effectiveness of Basic Health Care Provision Fund through innovative financing mechanisms (to be delivered through MOU with World Bank)
- Output 4: **Technical Assistance (TA)** to maximise Government of Nigeria resources and efficiency – Enable more efficient use of existing resources for delivery of health services
- Output 5: - **Private sector** Improve effectiveness of private sector in delivering affordable basic health services
- Output 6: **Service delivery in crises** - Improve access to essential health and nutrition services when critically required (to be delivered through accountable grant with NGO)
- Output 7: **Family planning commodities** - Increase availability of family planning commodities (to be delivered through MOU with UNFPA)
- Output 8: **Family planning demand and delivery** – Family planning demand creation and support to family planning services

37. The portfolio of investments for Lafiya is listed below. The scope of DELVe is relation to these investments is discussed in more detail in Section D below.

- Lafiya **contract** with one lead supplier or lead member of a consortia supplier
- **Accountable Grant** with NGO(s) to deliver support to essential health and nutrition services in crisis affected areas of Borno and Yobe initially, but with flex to respond to needs arising in any of the targeted states
- **MOU** with UNFPA to procure of family planning commodities, and strengthen the supply chain to deliver these where they are required
- **MOU** with World Bank to support the Basic Health Care Provision Fund.
- **Externally Financed Output (EFO)** agreements with World Bank is to enable technical support on demographics, human capital, health financing and private sector.

38. Geographic Scope: the Lafiya portfolio will focus on DFID's priority states in the North of Nigeria (Borno, Jigawa, Kaduna, Kano and Yobe), and will work at federal level where there is potential for greatest impact. The entirety of this geography is in scope for verification and evaluation.

PLANE

39. Nigeria faces a learning crisis. Literacy rates are low, and lower still for marginalised children. It has the largest number of primary aged children out of school in the world. Public investment in education is insufficient, and millions of children are failing to learn the basics. Improved schooling and learning are critical to avert a demographic crisis and meet the SDG commitments.

40. Over the last 10 years, DFID has supported the Government of Nigeria's through policy advice, research and evaluation and technical assistance the UK is well placed to navigate the political economy of education reform. DFID's support to basic education in Nigeria has contributed to significant enrolment gains and enabled 11 state governments, reaching over 8 million children, to lay the groundwork for improving the quality of education in their schools (state and non-state).

41. While progress has been made, there are still deep and existing challenges. Without partner support there would likely be persistence and likely worsening of Nigeria's learning crisis, contributing to higher poverty, reduced economic growth and possibly worsening insecurity.
42. DFID's new education portfolio (PLANE)¹⁰ will be DFID Nigeria's flagship education programme, seeking to invest £170 million from 2019 over eight years to improve foundational skills (reading, writing and numeracy) in state and non-state basic education systems and including community support to learning. It will improve state and non-state education systems, potentially reaching up to 8 million children. It will enable an estimated 1.5 million children to benefit from improved teaching and learning and 600,000 children to learn through education in emergencies.
43. The planned **impact** of PLANE is that more children and young people acquire skills and transition to more productive life opportunities¹¹
44. The **intermediate outcomes** of the PLANE portfolio are:
 - More Focused **teaching and learning**: More competent teachers teach foundational skills better in performance driven schools and colleges, to benefit marginalised children
 - **Better managed systems** (state and non-state): More efficient & effective use of resources to support schools and teachers and enable children learn foundational skills, including marginalised groups;
 - **Focus on results**: The use of evidence and effective communication becomes embedded in ways of working, to deliver improved performance, in state & nonstate systems
 - Children in **conflict** environments able to learn
 - **Communities** better able to support learning for marginalised children
45. The outcomes outlined above for the PLANE portfolio will be achieved through the following **outputs**:
 - Output 1: **Focused Teaching and Learning** - Evidence based teaching & learning approaches & materials in use, in better managed schools & colleges
 - Output 2: **Improved governance of state system** - Improved planning, personnel management, public financial management practices, to deliver foundational skills
 - Output 3: **Improved governance of non-state system** - improved management & performance of non-state sector in delivering foundational skills
 - Output 4: **Use of data and evidence** - Effective approaches to teaching & learning & more resilient systems for children affected by conflict
 - Output 5: **Education in Emergencies and Early Recovery** - Effective approaches to teaching & learning & more resilient systems for children affected by conflict
 - Output 6: **Community support to learning** - Communities support children's participation and learning, including for marginalised groups
46. The portfolio of investments for PLANE is listed below. The scope of DELVe is relation to these investments is discussed in more detail in Section D below.
 - PLANE contract with one lead supplier or lead member of a consortia supplier: a large technical assistance programme to support schools and improve systems

¹⁰ See also the PLANE Business Case and ToR for the contract

¹¹ Paragraphs 24-29 in the PLANE Business Case set out impact, outcomes and outputs in more detail

- Bilateral agreement with USAID and NGO(s) to help marginalised children affected by conflict learn foundational skills, and support recovery of systems in the North East
 - Accountable grant NGO(s) to improving inclusion and learning for marginalised children through community support to learning
 - EFO agreement with the World Bank to work on tracking and accountability of education expenditure
 - DFID Managed component to work on independent research, reviews and audits
47. Geographic Scope: the PLANE portfolio will operate DFID Nigeria's partner states in North West Nigeria (Kano, Kaduna & Jigawa), in North East Nigeria (Borno and Yobe states), in the South West and South East through a regional approach to support policy, standards and management of non-state systems, and at the Federal level to influence policy making. All these places should be considered in scope for verification and evaluation purposes.

SUNMAP2

48. Building from the success of the SUNMAP programme (2008-2016), the SUNMAP2 (2017-2022) programme proposes to invest £50 million over 5 years to help address current malaria programmatic and technical gaps, complement and improve the effectiveness of the Global Fund's malaria efforts in Nigeria, reduce the risk of malaria resurgence, and build long term sustainability. At impact level, SUNMAP2 will contribute to a reduction in all causes of under-five mortality rate from 128 per 1,000 in 2013 to 80 in 2022 and a reduction in the proportion of children aged 6-59 months infected with malaria parasites from 27% in 2015 to 16% by 2022. It is further anticipated, under very conservative assumptions, that the programme will directly save 7,500 lives and avert 209,000 disability adjusted life years (DALYs).
49. The anticipated **impact** of the programme is a reduction of Nigeria's malaria burden through more efficient and effective use of available resources
50. The **outcome** of the programme will be an improvement in the planning, financing and delivery of sustainable and replicable pro-poor services for malaria in supported states. The **intermediate outcomes** of SUNMAP2 are:
- Increased proportion of population regularly **using an insecticide treated net**
 - Increased proportion of **children** being **tested** for Malaria when indicated, receiving **Seasonal Malaria Chemoprevention** in states where rolled-out, and who receive **artemisinin-based combination therapy**
 - Increased proportion of total annual **malaria expenditure** that comes from domestic sources.
51. The outcomes outlined above for SUNMAP will be achieved through the following **outputs**:
- Output 1: strengthened **government stewardship** at national level and in state supported states, SUNMAP2 will build the capacity of the Nigerian malaria programmes to provide improved malaria control services.
 - Output 2: **Better logistics and commodity availability** - increasing the sustainable availability of antimalarial commodities, such as such as insecticide treated bed nets, malaria testing kits and malaria drugs.



- Output 3: Greater **accountability and local ownership** – better engaged citizens and institutions in the country's malaria response will support a better understanding of the gap between awareness and use of malaria interventions, and support efforts to promote positive behaviour change and the appropriate use of malaria commodities.
 - Output 4: Better **use of evidence** – embed at national and supported states an evidence-based learning environment.
52. The portfolio of investments for SUNMAP2 is listed below. The scope of DELVe is relation to these investments is discussed in more detail in Section D below:
- Accountable Grant with Malaria Consortium to deliver Seasonal Malaria Chemoprevention in Jigawa State in 2018. This grant closed in March 2019.
 - Contract with Malaria Consortium to deliver the rest of the programme.
53. Geographic Scope: SUNMAP2 will intervene at the Federal level and in six states. In Kano, Kaduna and Jigawa the approach will be based on the DFID partner state engagement model, with a high-level compact with the state, a large complementary DFID portfolio as well as Global Fund support, and coordination from a DFID state representative. In Yobe and Katsina SUNMAP2 will be built around an issue-based partnership with the state, DFID Nigeria's Maternal, Newborn and Child Health phase 2 programme (MNCH2) and the Global Fund. In Lagos it will be based on supporting the state to address the substantial technical challenge of malaria pre-elimination and elimination, lesson learning and dissemination, and working with the private sector.

Theories of Changes and their linkages

54. Theory of change diagrams for PLANE and Lafiya appear in the Business Cases annexed to these terms of reference¹². Some key linkages between the theories are noted here by way of context and to provide motivation for the decision to seek a common supplier of their respective performance evaluations.
55. In both cases the programmes are seeking at outcome level more effective services, including for the poorest and most marginalised. There are causal pathways that are hypothesised to be similar between the two programmes. Specific areas of synergy include:
- social norms and citizens group engagement to hold government accountable and campaign for better managed public resources and anti-corruption;
 - exploring potential for teaching and learning materials to focus on sexual and reproductive health, family planning, and health and hygiene promotion;
 - using the delivery approach;
 - aiming to build the state-citizen compact and increase demand for services;
 - push on legislation to improve inclusivity for people with disabilities;
 - driving the overall agenda on the importance of non-state contributions to delivery of basic services; and
 - influencing the Government of Nigeria and partners to work to improve Human Capital in the country.

¹² See page 37 of PLANE Business Case and page 31 of Lafiya Business Case

D. Purpose, Objectives and Scope

Purpose

56. DELVe will fulfil both accountability and learning purposes as mentioned briefly in Section A. It is important to distinguish the role of DELVe from that of the programmes on which DELVe focusses.

Accountability

57. The ongoing management of the portfolio (including some elements of payment by results) depends on progress against the respective results frameworks. Whilst the collection and collation of such information is the responsibility of the implementing partners, the verification by DELVe of this reporting ensures DFID have **independent evidence with which to hold suppliers accountable**. This is especially important in geographic areas that are difficult for DFID staff to access, such as North East Nigeria.
58. A key feature of both PLANE and Lafiya is a break point after the first few years of implementation (the details differ by programme). So, the **accountability purpose** of the independent mid-term evaluation of each programme would be to provide a major plank of the evidence base used by DFID Nigeria at the programme break point. Accordingly, these evaluations would be conducted independently of the suppliers; the programme suppliers would offer a point of view on, but not determine the evaluation questions, methods and conclusions.
59. The final evaluations for PLANE and Lafiya will be used to provide accountability for the use of UK aid through these programmes. The findings will form a major element of the evidence base for determining whether and how the UK will intervene in the human development sector in Nigeria beyond 2027

Learning

60. The Business Cases for Lafiya and PLANE envisage that the programmes will respond to and be flexible to emerging evidence about the validity of the theory of change and its assumptions. **In other words that the programmes will learn**. Whilst the programmes themselves will be responsible developing processes that allow them to operate in this way, the purpose of DELVe is to facilitate the identification of questions, to generate robust evidence and to effectively communicate that evidence into the overall process.

Specific Objectives

61. To achieve the purpose described above there are four specific objectives for DELVe.
62. **First, to provide DFID Nigeria with rigorous and independent evidence to contribute to decision making. The major decision points are at each of the programme's break points and in the final year of each programme where future interventions are under consideration.** This should be in the form of an independent midterm and final evaluation.
63. **Second, to generate high quality formative evaluation products whose findings and recommendations help the suite of programmes to learn and improve.**

64. **Third, to independently verify reported results.** A range of information reported to DFID by implementing partners (including but not limited to output indicators, value for money data) should be verified by DELVe. Within this objective there is a particular focus on the ground verification in geographic areas that are difficult for DFID staff to access, such as North East Nigeria.
65. **Fourth, to provide independent ad hoc advice related to measurement and monitoring to DFID advisers** to support the DFID advisers in the quality assurance of the monitoring systems proposed and implemented by the suppliers of all three programmes.
66. Section G below explores these five objectives in more detail and discusses relevant activities and methods.

Programmatic Scope and Exclusions

67. As introduced in Section C, the Human Development portfolio **includes a range of investments** including commercial contracts, accountable grants (AG), memoranda of understanding (MOU), externally financed output (EFO) and delegated cooperation agreements (DCA).
68. The details of the programmatic scope of DELVe with respect to each programme is summarised in the table and elaborated in more detail below.

Programmatic Element	Evaluation	Verification
Lafiya		
Main contract	In scope	In scope
Accountable Grant(s)	In scope	In scope
MOU with UNFPA	In scope only as part of theory of change evaluation of Lafiya portfolio	Out of scope
MOU with World Bank	In scope only as part of theory of change evaluation of Lafiya portfolio	Out of scope
EFO with World Bank	In scope only as part of theory of change evaluation of Lafiya portfolio	Out of scope
PLANE		
Main contract	In scope	In scope
Accountable Grant(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Support to Learning Education in Emergencies 	In scope	In scope
Accountable Grant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accelerated Learning 	Out of scope	Out of scope
Delegated Cooperation Agreement (DCA) with USAID	In scope as part of theory of change. Building on evidence generated by USAID itself.	Out of scope
EFO with the World Bank	Out of Scope	Out of scope
SUNMAP2		

Main contract (Malaria Consortium)	Out of scope (evaluation not required)	In scope
Accountable Grant (Malaria Consortium)	Out of scope (evaluation not required)	Out of scope (time limited grant)

Lafiya

69. **Lafiya will include a contract with one lead supplier or lead member of a consortium supplier.** The contract will deliver at federal level, as well as with a focus on targeted states (Borno, Jigawa, Kaduna, Kano and Yobe), where appropriate in line with needs and access (particularly the crisis affected areas of Borno and Yobe). Lafiya activities will be tailored for each specific state, and a “one size fits all” approach will not be taken.
70. **Lafiya will also include Accountable Grant(s) with NGO(s) to deliver support to essential health and nutrition services** in crisis affected areas of Borno and Yobe initially, but with flex to respond to needs arising in any of the targeted states.
71. All activities conducted under both the contract and the accountable grant(s) are **fully in scope** for verification and evaluation purposes. There are no exclusions.
72. **In addition, the programme includes an MOU with UNFPA** to procure of family planning commodities and strengthen the supply chain to deliver these where they are required.
73. **Finally, the programme envisages an MOU with World Bank** to support the Basic Health Care Provision Fund, and **EFO** agreements to enable technical support on demographics, human capital, health financing and private sector.
74. The MOUs and EFOs with the World Bank are **out of scope** but the contribution of the investment through World Bank and UNFPA **to the Lafiya theory of change should be considered** as part of the evaluation and learning services.

PLANE

75. **PLANE includes one contracted consortium, to deliver outputs 1 to 4.** These outputs relate to teaching and learning, improved governance (for state and non-state education delivery) and increased use of data and evidence.
76. PLANE will also include **accountable grants** to an NGO to deliver the PLANE output that relates to community support to learning and to education emergencies (Borno and Yobe).
77. All activities conducted under both the contract and the two accountable grants named above are **fully in scope** for verification and evaluation purposes. There are no exclusions.
78. PLANE also includes an **accountable grant** to an NGO to deliver an Accelerated Learning intervention in 2019/20. This is **out of scope** of evaluation and verification services.
79. PLANE includes and **EFO with the World Bank** to work on tracking and accountability of education expenditure. This accountable grant is **out of scope** of the evaluation and verification services.
80. Finally, support to help marginalised children affected by conflict learn foundational skills, and support to recovery of systems, a bilateral agreement with USAID. The focus is on Borno and Yobe states.



81. The agreement with USAID is **out of scope** for verification services. The contribution of the investment through USAID to the PLANE **theory of change should be considered** as part of the evaluation design drawing in the first instance on evidence generated by USAID itself.

SUNMAP

82. SUNMAP2 included a short-term accountable grant to the Malaria Consortium that is already complete. The main delivery mechanisms through a contract with the Malaria Consortium.
83. SUNMAP2 **does not require any independent evaluation** from DELVe. Results reported under the **contract** with Malaria Consortium **require independent verification**. The accountable grant element of SUNMAP2 will have closed before DELVe activities begin and do not require independent verification.

E. Deliverables

84. The table below outlines the deliverables that are expected throughout the lifetimes of SUNMAP, PLANE and Lafiya. As described in Section A both PLANE and Lafiya will be subject to a major review in 2023 which will determine whether and in what form the programmes continue. The DELVe services required after the midterm evaluations may therefore be adjusted to respond to changes in the programmes.
85. As part of their bid the supplier should respond to this proposed schedule of deliverables with their own proposal.
86. The earlier deliverables in the table are defined with reference to key milestones in the life cycle of PLANE and Lafiya which are not at present firmly fixed. For planning purposes, however current thinking is that:
- The DELVe contract will commence in March 2020
 - The Lafiya contract is anticipated to commence by the end of 2019
 - The PLANE contract is anticipated to commence in September 2020

Deliverable	Description	Timing	EQUALS review & publish?	% payment of contract value
Inception Report	Determines the overall approach to the different elements of the assignment including an elaboration of the purposes, the high-level approach, the teams and the coordination and governance structures	To be approved by DFID within the first two months of DELVe	No	1%
Verification Design	Detailed design of the Verification work strand focussed on SUNMAP and with the ability to be built out to Lafiya and PLANE. To include sampling plan, instrument design and reporting format.	To be approved by DFID within the first three months of DELVe	No	3%
Lafiya Evaluation Design	Detailed design of the Lafiya evaluation including the baseline, the formative evaluation products and the mid-line evaluation. Also, the broad approach to the end line evaluation (recognising this will be adjusted in later years).	Concurrent with Lafiya main contract inception phase (which will last 6 months).	EQUALS review. Not published.	2%
PLANE Evaluation Design	Detailed design of the PLANE evaluation including the baseline, the formative evaluation products and the mid-line evaluation. Also, the broad approach to the end line evaluation (recognising this will be adjusted in later years).	Concurrent with PLANE main contract inception phase (which will last 6 months).	EQUALS review. Not published.	2%
Ad Hoc Evaluation and Monitoring Advice to DFID	Advice to DFID to support quality assurance of key products for implementing partners (such as their Monitoring Handbooks). For more details see paragraph heading Independent Ad Hoc Advice to DFID Nigeria.	Ad hoc. Likely to be heavy requirements during Inception phases	No	6%
Verification Reports	Reporting to DFID Nigeria by programme (SUNMAP, Lafiya, PLANE) on the accuracy of quantitative data and beneficiary feedback on the programmes	Twice each year in 2020, 2021 and 2022 (therefore 6 in total).	No	7%

Deliverable	Description	Timing	EQUALS review & publish?	% payment of contract value
Lafiya Inception Review	Capturing initial findings for some Evaluation Questions (especially on Relevance).	Within 2 weeks of the end the inception period of the Lafiya main contract	No	2%
Lafiya Baseline Report	Capturing quantitative and qualitative baseline data as agreed in the Evaluation Design as well initial findings for some Evaluation Questions (especially on Relevance).	Within 3 months of the end the inception period of the Lafiya main contract	Review & Publish	4%
PLANE Inception Review	Capturing initial findings for some Evaluation Questions (especially on Relevance).	Within 2 weeks of the end of the Inception Period of the PLANE main contract	No	2%
PLANE Baseline Report	Capturing quantitative and qualitative baseline data as agreed in the Evaluation Design as well initial findings for some Evaluation Questions (especially on Relevance).	Within 3 months of the end the inception period of the Lafiya main contract	Review & Publish	4%
Formative Products Evaluation	Providing evidence in relation to selected questions connected to specific aspects of the programmes' theories of change, as agreed in Evaluation Design and updated Annually.	Workplan agreed as part of the Lafiya and PLANE Evaluation Design and updated annually.	To be agreed depending on scale	21%
Lafiya Mid-line Evaluation	Addressing the questions agreed in the Evaluation Design as a basis for DFID Nigeria's mid-term review of the Lafiya programme in 2023. Recommendations for further formative work.	Approved by December 2022	Review & Publish	9%
PLANE Mid-line Evaluation	Addressing the questions agreed in the Evaluation Design as a basis for DFID Nigeria's mid-term review of the PLANE programme in 2023. Recommendations for further formative work.	Approved by December 2022	Review & Publish	9%

Deliverable	Description	Timing	EQUALS review & publish?	% payment of contract value
Deliverables following DFID Nigeria's review of PLANE and Lafiya are liable to change				
Verification Reports 2023 to 2027	Reporting to DFID Nigeria by programme (Lafiya, PLANE) on the accuracy of quantitative data and beneficiary feedback on the programmes	5 such reports: once each year.	No	6%
Lafiya Final Approach Paper	Detailed specification of the Final Evaluation building on the original Evaluation Design updated in light of other evaluation products	2 years before the close of Lafiya	No	2%
PLANE Final Approach Paper	Detailed specification of the Final Evaluation building on the original Evaluation Design updated in light of other evaluation products	2 years before the close of PLANE	No	2%
Lafiya Final Evaluation	Final Evaluation Report for accountability purposes and to inform any future programming or work in Nigeria.	One year before the close of Lafiya (to inform future programming)	Review & Publish	9%
PLANE Final Evaluation	Final Evaluation Report for accountability purposes and to inform any future programming or work in Nigeria.	One year before the close of PLANE (end 2026 to inform future programming)	Review & Publish	9%

87. The **Inception Report** should describe the overarching approach to the whole contract. This would include clarifying DFID Nigeria objectives and requirements in more detail and beginning to explore the theories of change and their commonalities. It should set a more detailed plan for the deliverables including the financial and human resources that will be allocated and the risks that have been identified and managed. It should also provide an independent view of the Results Chains, Assumptions and M&E plans developed by the different programmes.
88. The **Verification Design** should set out an understanding of the results that implementing partners will be reporting, clarify in more detail what information DFID SROs will need to take action with programmes and propose a detailed approach that is methodically robust, includes the most marginalised and maximise value for money to DFID. The cycle of verification activities (field work, analysis, reporting and so on) will be carried out twice a year.
89. The **Evaluation Design Documents** should unpack in some detail the programme theories of change, and what DFID and other stakeholders need to know for decision making. It should include detailed description of sampling, data collection and analysis plans and discuss communication products and approaches that will be required for different stakeholders. The design documents are delivered in sequence, so each should look for opportunities ask common questions and share data collection arrangements. It is anticipated the Design Documents map out the evaluation up and including the Final evaluation but recognised that refinements for final evaluation may needed closer to the time through the Final Evaluation Approach Paper.
90. The **Inception Review** for each programme will be a relatively short product delivered rapidly after the end of the main contract inception period.
91. **Baselines Reports** should capture quantitative and qualitative data as agreed in the design reports. The timing of the Baseline Reports should coincide with the end of each programme's inception period (specifically the Baseline Reports should be finalised three months after the main contract inception period). They should present findings and recommendations relevant to programme implementation and in particular should comment on the continued relevance of the programme design.
92. The **Midterm** evaluation will be the culmination of the first wave of DELVe activities and a major plank of the evidence for break point in each programme. As such they should provide robust evidence to DFID, in accordance with the Design Document, for the ongoing relevance of the programme design and any evidence for the extent to which the programmes are effectively beginning to contribute to the intended intermediate outcomes. They should also assess whether approaches continue to be relevant and whether there is a need to change.
93. The timing for **Formative Evaluation and Learning products** will be agreed with DFID during the Inception Period.
94. The **Final Evaluation Approach Paper** is intended to build on the approach first proposed in the Design Document and to adjust in light of changes over the intervening five years. Such changes will include (but not be limited to) changes in PLANE and Lafiya as a result of the midterm or other reviews, additional information available through the Formative Evaluation and Learning Product and changes in emphasis in DFID Nigeria's needs and priorities.

F. The Recipient and Audiences

OFFICIAL

95. The **recipient** for these services is the Human Development Team in DFID Nigeria. Additional audiences in Nigeria will be other stakeholders in the HD suite of programmes (including Government partners, other development partners and DFID's implementing partners). There will be a more global audience of development practitioners in the health, education and service delivery sectors.
96. The supplier should outline an approach to communicating with influencing the different stakeholders as part of their bid. This would be completed in more detail as part of the DELVe inception phase.
97. Broadly speaking the approach and findings from verification exercises will be communicated narrowly to DFID and its implementing partners. The learning from formative evaluation activities will be primarily aimed at stakeholders in the programmes. The findings from the mid-term evaluation would also be relevant to broader audiences interested in human development system strengthening (in addition to immediate stakeholders).
98. At this point there are no formal agreements about the mechanisms through which Nigerian stakeholders as a key audience for DELVe will shape the details of the evaluation (though the roles of the implementing partners are specified in their contractual agreements as outlined in Section I, below).
99. However, the DELVe supplier should assume advisers in the DFID Nigeria will broker access to key stakeholders through their existing networks. DFID Nigeria is a strong influential member of both the Health and Education Development Partner groups in Nigeria and has deep relationships with Federal and especially state governments through Regional Coordinators based in our partner states.

G. Proposed Methodology

100. It is envisaged that separate designs for the independent performance evaluations will be required for the PLANE and Lafiya programmes, but that a common design will apply to independent verification and to the provision of independent ad hoc advice.
101. Bidders are requested to respond to the guidance provided in these terms of reference by outlining their technical approach as a substantial element of their bids. Section O below explains how the bids will be assessed. During the inception and design periods the supplier will need to finalise these designs though some indicative features are described below.

Independent Performance Evaluations

102. As outlined above the first purpose for DELVe is that DFID Nigeria needs rigorous and independent evidence to contribute to decision making at the programme break points for both Lafiya and PLANE, and towards the end of the programmes when considering future interventions. This should be in the form of a mid-term and final evaluation for each programme.
103. The second purpose of DELVe is that formative evaluation learning products should contribute findings and recommendations that help the Lafiya and PLANE programmes to learn and improve.
104. It is recognised that at this point in the programmes' lifetimes it is unlikely that evidence of the ultimate outcome will be available. An assessment of the continued **relevance and balance** of the programme outputs will be required.

105. The Lafiya and PLANE mid-term evaluation reports will be **separate products** for different (but partly overlapping audiences). However, bidders for DELVe should propose to what extent other aspects of the evaluations (such as data collections and analysis) can be conducted jointly.

Indicative Criteria and Questions for Mid-Term and Final Evaluations

106. Indicative mid-term and final evaluation questions for each programme are set out below. During the design of each evaluation (and the approach paper for the final evaluations) these questions should be refined and clarified with DFID Nigeria and other stakeholders. The questions that DFID Nigeria considers more suited to being addressed at the final evaluation (rather than midterm) are marked with an asterisk (*).

Criterion	Lafiya	PLANE
Relevance	<p>Is the design of the programme consistent with the current political economy at state and Federal level?</p> <p>Are the programme outputs complementary to the work of other programmes and actors?</p> <p>Are the activities / outputs still appropriate to deliver the desired outcomes?</p>	<p>Is the design of the programme consistent with the current political economy at state and Federal level?</p> <p>Are the programme outputs complementary to the work of other programmes and actors?</p> <p>Are the activities / outputs still appropriate to deliver the desired outcomes?</p>
Effectiveness	<p>Have increased resources been spent to improve human capital (particularly health, nutrition, WASH and education) or has there been increased prioritisation of political profile of these areas?</p> <p>Is there evidence of improved effectiveness or efficiency of basic health services (both public and private health services), in targeted areas?</p> <p>Is there increased prioritisation of vulnerable and marginalised groups in targeted areas?</p> <p>Is there any evidence that the modern contraceptive prevalence rate for targeted populations is increasing, there is an increase in delivery/demand for family planning services, or that social norms are changing?</p> <p>To what extent and in what ways have Lafiya's outputs contributed to these changes?</p>	<p>In targeted schools are teaching and learning more focused on achieving learning outcomes in basic foundational skills?</p> <p>In targeted places, are resources being better managed (personnel including teachers + financial + other resources)</p> <p>Are targeted communities showing more support for learning, including for marginalised children?</p> <p>Do girls and boys in conflict have greater access to learning and are they better able to learn?</p> <p>To what extent and in what ways have PLANES's outputs contributed to these changes?</p>
Efficiency	<p>Were the outputs delivered cost effectively?</p> <p>Are there opportunities to increase cost effectiveness?</p>	<p>Were the outputs delivered cost effectively?</p> <p>Are there opportunities to increase cost effectiveness?</p>

Criterion	Lafiya	PLANE
	How does the cost effectiveness of similar or related outputs across the HD portfolio compare?	How does the cost effectiveness of similar or related outputs across the HD portfolio compare? Compare the effectiveness (and cost effectiveness) of different interventions in the given contexts to achieve targeted outcomes, e.g. improved literacy and numeracy.
Impact	<p>How many lives has Lafiya saved or contributed to saving (estimate)?</p> <p>For how many additional people has Lafiya contributed to their having improved access to the health services they need, of sufficient quality to be effective without suffering financial hardship?</p> <p>Does access to quality healthcare extend to the most marginalised and vulnerable groups?</p> <p>How has Lafiya contributed to additional people having access to improved healthcare?</p> <p>To what extent has the additional access contributed to more equitable access to services within the population?</p>	<p>For how many additional girls and boys has PLANE contributed to better learning outcomes?</p> <p>Has PLANE contributed to better learning outcomes for the most marginalised groups (include girls, people living with disabilities and displaced people)?</p> <p>How has PLANE contributed to improved learning outcomes?</p> <p>To what extent has PLANE support contributed to more efficient and effective state and non-state systems, including financing and human resource capacity?</p> <p>To what extent have children with better foundational skills benefitted from better life experiences?</p>
Sustainability	<p>How has Lafiya contributed to increased sustainability of basic health services in Nigeria?</p> <p>What is the evidence that Government of Nigeria will continue to use its own resources to improve primary healthcare?</p>	<p>How has PLANE contributed to improving the processes to manage the education system (federal, state and local) for state and non-state systems?</p> <p>What is the evidence that state and non-state systems will continue to use their resources to improve learning outcomes in foundational basic skills, including for marginalised children?</p>

Indicative Questions for Formative Evaluation and Learning

107. It is envisaged that a number of **formative studies** will be required from the Supplier in order to inform specific elements of the theory of change.

108. The *primary* purpose of the formative studies is to inform programme learning and adaptation, including in relation to programme flexibility but the evaluation design should consider as a secondary purpose how best to exploit the findings to answer the evaluation questions for the mid-term review.

OFFICIAL

109. The table below provides an indicative set of questions that are likely to need to be addressed by DELVe to help PLANE and Lafiya learn and adapt. In practice these questions should be refined and prioritised during the detailed design of each evaluation. Whilst DFID would retain ultimate authority of the workplan for formative evaluations the learning needs of implementing partners and government stakeholders should also be elicited and taken into consideration.

Thematic Area	Lafiya	PLANE
Influencing	<p>What is the relative effectiveness of different approaches to influence the Government of Nigeria to prioritise human capital / health priorities? What factors are associated with being more successful?</p> <p>What is the relative effectiveness of different approaches to influence community, religious, traditional and political leaders to increase focus on demographics, and to change social norms with relation to family planning?</p>	<p>What are the most effective ways to incentivise changes in behaviours and practices amongst government personnel at federal, state and local level to improve management of the system? (Also for non-state providers).</p>
Implementation	<p>Is there the right balance of focus on 'supply' and 'demand' with relation to family planning services?</p> <p>How effective has the so-called 'delivery approach' been in the States [Kaduna] where it has been attempted? What were the circumstances and mechanisms that explain these outcomes? What is the feasibility of this being rolled out to other states and other sectors? – for Lafiya and for PLANE</p> <p>How effective have the private sector pilots of delivery of low-cost basic health services? Could these be scaled up?</p>	<p>How effective have Early Grade Reading Programmes (in Hausa) been in improving children's literacy and numeracy at early grade and setting a sufficient basis to learn English?</p> <p>How effective have the remediation programmes (Hausa and English) been in terms of improving children's levels of basic foundational skills (literacy and numeracy) before they exit primary school?</p> <p>How effective has the support to improving teacher management systems in terms of improving the quality of teachers in the system?</p> <p>What approaches are most successful to improve the capacity of non-state systems to deliver basic foundational skills (at scale)?</p> <p>How effective have the approaches to improve capacity within the education system been? What key learning has the programme provided with respect to optimal approaches to technical assistance?</p> <p>To what extent does provision of data and evidence in real time and more accessible formats impact on decision makers work at different levels of state systems (federal, state, local – as appropriate)?</p>

Thematic Area	Lafiya	PLANE
Knowledge, Attitudes and Behaviours	What are the most (cost-) efficient and (cost-)effective approaches to changing social norms with communities and religious/traditional/community/political leaders, and communicating family planning messages?	What are the most efficient and (cost) effective ways to improve teachers' ability and attitudes (including addressing teacher absenteeism) to teach basic foundational skills?
		What are the most (cost-) efficient and (cost-) effective approaches to changing community attitudes and behaviour towards education, including for marginalised children?
Humanitarian Development Nexus	What lessons have been learnt on the balance of delivery of services and strengthening of systems in North-East Nigeria, working across the humanitarian-development continuum?	What lessons have been learned on the effectiveness of different approaches to delivering education in emergencies?
	How effectively are the different mechanisms working together on delivering across the humanitarian-development nexus?	
	To what extent has the programme been able to flex to ensure that it continues to be most relevant to the (changing) context.	

Guidance on Approach and Methodology for Independent Performance Evaluations

110. A schedule of deliverables is proposed in Section E. The schedule is intended to make more concrete the features of approach and methodology described here.
111. Broadly speaking each independent evaluation would comprise a design period (which would deliver a detailed evaluation design and a quick review of the programme inception period and); a baseline report; a set of formative evaluation products for learning purposes and a mid-term evaluation by December 2022.

Outline of Activities

112. The **design period** for each evaluation will intentionally overlap with the inception period for the main contract for each of Lafiya and PLANE. This is to enable DELVe shape and influence both the programmes' own (internal) monitoring and learning systems and (to a lesser extent) the implementation of the programmes. For example, it may be possible to maximise learning by exploiting natural experiments and phased implementation.
113. The **evaluation design** arising from the design period would refine the evaluation questions and provide a detailed plan for the remaining deliverables. It would also outline in general terms the features of a possible end-line evaluation under any future DELVe contract.

114. The end of **inception phase review** for each programme will be the first opportunity to contribute to DELVe's learning purposes and provide formative recommendations. These reviews would draw on the activities of the design period such as literature review, political economy analysis and key informant interviews to comment on the continued relevance of the programme designs, inception and implementation plans.
115. The **baseline report** for each evaluation will capture and record the initial state of affairs in the health and education systems in both quantitative and qualitative terms according to the evaluation design. This will primarily support the accountability purpose of DELVe in so far as it will provide a basis for measuring change. As a secondary objective, the baseline report will be a further opportunity to provide lessons and recommendations to the programmes to support learning and adaptation (for example by updating the understanding of the assumptions being made in the programme theories of change). Specifically, for health, baseline reports should make reference to standardised datasets, such as DHS surveys, among others, in particular when setting baselines for child and maternal mortality. It is expected that such baselines will be available by State, or if the datasets are too small to ensure adequate statistical power for some indicators, that they are aggregated across the five states to provide a combined baseline for the entire programme area. For education, the baseline should include an investigation of how reforms supported by previous programmes (ESSPIN and others; see Section B) have been sustained¹³.
116. The precise questions and schedules for the **formative studies** will be agreed during the design of each performance evaluation and in consultation with DFID and the respective implementing partners of Lafiya and PLANE. The initial plan for such studies will be agreed during the design phase and will be revised in agreement with DFID and suppliers on an annual basis. The formative studies will vary in scope and scale.
117. The **mid-term evaluations** will include recommendations as to whether the programmes' approaches need to change and the type of change that is appropriate and feasible. The mid-term evaluation will need to look at the balance of investment by delivery mechanism for both programmes (Lafiya and PLANE) and whether these are fit for purpose or should be adjusted.
118. The recommendations will be based on an assessment of whether outputs (and activities within each output) are being **efficiently** delivered, and whether or not there is any evidence that the activities and outputs are **effectively** contributing to the intermediate outcomes, as well as whether there is effective **synergy** between outputs in each programme (PLANE and Lafiya) and across the HD portfolio.

Methodological Guidance

119. Whilst the Supplier is invited to propose a methodology the following steers should be considered.
120. The independent performance evaluations will need to use a **mixed methods theory-based approach to assess progress along the theory of change towards the intermediate outcomes** and to explain progress or otherwise.

¹³ The ESSPIN Project Completion Review (2017) recommended that there should be an investigation, 2 – 3 years after the end of ESSPIN, as to how ESSPIN supported states had performed with regard to sustaining School Improvement reforms supported by ESSPIN.

121. On the **quantitative** side there are a range of possibilities for establishing and measuring counterfactuals across the two programmes and these will need to be outlined as part of any bid and explored during the inception phase. At the level of schools, health care facilities and perhaps Local Government Areas some form of randomisation might be possible. Where randomisation is not possible there may be an option to create a counterfactual through some form of matching.¹⁴
122. Such possibilities will have to be explored in conjunction with their PLANE and Lafiya suppliers as part of their own inception periods (which are designed to overlap with evaluation design periods, as described in more detail in Section E).
123. For “small-n” interventions for example at the level State government counterfactual seems unlikely. Comparison to States outside DFID Nigeria’s operational footprint may be useful although at this level qualitative methods will be increasingly important.
124. On the **qualitative** side the voices and experiences from all parts of the theory of change should be heard, ranging from citizens and the groups that represent them through to front line public servants (teachers and healthcare professionals) and through the different layers of governance (from community level, LGA, State and Federal). At all levels the stakeholders for all three programmes are likely to significantly overlap and the designs should take account of this.¹⁵
125. Methods such as Contribution Analysis are likely relevant to marshalling the various evidence against the evaluation questions.
126. The table above (headed: indicative questions for formative evaluation and learning) shows that there is some overlap between the formative learning questions raised for each of the programmes. The Supplier is invited to propose an approach to the formative learning that exploits these commonalities. For example, there may be scope to use shared designs, data collection, analysis or reporting.
127. The questions related to **influencing** will likely need to be addressed using **qualitative** methods, in conjunction with political and media analysis triangulated with budget and expenditure analysis. The realist perspective of what works for whom, in what circumstances may be a useful way to frame these questions.
128. The questions related to **implementation** would likely require at a minimum before and after analysis for the places where new management approaches have been attempted. Whilst a true counterfactual may not be possible the Supplier is invited to propose other comparisons which may help to contextualise the before and after comparison.
129. Questions about changing **knowledge, attitudes and behaviour** may likely lend themselves to experimental or quasi experimental designs (small scale trials) at least for communications approaches that are rolled out at community of Local Government Area level.
130. Questions related to conflict affected areas are more difficult to frame at the time of writing since the situation is quickly evolving. However, it is likely that a mixture of methods may be required.
131. Section H has described the programme generated evidence and data that it should be assumed would be available for the purposes of the independent performance evaluations. DELVe should therefore

¹⁴ For PLANE - Refer to technical reports of ESSPIN Composite survey 3 (2016), TDP Endline (2018) and GEP3 RANA midline (2018) for more information on technical considerations with regards to randomisation.

¹⁵ The overlap in terms of stakeholders at government and community level is likely to be more pronounced the overlaps in quantitative data collection from health and education systems.

expect to devote **around 60% resources allocated for performance evaluations to primary data collection** that includes but is not limited to:

- In depth **qualitative data** collection at national, state, local and community level
- Quantitative data in geographic areas outside of programme operations (where this is need for possible counterfactual analysis)
- Detailed data collection for **small scale trails focused on specific causal linkages** in the theory of change.

Independent Verification

132.DELVe should deliver independent verification of the results reported to DFID by both commercial suppliers and grantees. The verification should provide evidence to DFID on both the accuracy of numerical reporting received from partners and on the perceptions among beneficiaries and other stakeholders as to how the programme is being delivered.

133.In terms of **accuracy of reporting** the verification exercise would focus on verifying partner's reporting against a subset of the indicators for which data are reported to DFID Nigeria. This would likely include indicators from the logical framework, the value for money framework or other reporting frameworks.

134.In practice implementing partners would provide a list of beneficiaries (individuals, facilities or communities) to the verification team. The implementing partners will be required to do so as part of their contractual arrangement with DFID.

135.The list of beneficiaries becomes in effect the sampling frame for the verification exercise. The verification team would randomly sample a subset of beneficiaries and undertake their own data collection using the same or similar instruments. The detailed datasets from this exercise should be carefully stored and documented.

136.The verification exercise would be required **to collect qualitative data from beneficiaries, others in benefiting communities and other stakeholders**. Attention will need to be given to having appropriate tools and instruments to gather useful information in this regard. Such data will provide DFID with one source of information on aspects of programme implementation which can be triangulated with other evidence. For the avoidance of doubt, this not asking for the programme outcomes or impacts to be measured on a six-monthly basis. Rather, it is asking for DELVe to provide a range of information about the implementation of outputs which is broader than that supplied by the main suppliers.

137.The **deliverable from the verification exercises** (which are expected to take place twice each year) exercise should use a standard format that clearly highlights areas of concern in terms of implementation or reporting. The standard reporting will form the basis of discussion between DFID programme managers and implementing partners, with the goal of improving implementing partners implementation reporting and systems.

138.The Supplier is requested to propose an approach to verification that provides statistically robust evidence on accuracy of reporting and range of voices (including women, the poorest and people living with disabilities) who can speak to the quality of outputs.

139.It is envisaged that savings should arise as a result of using a common approach and common verification missions across all the HD programmes and this should be illustrated in the Supplier's bid.

Independent Ad Hoc Advice to DFID Nigeria

140. The various implementing partners for the three projects will be required to propose to DFID the design of their monitoring and learning systems. The majority of this work would take place during the inception phases of the programmes although revisions to the overall design or ad hoc pieces of work may be developed during the life of the programme.
141. DELVe should provide to the relevant DFID Advisers technical advice on the design work and on selected monitoring or learning products in order to support DFID to fulfil its quality assurance functions. In practice, at the design stage the advice might relate to such matters as sample designs, instrument design and analysis plans. At the reporting stage, advice might relate to matters such as the quality of the analysis and the validity of the conclusions.
142. It is difficult to specify these services in detail at this point, but the supplier should propose a model that would enable to DFID Nigeria to draw on expert desk-based expert advice on monitoring, evaluation and learning in the context of human development in northern Nigeria on scale commensurate with the proposed budget for this activity (7% of the total value).

Cross Cutting Methodological Issues

143. There are several important cross cutting issues that should be reflected in the design of the DELVe services.
144. First, in line with the Sustainable Development Goals and DFID's own commitments it is important to leave no-one behind. This means that the most marginalised groups – women and girls, people living with disabilities and the extreme poor - should be made visible by DELVe. This means that quantitative data should be appropriately disaggregated (and if necessary oversampled among marginalised groups). It means that instruments, data collection protocols, analysis and conclusion should shed light on these groups.
145. Second, given the ambition of the programme to influence public service delivery and all levels of government, and Nigeria's exclusive political settlement and position at 144 (of 180 countries) in Transparency International's Global Perception Index the design should be sensitive to these issues in developing and answering evaluation questions.
146. All DELVe activities, including but not limited to data collection, storage and analysis should adhere to international best practice. This includes DFID Ethical Guidance for Research Monitoring and Evaluation (2019) which is annexed to these terms of reference and obtaining appropriate ethical approval within Nigeria.

H. Availability of Datasets and Evidence

Generated by the HD Portfolio

147. All three programmes (Lafiya, PLANE, SUNMAP2) will be subject to the general DFID programme management cycle as outlined below.

148. DFID will conduct **Annual Reviews** of each programme to examine progress against outputs and outcomes, and value for money. At the mid-point of each programme, the Annual Review will assess in greater depth the likelihood that programme activities, outputs and outcomes will achieve the desired impact, the value for money of the programme and its components and the evidence generated through programme research.
149. At the end of the programme a **Project Completion Review (PCR)** will be undertaken, to assess the extent to which the project successfully attained outcome and impact goals and to identify lessons learned. The PCR will inform the planning for further support/next steps for Human Development interventions in Northern Nigeria.
150. There will also be additional programmatic or financial reviews, audits or strategic initiatives related to the programme, when the need arises. Independent financial audits of the programme to give full and satisfactory audit discharge to the project expenditure, will be conducted after the first 18 months of operation, and annually thereafter.
151. In addition to these general activities the programmes will generate specific data and evidence as follows.

Lafiya

152. **The Lafiya contract and accountable grants** will monitor its own success closely at output and outcome level, using specific and measurable indicators against demonstrable, realistic and timebound milestones. This will include a detailed log frame, setting out indicators and targets at output, outcome and impact level, which will form the foundation of programme monitoring. The main supplier will track progress towards the achievement of outputs and outcomes (reflecting DFID's data disaggregation action plan, disaggregating data by sex, age, and disability). This process should be linked to baselines identified in the baselines report, including specific reference to child and maternal mortality as specified in articles 91 and 115.
153. The other parts of the Lafiya portfolio include **MOUs with multilaterals, including World Bank and UNFPA**. These programmes will share the overall monitoring information with DFID and DELVe, as part of the national monitoring of these programmes¹⁶.
154. When these monitoring arrangements for Lafiya are combined with the independent verification services supplied as part as PLANE it follows that the independent performance evaluation for Lafiya should expect to benefit from high quality data with respect to the programme outputs and outcomes.

PLANE

155. **The main PLANE supplier** (under Output 4 of the PLANE programme) will coordinate reporting to DFID on progress towards outputs and outcomes for all the output areas of PLANE (those delivered under the main commercial contract and those delivered under accountable grants).
156. In addition, this same Output 4 of PLANE will pay attention to both the need to support evidence-based programming **within and across PLANE outputs**, as well as build national capacity to generate, use and communicate data and evidence to improve education service delivery and promote citizen engagement. Areas of intervention include technical assistance to:
- Support monitoring and use of evidence across PLANE outputs.

¹⁶ As specified in Section D, this does not need require verification by DELVe

OFFICIAL

- Support to improve quality and use of education plans and budgets and improve system level monitoring.
- Support to enable robust national learning assessment.
- Improve national capacity to generate and use data and evidence, including appropriate communications and knowledge products.
- Support to determine the costs and cost effectiveness of different interventions.

157. In the case of PLANE, the design of Output 4 means that the independent evaluation should also expect to benefit from learning and evidence products generated internally (by PLANE) and to data and evidence generated by Nigerian national systems (with the support of PLANE).¹⁷

158. As a consequence of these arrangements in combination with independent verification service provided under DELVe, the **independent performance for PLANE will have access to a high-quality dataset for the programme outputs and outcomes.**

SUNMAP2

159. Data to measure SUNMAP2 results will come from a variety of sources, including programme specific data collection and programme surveys, national data systems (e.g. HMIS, LMIS, facility records) and surveys at State or national level (e.g. MIS, MICS, Smart Survey, DHS, HDSS, Net Retention Surveys, Service Delivery Indicator Surveys, ACT Watch, market and consumer surveys).

Other Sources of Evidence

160. For the North East, available evidence includes the Humanitarian Response plan and sector updates.

Health

161. Other sources of national include programme specific data collection and programme surveys, national data systems (e.g. Health management Information Systems, facility records) and surveys at State or national level (e.g. Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey, National Immunisation Coverage Survey, Demographic Health Survey, Health and Demographic Surveillance System, Standardised Monitoring and Assessment of Relief Transitions).

162. Sources of data related to humanitarian interventions include information from the health cluster/sector coordination mechanisms, WHO, HeRAMS (Health Resource Availability Monitoring System) and HIS (Health Information Systems).

Education

163. Approaches to independent evaluation in PLANE benefit from 6 years of robust evaluations undertaken under the DFIDN Education Data Research and Evaluation in Nigeria (EDOREN) programme (2013-19). EDOREN's main products, including evaluation reports are available at www.nigeria-education.org. DFIDN will also share separate synthesis reports which drew on these evaluations (and other sources) to answer key questions relevant to teaching and learning in Northern Nigeria.

164. Evaluation and other reports produced by other donor projects such as USAID's Northern Education Initiative Plus (NEI+) are useful. Other relevant secondary sources include household surveys such as

¹⁷ For the avoidance of doubt, DELVe is not expected to verify the data generated by Nigerian national systems

OFFICIAL

the Demographic Health Survey, Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey, Nigeria Education Data Survey, LEARN Nigeria Citizen led assessments.

165. The Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC) Personnel Audit (2018), Annual School Censuses, Federal and State level sector analyses, plans and budgets are also important sources. Specific technical reports from previous programmes in key areas such as pre-service reform, private education and community engagement are also important secondary sources. These will be shared with the DELVe implementers at the start of inception.

I. Governance and Management Arrangements

Access to Materials

166. DFID will have unlimited access to the materials produced by the supplier as expressed in DFID's general conditions of contract. DFID will have unlimited access to the material produced by the supplier in accordance with DFID's policy on open access to data as expressed in DFID's general conditions of contract.

Day to Day Management

167. The day to day point of contact for this contract will be the **Programme Management lead** in the Human Development Team who will oversee the project management of the contract.

168. The technical leadership will be provided by the DFID Nigeria Evaluation and Statistics Adviser and the respective Senior Responsible Owners of the programmes in the HD Team suite, as described in more detail below.

169. Given the cross-cutting nature of the contract the HD Team Leader will be the final decision maker in relation to the DELVe services from DFID's point of view for matters arising.

DELVe Management Group

170. DFID Nigeria will convene a **management group** to review and approve the major deliverables for this contract. The group would be chaired by the HD Team Leader with secretariat support by the HD programme management lead (or his delegate) and would comprise the three SROs plus the Evaluation and Statistics Adviser. The group would meet monthly in the inception period of the HDMEL contract and quarterly thereafter.

171. Where a deliverable relates uniquely to one of three programmes then at a minimum the relevant SRO and the Evaluation and Statistics adviser would be involved in reviewing the deliverables, although members of the group would be encouraged to participate to maximise learning across the suite of programmes.

172. The deliverables relating to independent evaluation (as opposed to verification) would be subject to **external quality assurance** through the Evaluation Quality Assurance and Learning Service (EQUALS) or its successor.

Interaction with Implementing Partners

173. In line with multiple purposes and objectives for this contract the DELVe supplier will need to apply different ways of working with the implementing partners for different purposes. The roles and responsibilities of the suppliers for Lafiya, PLANE and SUNMAP have been set out in their contractual agreements.
174. For the evaluation and learning work the evaluator will need to work closely and collaboratively with the implementing partners to unpack their understanding of theory of change and their reporting systems.
175. However, given the role that the mid line evaluation will play in DFID's decision making it is important that the independence of the evaluation findings is clearly demonstrated.
176. Likewise, in terms of independent verification, the verification teams must work closely with the implementing partners to establish the sampling frame but the verification exercise itself must take place independently of the implementing suppliers.
177. Section M below acknowledges the risk that these multiple roles present to the DELVe supplier and asks for suppliers to propose their approach to risk management as part of their bid.

Other Donor Programmes

178. The UK is committed to work in partnership with other development partners to support Nigeria in addressing its Human Capital Challenges. Key donors in health and education are set out below. DFID Nigeria's Business Cases have been written to align with the programmes set out below.
179. To prevent duplication and improve coordination of research efforts, DFID's Evaluation and Statistics Adviser will work with advisers in the human development team to understand the research questions under consideration in these other programmes and share this information with the DELVe supplier.

Health

180. Key donor programmes at federal level in the health sector include:
- Technical support to Federal Ministry of Health and National Primary Healthcare development Agency (NPHCDA) supported by **Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF)**¹⁸
 - Technical support to Federal Government (including Basic Health Care Provision Fund) supported by **World Bank**¹⁹
 - Technical support to Federal Government (including Basic Health Care Provision Fund) supported by **USAID**. The Lafiya contract will be expected to take over some of the technical support to the Basic Health Care Provision Fund (included embedded advisers) that is currently supported by USAID through Health Policy Plus (HP+)²⁰

¹⁸ Measurement, Learning and Evaluation Project Nigeria Team. Evaluation of the Nigerian Urban Reproductive Health Initiative (NURHI) Program. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sifp.12027>

¹⁹ <http://projects.worldbank.org/P163969?lang=en>

²⁰ <http://www.healthpolicyplus.com/nigeria.cfm>

OFFICIAL

181. Key donor programmes in targeted states in the health sector include:

- a. Technical support to State Ministry of Health provided by **Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation** – Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation are one of the only other funders to support health programmes in Kaduna and Kano.
- b. DFID has signed an MOU with Kaduna State Government and the **Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Aliko Dangote Foundation, UNICEF, & The Global Fund for Aids, TB, & Malaria (GFATM)** to transform the primary health care system in Kaduna
- c. **World Bank** supported health programmes in the targeted states, including Saving One Million Lives (SOML)²¹ and the World Bank's new multi-phased approach (currently in design phase)

Education

182. Key donor programmes at federal level in the education sector include:

- a. **Global Partnership for Education (GPE)** is supporting the Federal Ministry of Education and refreshed National Education Group to carry out national Education Sector Analysis which will be used to update the Ministerial Strategic Plan.

183. Key donor programmes in targeted states in the education sector include:

- a. The first **GPE** project began in Nigeria in 2015 with \$100m benefitting 5 Northern states²². Nigeria is eligible for another allocation of \$100m and has confirmed intention to apply in 2020. The DFID SRO will update DELVe suppliers on this successor programme at the start of the inception period for the contract
- b. The new **World Bank** results-based financing project, Better Education Sector Delivery for All (BESDA) is a \$611m (£468m) programme focused on 3 results areas - improving access to education, basic literacy and accountability for results²³
- c. **USAID** are working on improving reading policy and skills and systems improvements in selected northern states, through 2 programmes – the Northern Education Initiative Plus which works in Sokoto and Bauchi states and a newly awarded programme to address educational needs in North East Nigeria²⁴.
- d. There will be a new USD 500m World Bank programme to support education and empowerment of adolescent girls in selected Northern states (to be approved in 2020)

Links with other DFID programmes

184. Four other DFID-funded projects are acquiring learning and may be relevant to the projects to be evaluated under the DELVe contract. For each of these projects, alignment will be facilitated by DFID's Evaluation and Statistics Adviser who will work with the SRO and lead advisers of each programme to ensure that there is coordination and no unnecessary duplication between the work undertaken by DELVe and the other programmes.

North East Nigeria Transition to Development programme (NENTAD: 300432)

185. DFID Nigeria's NENTAD aims to deliver an effective response to the basic needs of vulnerable people impacted by the crisis in the North East of Nigeria. The programme will deliver humanitarian assistance in nutrition and food security; protection and Education in Emergencies; multi-sector support including health, water, shelter and livelihoods interventions; as well as enabling a more efficient response to the

²¹ <http://www.projects.worldbank.org/P146583?lang=en>

²² The 5 states currently benefitting from the current GPE project (to June 2020) are Kano, Kaduna, Jigawa, Sokoto and Katsina states – all in the North West. (<https://www.globalpartnership.org/country/nigeria>)

²³ On the World Bank BESDA programme, see <http://projects.worldbank.org/P160430?lang=en>

²⁴ <http://neiplus.com/>

OFFICIAL

crisis, including strengthened government planning, budgeting and coordination; and risk management.

186. The NENTAD programme has arranged for independent results verification through an accountable grant with a consortium led by IMPACT. The DELVe contractor would be expected to interact with the IMPACT consortium for example through participating in workshops to learn lessons in terms of approaches to results verification and working with DFID. The supplier should also be open to collaborating with IMPACT in areas of geographic overlap (Borno and Yobe) where this could deliver value for money savings to the taxpayer.

Powering Economic Growth in Northern Nigeria (LINKS: 300028)

187. DFID Nigeria's LINKS programme will achieve both a high targeted impact and a strong demonstration effect, delivering **large scale job creation, income improvements and inclusive economic growth**. Important additionality will include environmental benefits from renewable energy and improved agricultural land and water use planning, as well as easing the tensions that lead to conflict, through creating economic opportunities, especially for women and youth.

188. LINKS is planning to procure a commercial supplier of independent results verification, which will be undertaken once each year in preparation for the DFID Annual Review. As with NENTAD, the DELVe contractor should be open to sharing lessons with LINKS independent verification team and exploring options for collaboration in areas of geographic overlap.

Partnership to Engage, Reform and Learn (PERL: 204822)

189. DFID Nigeria's governance programme provides support at federal and state level on centre of governance reforms including on planning and budgeting processes as well as specific support to service delivery sectors (health and education) where these are prioritised in states. It also leads DFID's efforts to ensure citizens are engaged in planning and governance processes. The DELVe contractor will need to engage with PERL particularly in understanding federal, state and local governments contexts and systems and in being informed by Political Economy Analysis undertaken by PERL.

Education Research in Conflict and Protracted Crises (ERICC: 300405)

190. For Education in Emergencies, the DELVe contractor will need to engage with DFID's centrally managed ERICC programme which will be active in Nigeria to ensure that any formative evaluation in these areas is complementary rather than duplicative. This relationship will be brokered by DFID Nigeria.

191. ERICC aims to strengthen the international research agenda on education in conflict and protracted crises through evidence generation and more harmonised efforts among all stakeholders. At outcome level, an improved body of rigorous evidence on what works will improve knowledge among policy makers and practitioners. It will also strengthen the ability of DFID and partners to better design and implement programmes in these contexts, resulting in improved value for money and more effective programmes. The desired impact is 'more children getting better quality education in conflict and protracted crisis'.

Research on Improving Systems of Education (RISE: 204322)

OFFICIAL

192. Research on Improving Systems of Education (RISE) is a large scale, multi-country research programme that seeks to understand how school systems in low- and middle-income countries can overcome the learning crisis and deliver better learning for all. The RISE Nigeria project will run through 2022 and focuses on examining the role of parents' aspirations for their children's education, and parents' and communities' engagement with schools. The aim is to investigate whether and how demand for improved learning drives educational systems change in Nigeria. The research agenda will also analyse key historical developments that have shaped educational outcomes in the country.
193. The DELVe contractor may be required to engage with RISE's Nigeria programme, alongside engagement with PLANE, to ensure that any formative evaluation on education systems is complementary rather than duplicative. This relationship will be brokered by DFID Nigeria.

J. Budget

194. The budget for the DELVe services required to December 2027 is set up to £ 9 million (inclusive of all applicable local government taxes and exclusive of UK VAT).
195. The supplier should set out how each of the deliverables will be met in terms of fees and reimbursable costs. Any unknown costs at this stage which should be highlighted.
196. The supplier should provide clear VAT implication for services to be provided. DFID programmes are not automatically tax exempt and therefore the supplier may be liable to pay tax in respective countries of operation. Tax liabilities should therefore be taken into consideration in commercial proposals.
197. At the end of the inception period the supplier will provide an indicative budget for the life of the programme together with a detailed annual budget for the first year of operation. Thereafter, a detailed annual budget, for each financial year 1st April to 31st March, should be provided to DFID by the end of February each year.

K. Skills and Experience Required

198. The team should have a sound understanding of verification, research and evaluation designs and **methods**, in particular of carrying out performance evaluations of complex programmes in fragile and conflict affected states.
199. They should **understand the strengths and limitations of different approaches** and how to accurately interpret and present findings to a variety of audiences. The team will require a broad set of skills to be able to effectively design and conduct the required evaluation, learning and verification services.
200. The evaluation team will need to be **flexible** in the approach to designing the services to ensure that the study designs and programme designs are as closely linked as possible to allow for the most rigorous design feasible.
201. The evaluation team will need to demonstrate a **strong presence in and experience of Northern Nigeria providing evidence of partnership with relevant local organisations**.
202. The team will have a demonstrated **ability to communicate complex studies and findings in an accessible** way for non-technical audiences, including presentation of data in visually appealing ways, highly structured and rigorous summaries of research findings and robust and accessible synthesis of key lessons from across different studies.

203. The evaluation team will need to have a mix of skills that will be weighted equally and cover:
- Understanding of human development sectors including primary health care, family planning, water, hygiene promotion, sanitation, nutrition and basic education, community engagement
 - Understanding of public policy making public management and citizen engagement.
 - Ability to design theory based mixed methods evaluations to address user needs
 - Quantitative research methods including experimental and quasi-experimental methods
 - Qualitative research methods, including community and participatory research methods.
 - Proven skills in the application of mixed methods;
 - Value for money and in particular cost effectiveness analysis;
 - Political economy analysis;
 - Presentation of reports, data visualisation, and synthesising findings;
 - Research and evaluation communications and uptake;
 - Management of simultaneous evaluative and verification activities
 - Gender, disability, poverty and minority group analysis and equity and social inclusion analysis;
204. The evaluation supplier will need to be able to guarantee sufficient people to be able to implement the full breadth of the requirements in these terms of reference.
205. While the team composition and the structure of any sub-teams should be defined by the evaluation supplier, it will need to ensure that a full programme team is available for the full duration of the programme, with **key personnel based full time in Nigeria**.
206. The quality of human resources service providers included in their offers will be a key element in the assessment of bids. Any attempt to change key personnel post-award will be regarded as a significant variation in terms of their tendered offers and may have commercial ramifications.
207. The evaluation supplier will need to comply with DFID's policies on fraud and anti-corruption and cooperate with checks and balances programme staff will require from them for the duration of the evaluation e.g. annual audited statements, policies on management of funds.

L. Management and Reporting Arrangements

208. DFID will require the supplier to provide periodic management reporting (as distinct from the evaluation, learning and verification deliverables outlined in Section E above) covering but not limited to the following elements.
209. At the end of the inception phase the supplier will submit a workplan setting out the activities and timelines (as described in Section E above)
210. The supplier should assess project progress from the beginning of implementation and throughout the programme period, in particular:
- Assess progress against agreed DELVe work plans and deliverables;
 - Set out a schedule of meetings and who will be required to attend both from the supplier and DFID
 - Set a schedule of deliverables, timelines for review and feedback, meeting requirements

OFFICIAL

- Quarterly meeting to review progress against workplans, review
- A risk register with mitigating actions.

211. **Quarterly reports** may cover some or all the following elements, although Suppliers should consider what type of reporting regime would be most appropriate and how data will be best presented for the following:

Field visits to assess progress of the interventions;
Observation of local programme stakeholder / beneficiary meetings;
Assessment of the beneficiary selection process, including compliance with procedures and criteria for selection.
Monitoring of Interim Review Points and Milestone achievements;
A rolling assessment of the key risks and opportunities for delivery of DELVe services, including recommendations for enhancing against the requirement
A breakdown of lessons learned
Forward look and updated workplan

212. **Annual reports:** An annual performance self-assessment report is to be submitted one month prior to DFID's formal Annual Review of the Lafiya programme (that is in September each year in advance of the Lafiya Annual Review). This is because for DFID's internal purposes DELVe will be funded from the Lafiya programme and within scope of the Lafiya Annual Reviews. Annual Audited Statements are to be submitted annually within six months of the following year. DFID may require the supplier to provide additional reports will be agreed in advance. There will be a requirement for financial information which will be agreed with the supplier.

M. Risks and Constraints to the Evaluation

213. The following risks and constraints have been identified. In their bid suppliers should identify any additional risks and propose how all risks would be mitigated and managed.

214. There is a **complex web of actors**. Each programme in the portfolio has a distinct Senior Responsible Owner within DFID and is delivered through multiple contracts, accountable grants and other arrangements. In some instances, the Supplier will be expected to play a supportive, learning role with the programmes (e.g. in reviewing theory of change, Results Chains and Inception plans). In other instances, the role will be more independent in order to fulfil an accountability function and strengthen the accountability between DFID and the programmes. So, there are risks of miscommunication, duplication, and a lack of buy in.

215. The **theories of change** at this stage are not yet completely developed and many of the outcome level changes refer to changes in the approach of government bodies which are traditionally considered hard to measure. In addition, the programmes themselves include elements that are designed to be **flexible and adaptable**. The **geographic spread** of the programmes is broad, covering a number of states and language groups and may be adjusted during the lifetime of the programmes. These three factors present a risk that the design of the evaluation may become less relevant over the lifetime of the programmes.

216. The **difficult and changing security situation** in Nigeria and especially North East Nigeria presents a risk to the delivery of DELVe.

N. Duty of Care

OFFICIAL

217. 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.
218. DFID will share available information with the supplier on security status and developments in-country where appropriate. DFID will provide 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. A named person from the contracted organisation should be responsible for being in contact with DFID to ensure information updates are obtained. There should be a process of regular updates so that information can be passed on (if necessary). This named individual should be responsible for monitoring the situation in conjunction with DFID.
219. Travel advice is also available on the FCO website and the supplier must ensure it (and its personnel) are aware of this. The supplier is responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security briefings for all its personnel working under this contract.
220. The supplier is responsible for ensuring that appropriate arrangements, processes and procedures are in place for its personnel, considering the environment they will be working in and the level of risk involved in delivery of the contract (such as working in dangerous, fragile and hostile environments etc.). The supplier must ensure its personnel receive the required level of appropriate training prior to deployment.
221. Suppliers must develop tenders 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 (annexed to these terms of reference). They must confirm in the tender that:
- They fully accept responsibility for security and Duty of Care.
 - They understand the potential risks and have the knowledge and experience to develop an effective risk plan.
 - They have the capability to manage their Duty of Care responsibilities throughout the life of the contract.
 - They will give responsibility to a named person in their organisation to liaise with DFID and work with DFID to monitor the security context for the evaluation.
222. If you are unwilling or unable to accept responsibility for security and Duty of Care as detailed above, your tender will be viewed as non-compliant and excluded from further evaluation.
223. Acceptance of responsibility must be supported with evidence of capability (no more than 2 A4 pages) and DFID reserves the right to clarify any aspect of this evidence. In providing evidence tenderers should consider and answer yes or no (with supporting evidence) to the following questions:
- Have you completed an initial assessment of potential risks that demonstrates your knowledge and understanding, and are you satisfied that you understand the risk management implications (not solely relying on information provided by DFID)?
 - Have you prepared an outline plan that you consider appropriate to manage these risks at this stage (or will you do so if you are awarded the contract) and are you confident/comfortable that you can implement this effectively?
 - Have you ensured, or will you ensure, that your staff are appropriately trained (including specialist training where required) before they are deployed, and will you ensure that on-going training is provided where necessary?
 - Have you an appropriate mechanism in place to monitor risk on a live / on-going basis (or will you put one in place if you are awarded the contract)?

OFFICIAL

- Have you ensured, or will you ensure, that your staff are provided with and have access to suitable equipment and will you ensure that this is reviewed and provided on an on-going basis?
- Have you appropriate systems in place to manage an emergency / incident if one arises?

O. General Data Protection Regulation

224. Please refer to the details of the GDPR relationship status and personal data (where applicable) for this project as detailed in the Annex list and the standard clause 33 in section 2 of the Framework Agreement Contract.

P. List of Annexes

The following annexes were provided as part of the Invitation to Tender and will not be included in the contract.

Business Cases

Lafiya

PLANE

SUNMAP

DFID Ethical Guidance for Research, Monitoring and Evaluation

Initial duty of care risk assessment matrix prepared by DFID Nigeria

Schedule of Processing Data and Data Subjects

Annex : Schedule of Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Parties acknowledge that Clause 33.2 and 33.4 (Section 2 of the Framework Agreement) 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 Personal Data necessary for the administration and / or fulfilment of this contract. 2) For the avoidance of doubt the Supplier shall provide anonymised data sets for the purposes of reporting on this project and so DFID shall not be a Processor in respect of Personal Data necessary for the administration and / or fulfilment of this contract.



Appendix A, Annex B

Schedule of Prices

REDACTED