Section 3

Terms of Reference

Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) Service Provider for 2019-2023

Glossary

aNDPB	advisory non-departmental public body
COI	Conflict of interest
ICAI	Independent Commission for Aid Impact
DFID	Department for International Development
FCO	Foreign and Commonwealth Office
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
HMG	Her Majesty's Government, i.e. The UK Government
HTML	Hyper text mark-up language
IATI	International Aid Transparency Initiative
IDC	International Development Committee
KPI	Key performance indicator
ODA	Official development assistance
OGD	Other government departments
PDF	Portable document format
PMO	Project management office
Q&A	Question and answers
TOR	Terms of reference
UK	United Kingdom

Links to Useful Websites

https://icai.independent.gov.uk/

https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-international-development

https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/international-development-committee/

http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/officialdevelopmentassistancedefinitionandcoverage.htm

https://www.gov.uk/guidance/check-employment-status-for-tax

http://www.aidtransparency.net/

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/procurement-policy-note-0218-changes-to-data-protection-legislation-general-data-protection-regulation

https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/guide-to-the-general-data-protection-regulation-gdpr/

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/707868/GDPR.pdf

Introduction

The Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) is an advisory Non-Departmental Public Body (aNDPB) of the Department for International Development (DFID). ICAI was established in May 2011 to scrutinise all UK Official Development Assistance (ODA). ICAI is sponsored by DFID but delivers its programme of work independently and reports to Parliament's International Development Committee (IDC).

ICAI works to ensure United Kingdom (UK) aid is spent effectively for those who need it most and delivers value for UK taxpayers.

ICAI carries out independent reviews of aid programmes and of issues affecting the delivery of UK aid. ICAI publishes transparent, impartial and objective reports to support UK government decision-making and to strengthen the accountability of UK ODA.

ICAI operates on 4-year cycles, linked to the terms of its Board of Commissioners. The first ran from 2011-2015; the second is currently running from 2015-2019. ICAI is now planning for its third to cycle from 2019-2023.

A contracted supplier supports the ICAI Board of Commissioners to deliver its scrutiny reviews. The supplier provides expertise and flexibility that enables ICAI to deliver credible, in-depth reviews on aid spending programmes across a diverse range of subject matter. This arrangement is central to the value attached to ICAI by Parliament and other external stakeholders, as well as by government itself.

This contract is re-tendered every 4 years and this Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the requirements that ICAI expects the 2019-2023 supplier to deliver.

Background

ICAI's mandate

ICAI's mandate covers all UK government ODA. In addition to the Department for International Development, aid-spending departments include the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the Department of Health and Social Care, the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and cross-government funds such as the Conflict, Stability and Security Fund and the Prosperity Fund.

ICAI's mandate does not cover ODA spent by the devolved Scottish and Welsh governments.

Core values

ICAI operates on the basis of the following core values:

- Accountability: we conduct our work with objectivity and impartiality, assisting the IDC to hold the government to account for the effectiveness of UK aid. We are also accountable to the IDC for our performance. Although operationally independent, we are also accountable for our management of public money and governance to DFID as our sponsoring department.

- Feedback and learning: we believe that to do our job well, accountability must go hand-in-hand with learning. Building effective feedback loops into our review process will be critical to our work.

- Analytical rigour: we are committed to the rigorous use of evidence and analysis in our reviews. ICAI reports rely primarily on existing sources of evidence, supplemented and triangulated through additional empirical research as appropriate.

- Accessibility: we design and deliver reviews with a clear purpose and audiences in mind.

- Transparency: we are committed to transparency in our approach to reviews, including in the way we use and present data and evidence.

Objective

ICAI is supported in undertaking its reviews by a contracted-out service provider ("the Supplier"). The Supplier for 2019-2023 will produce relevant, high quality, independent, rigorous, evidence based reviews of the UK government's ODA spending and activities, as directed by ICAI.

The contract with the existing Supplier is due to end in June 2019. A Supplier is required for the period from January 2019 till end June 2023, with the option of up to a further two-year extension. Any extension would be subject to satisfactory performance of the Supplier, continuing need and availability of funding, and the agreement of the Supplier, ICAI and DFID, utilising a negotiated procedure.

This contract will commence before the end of the current Supplier contract (June 2019). Despite this overlap each Supplier will have distinct responsibilities. The Supplier for January 2019-June 2023 will be accountable for reviews published from July 2019 onwards. They will not be accountable for reviews scheduled to be published up to end of June 2019. NB the 2019-2023 Supplier will, as part of their workload for July 2019-June 2020, be required to complete the follow up review of reviews published July 2018-June 2019.

ICAI will determine the annual work programme for the Supplier. ICAI will consult on the work programme with a range of stakeholders. This will include the UK Parliament, Government, and development specialists. The work programme will be approved by Parliament's International Development Committee. The Supplier must

be flexible and agile to respond to the needs of the work programme and emerging stakeholder requirements.

The Recipient

The recipient of the service is the ICAI Board of Commissioners led by the Chief Commissioner. The ICAI Secretariat acts on the instructions of the Board of Commissioners in managing the contract with the Supplier and in delivering the ICAI work programme.

Scope

This section sets out at a high level the areas that are in and out of scope for the Supplier.

In scope for the Supplier will be;

- The production and completion of 8-10 timely, credible, independent reviews per annum on any aspect of UK ODA spend as directed by ICAI and up to 2 corporate reports. This will include ODA spent by DFID, other government departments and cross government funds.

- Whilst the exact mix of products in any year of the contract may vary, as an indicator[1], for each year of the contract, the Supplier will be expected to deliver:

  - 6-8 full reviews,
  - up to 2 short reviews, and,
  - 2 corporate products, including an annual follow-up report on progress against the previous year's reviews,

- This includes:

  - undertaking background research to inform scoping of the work plan and specific review topics,
  - supporting the development by ICAI of individual review terms of reference,
  - gathering evidence, including undertaking country visits to fragile and non-fragile states,
  - producing final reviews including the copy-edit and design of the reviews according to ICAI's house style,
  - supporting the secretariat with the publication of ICAI reviews,
  - participation at Parliamentary hearings on ICAI reviews,
  - participation at engagement events following publication of reviews,

---

[1] Examples of all ICAI published documents, including page length and house style can be found at **https://icai.independent.gov.uk/**

- coordination and management of the review pipeline,
- provision of additional ad hoc briefing material on matters related to ODA spend as directed by ICAI (for example, the current supplier produced a recent Briefing Note for the IDC on the definition and administration of ODA),
- undertaking continuous improvement of review processes (alongside ICAI),
- fulfilling Duty of Care requirements at all times for all Supplier staff, and,
- managing any conflicts of interest in line with ICAI policy.

Out of scope for the Supplier will be;

- deciding topics for reviews,
- review of any non-ODA spend,
- review of ODA spend by Welsh and Scottish Governments,
- leading on any press, publicity or engagement around ICA reviews,
- managing any government response to a published ICAI review,
- managing the relationship with the IDC, DFID and other government departments,
- fulfilling Duty of Care requirements for any ICAI staff or Commissioners,

The Requirements

ICAI has established processes and products to manage the production of the reviews. The below requirements reflect current practice. ICAI is committed to working with the Supplier to drive efficiencies and eliminate waste through process improvement. In responding to ICAI requirements, Suppliers are encouraged to include examples of innovation or process efficiencies that could reduce cycle time, reduce the cost, or, enhance the quality of the review.

The Supplier will deliver on six key work areas:

1. Supporting the scoping of reviews by undertaking initial background research on review topics selected by Commissioners, to inform the development of Terms of Reference by ICAI.

2. Supporting ICAI by designing the methodology, researching and writing reviews which scrutinise the impact, value for money, and effectiveness of UK Government ODA. The Supplier must resource the teams to carry out the reviews. The reviews are written by the Supplier on behalf of ICAI Commissioners. The process involves close working with them and the ICAI team throughout the project. Examples of the reviews currently produced and further details of ICAI's work are available at https://icai.independent.gov.uk/

3. Supporting ICAI with a dedicated quality assurance function. This must ensure the reviews are based on robust methodology and findings, recommendations are based on and clearly linked to strong evidence, are

peer reviewed, and that the final products are high quality, publication ready pieces of work.

4. Supporting ICAI with the production of reviews, including a design and copy-editing function to ensure consistent high quality and that all reviews comply with ICAI's branding and style guide.

5. ICAI has a wide range of stakeholders. The supplier must have the capability to identify, map and deploy stakeholder management plans. They must deal with stakeholders in a manner that enhances ICAI's reputation for professionalism and independence. This will include supporting and representing ICAI at International Development Committee hearings, sector stakeholder and engagement events, and representing ICAI to government, NGO and multilateral organisations and beneficiaries in the UK and aboard.

6. Operational capacity and capability, including a dedicated Project Management Office (PMO) function. This function must

    • manage the programme to meet contract Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and milestones,
    • resource a range of experts across a number of reviews,
    • manage the delivery of multiple concurrent outputs, and,
    • manage resource and schedules dynamically.

Including the corporate reports, it is estimated that there will be around 10-12 reviews published per year. NB work for an ICAI review may start in the year before it is published – so Suppliers should be prepared to manage a programme that could have up to 18 reviews live at any point in time. A full list of ICAI reviews split by type (performance, learning, impact, rapid and follow up) is available at Annex B.

Specifically, the following 8 products must be delivered.

1) Review Scoping

• The Supplier must collate light touch background information on thematic areas of aid spending selected by Commissioners for review. This should include, but not be limited to;
    o volume and type of spend,
    o maturity of portfolios,
    o delivery channels,
    o strategic relevance,
    o key dimensions of risk, and,
    o key external debates related to the topics.

• The Supplier must also participate in a small number of preparatory, background meetings with relevant HMG teams and external stakeholders.

• ICAI are responsible for developing review terms of reference (TOR). This will set out the scope of the review, the questions that must be answered and how

the review will be managed. However, the Supplier is expected to contribute to the development of the terms of reference by;

- o undertaking scoping of the review subject matter to support the development of the TOR,
- o liaising with ICAI on appropriate methological approaches, including sampling,
- o liaising with ICAI on the practicalities of delivering the TOR as it is being developed, considering evaluability, time and budget parameters

2) *Response to Review Terms of Reference*

- The Supplier must respond to the review terms of reference by designing a methodology and project plan to answer the questions set out in the terms of reference. The design outputs should include;
  - o an outline of evidence collection and analysis methods proposed to answer review questions,
  - o the sampling framework and the standards against which government performance will be judged.

This will be approved by the lead Commissioner for the review and will contribute to achieving KPI 1. (A breakdown of KPIs can be found at page 26.)

- The Supplier must produce a fixed price cost for delivering against the full scope of the review and including participation at Parliamentary and sector engagement events. Approval of the cost of the review by the lead Commissioner and ICAI Head of Secretariat will contribute to achieving KPI 1.

3) *Teaming*

- The Supplier must resource core and project teams for the whole programme of reviews.

- The Supplier must ensure a core team includes the following functions which operate across all reviews

  - o Programme leadership: Senior level accountability for the performance of all aspects of the programme
  - o Quality control: To ensure consistency of quality standards across each of the reviews in the programme
  - o Programme and project management: To ensure all reviews in the programme remain on schedule and deliver as expected. Ensure all cross review administrative processes (e.g. security clearance, planning for country visits etc.) are carried out consistently and using a standard process.
  - o Review design and production: To ensure that all reviews in the programme meet ICAI style guide, branding and design standards

- The Supplier must resource the review teams and any peer review. The team structure will include, but not be limited to; team leader, subject matter experts, junior researchers/ analysts and project and programme support staff. (Roles may be combined if appropriate).

- ICAI experience is that the team leader is a critical role in undertaking a successful review. A good team leader will have a combination of skills and expertise including;
  o domain or aid evaluation experience,
  o strong planning, project and performance management skills,
  o ability to manage, influence and respond to multiple stakeholder groups across government and the sector, whilst maintaining their independence,
  o ability to lead a small, often geographically dispersed, team,
  o ability to synthesise a range of evidence and construct compelling and well evidenced narratives,
  o strong presentation and effective written and face to face communication.

ICAI has also found that having a stable and consistent resource pool of team leaders who undertake a number of ICAI reviews throughout the life of the contract has been effective and is preferable. However, there will be occasions when the nature of the review requires a domain specialist that brings new skills and experience. Suppliers must ensure that their resourcing models can deliver not only the quality of team leader but also consistency of standards across the programme of reviews over the life of the contract.

- All team members must be approved by the lead Commissioner for the review. Approval of the team, project plan, methodology and budget by the lead Commissioner will contribute to achieving KPI 1.

- The Supplier must ensure all team members comply with ICAI conflict of interest policy and have been cleared to work on reviews. Compliance with the conflict of interest policy is KPI 2.

- The Supplier must ensure all team members have passed ICAI security clearance procedures and have been cleared to work on reviews. Compliance with security clearance process is KPI 3.

4) Producing a review

- The Supplier must produce an Approach Paper, summarising the agreed scope and methodology for the review. It is a Supplier responsibility to have this peer reviewed.

- A draft Approach Paper will be sent, by ICAI, for fact check to the relevant government departments. Responding appropriately to any challenges raised in the fact check process is a Supplier responsibility. The Supplier must complete a copy/edit/design process on the Approach Paper. The Approach

Paper is approved by the Chief Commissioner prior to publication. ICAI will publish this document and examples can be found at https://icai.independent.gov.uk/reports/upcoming-reviews/.

- The Supplier must gather evidence from which they will draw their conclusions and recommendations. This process typically will include, but not be limited to;

  - literature and document reviews,
  - interviews with government teams, delivery partners, other relevant stakeholders (such as thematic experts, partner governments and other donors) and potentially aid recipients or other programme participants[2].
  - evidence collection may include country visits.

- The Supplier must provide an evidence pack documenting all the evidence gathered. This will include a summary of findings against review questions, with a proposed review score. This will be provided to the lead Commissioner for the review 1 week before the emerging findings meeting as set out in the project plan. The Supplier must provide the evidence pack and summary of findings to time and quality standards. The emerging findings meeting will not proceed without these inputs and the failure of that meeting to take place would result in failing KPI 4.

- At the emerging findings meeting the Supplier must present the evidence they have gathered and their initial view of the answers to the questions set out in the Approach Paper. Commissioners and the ICAI secretariat will consider the evidence pack, summary of findings and emerging findings presentation. They will provide feedback on the quality of the evidence, the strength of the analysis and the clarity and robustness of the proposed answers to the questions posed in the terms of reference. At the end of this meeting and subject to satisfactory performance, the lead Commissioner for the review will approve transitioning from the evidence gathering phase to report drafting. This is KPI 4.

- The Supplier must produce a draft final report, taking into account input from:

  - both lead Commissioner for the review and the Chief Commissioner
  - the ICAI secretariat, and,
  - feedback from an Emerging Insights meeting with the HMG team under review.

It is a Supplier responsibility to have this final draft peer reviewed. ICAI will send a draft of the final report for fact check to the relevant departments. Responding appropriately to any challenges raised in the fact check process is a Supplier responsibility.

---

[2] ICAI rarely collects primary data from aid recipients given the breadth of reviews and resulting practical challenges in sampling, relying usually on secondary sources and key informants.

ICAI's experience is that the drafting process includes a skeleton draft, typically three drafts before fact check and two further drafts before copy edit/ design. The Supplier will ensure the review is professional and written to a high quality, with graphics included, and will complete a copy/edit/design process on the final report. The Chief Commissioner must approve the final report, prior to its publication online. Approval by the Chief Commissioner is a quality control gateway which the Supplier must achieve and is KPI 5.

- The Supplier must support the ICAI secretariat with any press and publicity material relating to the review. The Supplier must not produce publicity material or unilaterally promote the review without written ICAI consent.

- The Supplier team leader must prepare for, and participate as a witness at, the IDC hearing on the ICAI report. They must support the lead Commissioner for the review in answering any Committee questions on the review. The effectiveness of the Supplier support for Commissioners and performance at the IDC will reviewed by ICAI as part of KPI 6.

- The Supplier team leader will support ICAI with, and participate in, any industry engagement events following the report publication. Currently this averages 2 events per review.

5) Adherence to Conflict of Interest Policy/Ethical Walls

ICAI has an existing conflict of interest policy which is written to reflect the existing arrangements with current Suppliers.[3]

ICAI will update this policy in the light of the tender award, but Suppliers must;

- set out how they propose to manage any conflicts of interests that may arise from the rest of their commercial portfolio.

- manage, maintain and apply a robust Conflict of Interest policy and ethical walls for handling all government data, which will be tested on a regular basis.

- provide support to DFID and ICAI as required for the regular auditing of the COI policy and ethical walls.

- continue to apply the COI policy and ethical walls for 12 months duration beyond the end date of the Contract.

COI policy and ethical walls will apply to the Supplier, all supply chain organisations, as well as individuals.

6) Quality Assurance Process

---

[3] https://icai.independent.gov.uk/corporate-documents/conflict-of-interest-policy/

The Supplier must have an internal quality assurance process which ensures all work submitted to ICAI meets the required standards for;

- timeliness,
- relevance,
- credibility,
- transparency,
- accuracy,
- rigour of analysis and evidence based conclusions, and
- quality of presentation.

7) Flexible and Agile Response/ Operational Capacity and Capability

- The Supplier must have the operational capability and capacity to react to and manage multiple reviews concurrently, respond quickly and efficiently to changes in the ICAI workplan and recover any slippage against the agreed schedule.

8) Exit Strategy/Handover

- The Supplier must provide and adhere to a clear exit and handover strategy to facilitate a smooth transition post June 2023, including in relation to knowledge transfer and conflict of interest.

Constraints and dependencies

The following constraints have been identified:

- ICAI operates within a budget constraint. The 2017 Tailored Review[4] recommended that ICAI reduce the cost of its reviews over time[5]. Establishing a cost for the review that allows scope to be delivered in a methodologically robust way and also operates within ICAI's financial framework is a constraint.

- The Supplier is accountable for the Duty of Care for its employees at all times. When undertaking fieldwork, the Supplier will have to exercise

---

[4] DFID, *Tailored Review of the Independent Commission for Aid Impact*, December 2017, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/665905/Tailored-Review-ICAIb.pdf

[5] Historical ICAI review costs are shown in ICAI's Annual Reports. https://icai.independent.gov.uk/about-us/corporate-documents

Duty of Care for all of its employees, even if accompanied by a Commissioner, member of the secretariat or DFID country teams. This includes visits to fragile states.

- ICAI's operational independence is central to its credibility and effectiveness. All Supplier personnel must meet the requirements of the ICAI conflict of interest policy.

- All Supplier personnel must be security cleared to BPSS level as a minimum. On occasions, restrictions on evidence may require enhanced security clearances.

- ICAI has 3 Commissioners who share lead sponsorship roles on reviews. Only the Chief Commissioner works full time for ICAI – the remaining part time Commissioners are contracted for circa 5 days per month. The Supplier will need to take account of Commissioner availability in scheduling engagement in the review project plan.

- To enhance the impact of ICAI's reports and manage competing demands on stakeholders' time (including that of the Commissioners, IDC, Secretariat and HMG), ICAI aims to deliver its reviews at regular intervals over the course of each year. The Supplier must be able to consistently deliver reviews on schedule.

- The Supplier must index and store all information gathered in the course of any ICAI review for a period of 3 years after the date of the review publication. Any information must not be used by the Supplier for any other purpose without the written consent of the ICAI Head of Secretariat.

- ICAI will provide a secure location where official sensitive information can be stored and made accessible to individuals on the Supplier review teams with the appropriate security clearances.

- ICAI is located in Whitehall. DFID has offices in Whitehall and East Kilbride. Regular attendance at ICAI offices by the Supplier is expected for project and programme reviews.

- ICAI uses the Microsoft Office suite of software. All material from the Supplier must be presented to ICAI in software compatible with these packages.

Implementation requirements

The Supplier must be flexible and agile to effectively manage and deliver the review requirements. The deliverables set out below are the key deliverables for each stage. However, this is not an exhaustive list. Deliverables will be agreed as part of the Approach Paper and project plan to ensure that each review is specifically

tailored to address its unique requirements. There may be occasions when ad hoc deliverables are required, and these will be costed using the agreed rate card.

The Supplier must work with ICAI to implement any process improvement activities aiming to improve the quality of reviews, reduce cost or reduce cycle time.

A Work Order will be issued for each review setting out the specific terms of reference, key payment milestones and deliverable dates.

Review Process

All reviews go through the standard process steps. These steps and the Supplier deliverables at each stage are set out below. The Supplier must only deliver outputs after they have been through their own internal quality control processes.

In responding to these requirements Suppliers are encouraged to propose innovations which drive further process efficiency.

An ICAI Secretariat Review Manager is assigned to each review. They will oversee the delivery of each product and be the main day to day contact for the Supplier with the ICAI Secretariat.

Stage	Deliverable	Accountability
Programme Scoping	The Supplier must provide written input to the ICAI Head of Reviews on suggestions for topics for future reviews. This input will be used by ICAI Commissioners to help identify subjects for future reviews. These will be high level and no more than one (1) page in length.	ICAI is accountable for specifying the workplan and seeking IDC agreement. The Supplier is accountable for advising ICAI on potential subjects.
Terms of Reference (TOR)	ICAI is accountable for the production of the terms of reference. The Supplier must provide background thematic briefings on review topics agreed by Commissioners to inform the development of the terms of reference. These should provide • a brief description of aid portfolios within scope, • potential key lines of enquiry, • why the issue matters, and, • a high level overview of evaluability. The Supplier must liaise with ICAI on the practicalities of delivering the TORs as they are	ICAI is accountable for the production of the TOR, for organising background meetings with HMG and drafting concept notes. The Supplier is accountable for background briefing papers.

	being developed, considering evaluability, time and budget parameters.	
Resourcing the Review Team	The Supplier must provide suitably qualified, named individuals for each role in the review team. They must be available for the full duration of the review. Team members must be agreed by ICAI. The Supplier must also source a suitably qualified independent peer reviewer to review a draft approach paper and final report.	The Supplier sources team members, peer reviewer and provides CV's to ICAI for review.
	The Supplier must ensure all team members and peer reviewers are cleared through the ICAI conflict of interest process before starting work on a review. The Supplier must provide all information requested by ICAI to complete this process. ICAI will not approve team members to work on reviews if they fail to comply with and complete this process. Ensuring all team members are COI cleared is KPI 2.	ICAI will administer the COI clearance procedure.
	The Supplier must ensure all team members are security cleared to the appropriate level. The Supplier must provide all information requested by ICAI/DFID to complete this process. ICAI will not approve team members to work on reviews if they fail to complete this process. The cycle time to complete security clearance can take a number of weeks and the Supplier will need to plan this into their project plan. Ensuring all team members are security cleared is KPI 3.	The security clearance procedure will be conducted by DFID HR and security teams based on information provided by the Supplier.
Review Kick Off Meeting	For each review, the Supplier must attend kick off meetings with ICAI and key stakeholders for the review. For this meeting, the Supplier must; • develop a 'request for information' from government, indicating documentation required for refinement of approach and sampling, and for evidence-gathering.	The Supplier is accountable for presenting the review topic. ICAI will make logistical arrangements for the meeting.
Design Meeting	For each review, the Supplier must attend a design meeting where the Supplier must; • propose a review framework, linking the review questions to the defined judgement criteria, and indicating data collection methods and analytical approaches to be used. • propose a detailed sampling strategy (e.g. programmes, portfolios or institutions to be sampled; countries to be visited) and,	The Supplier is accountable for producing a methodologically robust design, project plan and budget. ICAI is accountable for making the

	if appropriate, the proposed sample. • present a proposed suite of research tools for the proposed methodology to be used throughout the review. • present a proposed budget for the review that takes account of the broad parameters that ICAI will indicate in the terms of reference. This will be agreed within 14 days of the design meeting. • present a credible delivery plan and timetable for the review. • propose a risk management strategy for the review including COI analysis. The Supplier must provide all material for this meeting to ICAI 3 working days before the meeting. This deliverable is KPI 1 requiring approval of the lead Commissioner to progress.	logistical arrangements for the meeting.
Draft Approach Paper	For each review, the Supplier must provide an Approach Paper. The Approach Paper must; • include an explanation of the purpose, scope and rationale for the review, including the type of review it is (performance, learning, impact, follow up or rapid). • include brief background to the subject of the review, including relevant UK government policies and commitments. • set out all the questions that the review is going to address. • contain a concise description of the analytical approach and methodology for the review, including any case studies or sampling elements, indicating how the necessary quality of evidence will be achieved. • include an analysis of the limitations of the proposed methodology. • be written to publishable standard and compliant with ICAI's style guide. • include a summary delivery plan and timetable and statement of risks and proposed mitigations. • Be 6-8 pages in length. The Supplier will provide a draft and make all	The Supplier is accountable for drafting the approach paper and making revisions to secure sign-off from lead Commissioner. The ICAI Secretariat will consolidate written comments from the Commissioners and Secretariat and/ or host discussions to discuss feedback.

	revisions necessary to satisfy the lead Commissioner that the concerns of Commissioners, the Secretariat and the peer reviewer (see below) have been adequately addressed.	
Approach Paper (AP) Peer Review	The Supplier must ensure that the draft Approach Paper has been reviewed by nominated peer reviewers and any concerns are addressed.	The Supplier must send the draft AP to the peer reviewer and ensure feedback is received and addressed to the satisfaction of the lead Commissioner.
Approach Paper Fact Check	The draft approach paper will be sent for fact check to the relevant government department(s). The Supplier must; - determine how to deal with fact check queries, seeking advice from the lead Commissioner where necessary. - update the draft Approach Paper accordingly. - provide a brief response explaining how each fact check query has been dealt with.	ICAI will send the draft to fact check. The Supplier is responsible for addressing any concerns raised about factual accuracy appropriate use of evidence and use of sensitive information in the approach paper.
Final Approach paper	The Supplier must provide a final Approach Paper that has been through copy edit and design and is compliant with the ICAI's style guide, is grammatically correct and with no spelling or formatting errors. Examples of previously published ICAI Approach Papers can be found at https://icai.independent.gov.uk/reports/upcoming -reviews/	The Supplier will be accountable for high quality copy edit and design, consistent with ICAI's house style. ICAI will provide guidance on house style, and will provide final sign-off on the Approach Paper, and publish it on ICAI's website.
Evidence gathering	The Supplier must undertake an evidence gathering activity. This must be consistent with the approach agreed for the review in the design framework and approach paper. The Supplier will be responsible for identifying	ICAI will be responsible for making initial introductions, handling protocol and facilitating

	informants for reviews and making arrangements for interviews/ consultations. The Supplier will be responsible for arranging country visits and itineraries thereof (accommodating availability of the lead Commissioner and/ or Secretariat representatives), and for the Duty of Care requirements for their staff on any country visits.	reasonable requests for access to HMG staff and information. ICAI will provide secure online space for information above "Official" status. The Supplier is accountable for ensuring sufficient evidence of the necessary quality is collected to answer review questions.
Emerging Findings Presentation	The Supplier must; • provide a soft copy Evidence Pack. This should contain the data and information collected during the course of the review. It must include the agreed deliverables for each component of the methodology and interview notes. This should be of sufficient quality to enable ICAI to check and quality assure evidence as necessary. This must be supplied to the secretariat a minimum of 10 working days before the emerging findings meeting. • provide a Summary of Findings document. This must summarise key findings from the research and the evidence on which they are based. It must provide an assessment of the quality of that evidence, propose answers to the review questions and, where appropriate, performance scores. This must be provided to the secretariat a minimum of 5 working days before the emerging findings meeting. • provide and deliver an emerging findings presentation to ICAI at which findings will be discussed. The presentation must be provided to the secretariat a minimum of 2 working days before the emerging findings meeting. This deliverable is KPI 4. Completion requires the approval of the lead Commissioner.	The Supplier is accountable for timely delivery of the required products to the standards required by ICAI. ICAI will arrange logistics for the meeting. ICAI will provide a clear steer to review teams on issues to be addressed in report drafting.

Skeleton Draft	The Supplier must; • produce a skeleton draft for review within two weeks of successful completion of the Emerging Findings meeting. This must include an outline of the structure of the report and headings for findings, from which the narrative flow of the report should be clear. • have a discussion with the Lead Commissioner to agree the proposed narrative and storyline of the report between providing the skeleton draft and first draft.	The Supplier is accountable for producing a high quality skeleton draft on time.
Emerging Insights meeting	The Supplier must • provide and deliver a brief 'emerging insights' presentation which outlines high level findings and emerging recommendations for sharing with DFID/ OGD. This must be shared with the secretariat review manager 1 day before the meeting.	The Supplier is accountable for preparing and delivering a presentation to the required standard. ICAI will arrange the logistics of the meeting.
Draft 1 Report	The Supplier must produce a first draft of the report (20-25 pages) for review by the lead Commissioner and ICAI secretariat. This must have passed the Supplier internal quality control process. The Supplier must respond to any feedback comments made. ICAI will provide consolidated feedback from the secretariat and Commissioners, focused on structure, narrative flow, the adequacy of presentation of evidence and whether any proposed score is well justified. (Feedback on subsequent drafts will focus down on specific evidence points, style and readability.)	The Supplier is accountable for delivering a report on time to the required standard. ICAI will provide to the Supplier consolidated feedback from the secretariat and Commissioners, including clear direction on issues to be addressed in the 2nd draft.
Draft 2 Report	The Supplier must produce a second draft of the report that has been internally quality-assured for review by the lead Commissioner and ICAI secretariat and respond to comments made.	The Supplier is accountable for delivering a report on time to the required standard. ICAI will provide to the Supplier consolidated feedback from the Secretariat and Commissioners,

		including clear direction on issues to be addressed in the 3rd draft.
Peer Review	The Supplier must • send the 2nd draft report for peer review. • consider peer reviewer comments in the 3rd draft • keep a record of how peer reviewer comments have been addressed and share this with ICAI.	The Supplier is accountable for ensuring that the 2nd draft is peer reviewed on time and that comments are appropriately considered.
Draft 3 Report	The Supplier must • produce a 3rd draft of the report that will be sent by ICAI to the relevant government department(s) for fact check, and respond to comments made. • present ICAI with a range of ideas for producing graphical and diagrammatic information and make these available to the ICAI secretariat in software compatible with the standard Microsoft Office suite of software.	The Supplier is accountable for delivering a report on time to the required standard.
Fact check and recommendation discussion	The draft report will be sent by ICAI to fact check by the relevant government department. Upon return of the fact check table by government, the Supplier must; • determine how to respond to each fact check query, taking advice from ICAI where necessary. • complete a record of ICAI's response to each fact check query. If this has not occurred at 'emerging insights', at an appropriate time between 3rd draft and the end of the fact check period, the Supplier and lead commissioner should hold a discussion of draft recommendations with the relevant government department to inform the targeting, relevance and clarity of recommendations.	ICAI manages the fact check process. The Supplier is accountable for addressing any concerns raised.
Draft 4 Fact Check response	The Supplier must; • produce a draft that responds to any issues raised during the fact check process. • update the fact check response spreadsheet to indicate proposed actions to be taken in response to each query raised.	The Supplier provides an updated draft report and response table that fairly addresses queries raised at fact check. ICAI will review the

		draft and check that queries have been addressed appropriately.
Final Report Design	The Supplier must provide a final report that • has been through the Supplier's internal quality control process. • Is grammatically correct, with zero spelling or formatting errors and conforms to the ICAI style guide. • The report must be well written, in plain English and be accessible to a general reader. • Provide an evidence table linking evidence references to key claims in any report. • have the capability to capture material in multiple formats for use in final report.	The Supplier provides a report to the specified standard. ICAI signs off the report to go to copy edit and design.
Final Report Sign Off	The Supplier must • provide a final report answering the review questions, • setting out recommendations with clear messages and graphics, and, • be compliant with ICAI's style guide. This is KPI 5. Completion requires the approval of the Chief Commissioner. Examples of ICAI reports and the style and branding conventions are available at https://icai.independent.gov.uk/reports/	The Supplier will be accountable for high quality copy edit and design, consistent with ICAI's house style. ICAI will provide guidance on house style, and will provide final sign-off on the report. ICAI will send it to HMG, and lead on media and sectoral engagement.
Publication	The Supplier must; • upload a final copy of a report in HTML and PDF onto the ICAI website on instruction from the ICAI Head of Engagement. • The Supplier must provide material to support the ICAI team on publication, for example support with producing briefings, press releases, Q&As. • The Supplier must provide standalone a version of the report's graphic (to be used online).	The Supplier is to deliver the specified products on time to the standard required. ICAI will be responsible for finalising engagement materials.
IDC Hearing	The Supplier team leader must; • participate as a witness at any Parliamentary hearing on the ICAI report	The Supplier is responsible for effective preparation

	in support of the ICAI Commissioners. • provide material to support the preparation for the IDC hearing, including analysing the government's response to the review, drafting questions for the IDC, preparing answers to likely questions, and attending a practice session with the lead commissioner. This is KPI 6. Supplier performance at the hearing will be assessed by ICAI and the lead Commissioner. The criteria will be how effective the Supplier was at representing ICAI key messages at the hearing and the quality of support received in preparing briefing material in advance of the hearing.	and participation in IDC hearings, and supporting engagement events. ICAI manages the relationship with IDC, and will finalise briefing materials for Commissioners.
Public engagement	The Supplier must prepare for and participate in events associated with the dissemination of the report learnings as required by the ICAI team. ICAI typically holds two events per review.	ICAI will organise any events. The Supplier responsibility is to participate and support ICAI on the day

Performance requirements

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

ICAI will manage the Supplier's performance through KPIs, including but not limited to those shown in table below.

Subject to satisfactory performance, the Supplier will be eligible to be paid at the completion of review milestones when products have been delivered. Final payment will not be made until all deliverables for each agreed milestone have been met. Suppliers must propose a set of standard payment milestones to be used across all reviews which take into account ICAI requirement that KPIs 1,4,5,6 all have payment milestones attached.

Table 1 Key Performance Indicators and mandatory milestone payments

KPI No	Stage	Measure	Payment Milestone

KPI 1	Design Meeting	The design meeting takes place as scheduled on the workplan and the lead Commissioner agrees • review team resourcing, inc. peer reviewers, • review framework, • review budget – (at meeting or within 14 days) • review scope, • review methodology and research tools, • review sampling strategy review project plan, and, • review risk management plan.	Yes
KPI 2	Conflict of Interest	All team members have been cleared by the ICAI COI process.	No
KPI 3	Security Clearance	All team members have the appropriate security clearance.	No
KPI 4	Emerging Findings	On the date set out in the project plan, the Supplier will hold an emerging findings meeting. For this meeting the Supplier must; • provide a soft copy of the evidence pack to ICAI Secretariat (10 working days in advance of meeting). • provide a soft copy of Summary of Findings to ICAI Secretariat (5 working days in advance of the meeting). • provide an emerging findings presentation to ICA Secretariat (2 working days before meeting). • deliver at the meeting an emerging findings presentation to Lead Commissioners and ICAI Secretariat. Following this meeting Lead Commissioner will decide whether the quality thresholds have been met and the KPI is met.	Yes
KPI 5	Final Report Sign Off	On the date specified in the project plan, the Supplier must provide; • a final report answering the review questions, setting out	Yes

		recommendations, with clear messages and graphics and compliant with the ICAI's style guide. The Chief Commissioner will sign the report off as meeting all required schedule quality and presentational standards.	
KPI 6	International Development Committee Hearing	The Supplier performance at the hearing will be assessed by ICAI and the lead Commissioner. The criteria will be; • how effective the Supplier was at representing ICAI key messages at the hearing, and, • the quality of support received in preparing briefing material in advance of the hearing.	Yes

Payment by results

The Supplier will be paid based on delivering results. 15% of any individual review cost will be subject to a payment by results clause.

KPIs can only be achieved if both quality and time elements are delivered. To assist the Supplier, the quality elements are set out as comprehensively as possible in the Quality Diagnostics table below.

Failure to achieve a KPI within 0-10 working days of planned deadline is viewed as being within a "grace period" and is not counted for the purposes of payment results. This is intended to cover minor administrative rescheduling, e.g. from diary scheduling.

For KPI 1, the date deadlines will be those set out in the workplan. For KPI 4 and KPI 5, the deadline dates will be those agreed in the work order or by any subsequent agreed request for change. KPI 6 has no date deadlines as it is determined by the schedule of the IDC.

ICAI will operate a request for change process – whereby the Supplier can request a change to a KPI deliverable date. If the request for change is agreed by ICAI, this date becomes the new deliverable date for payment by results. Requests for change based on circumstances that are beyond a Supplier's control or are at the request of ICAI will be approved. Examples of instances which ICAI would deem as beyond the Supplier control could include when government has responded late to fact check requirements and hence delayed the report publication schedule.

Table showing KPIs and associated scale of Payment by Results payment

KPI	Performance	Performance by results payment
KPI 1	Completion below ICAI quality standards and/or delivery delayed by workplan dates 10+ working days.	3%
KPI 4	Completion below ICAI quality standards and/or delivery delayed by work order dates 10+ working days.	4%
KPI 5	Completion below ICAI quality standards and/or delivery delayed by work order dates 10+ working days.	7%
KPI 6	Below standard performance.	1%

Performance related payments withheld for missing KPI 1 and KPI 4 will be reimbursed if the Supplier hits both schedule and quality for KPI 5. This gives the Supplier additional incentive to recover any slippage incurred for final report production.

The quality diagnostics ICAI will use to inform Chief/lead Commissioners sign off on the quality of the KPI are below

Table showing quality diagnostics for KPI 1, and KPI 4-6.

KPI	Quality Diagnostics
KPI 1	At the design meeting, did the Supplier • propose a high quality review framework, i.e. linking the review questions to the defined judgement criteria, and indicating appropriate data collection methods and analytical approaches to be used? • propose a high quality sampling strategy (e.g. programmes, portfolios or institutions to be sampled; countries to be visited) and, if appropriate, the proposed sample? • present proposed budget options for the review that take account of the broad parameters that ICAI has indicated in the terms of reference? • present a credible and cohesive project plan and timetable for the review? • propose a risk management strategy for the review including COI analysis and mitigations? • provide all documentation to ICAI in advance of the meeting in accordance with the deadline?
KPI 4	At the emerging findings meeting did the Supplier • demonstrate the evidence gathered is sufficient in quality and quantity to answer the review questions? • ensure the evidence pack clearly presented the available evidence, and identify any gaps in evidence base? • demonstrate the emerging findings and summary of findings

	documents provide sufficient information to answer the review questions credibly?
	• link evidence to narrative in a convincing way in the summary of findings and emerging findings presentation?
	• produce the emerging finding and summary of findings documents that support discussion of key issues?
	• provide all documentation to ICAI in advance of the meeting in accordance with the deadline?
KPI 5	Does the final draft provided by the Supplier
	• have an overall narrative which reaches evidence based conclusions and makes recommendations relevant to the review questions?
	• was the level of factual accuracy in the draft report sent for fact check reasonable?
	• use language proportionate to the strength of evidence presented avoiding over claiming?
	• present multiple examples of evidence and insights generated through the course of the review to support evaluative judgements made?
	• draw on the full evidence base for the review in reaching evaluative judgements?
	• written in clear and succinct style, the language used clear and the style guide is followed in nearly all cases and with few inconsistencies in the writing following copy edit?
	• make use of a wide range of design templates including boxes, quotes, tables, charts, maps - in order to present information and evidence in a clear and easily understandable way?
KPI 6	Did the Supplier team leader (or other appropriate Supplier team member)
	• represent the review effectively at the IDC hearing? Were they clear and confident in answering Committee questions? In answering questions did they convey ICAI key messages?
	• deliver all agreed briefing material in preparation for the hearing - for example Q and A – to time and standard required?

ICAI will assess Supplier quality KPI performance against the following standards.

- Green - Fully met or exceeded expectations
- Amber - Minor rework required to achieve expectations
- Red - Performance significantly below expectations. Major rework required.

Only Red performance grading against any KPI would trigger the payment by results mechanism.

Example 1

The total review budget is £275,000.

- The Supplier is 3 days late in delivering KPI 1 to quality required – PBR not triggered
- The Supplier is 13 days late in delivering KPI 4 to quality required. The root cause of the failure was Supplier performance. No change request is agreed. 4% PBR is triggered = £11,000
- The Supplier delivers KPI 5 on scheduled date in workplan and meets quality threshold – PBR for KPI 5 not triggered. Delivery of KPI to schedule and quality means PBR for failure to meet KPI 4 is reimbursed to the Supplier.

Total payment to suppler = £275,000

Example 2

The total review budget is £275,000

- The Supplier is 15 days late in delivering KPI 1 to quality required. However, the root cause was failure of ICAI to provide Terms of Reference to schedule. Supplier has issued a request for change. This has been agreed and the deliverable date has been moved by 15 days. – PBR not triggered as request for change process rescheduled delivery date
- The Supplier is 1 day late in delivering KPI 4 to quality required. – Delivery is within the 0-10 day's grace period and PBR is not triggered.
- The Supplier delivers KPI 5 15 days late. Root cause is rework required by Supplier as they could not justify a finding based on evidence gathered in report. Request for change not agreed. PBR for KPI 5 triggered @ 7% = £19,250

Total payment to Supplier = £275000 - £19,250 = £255,750.

Reporting

The Supplier will report on their performance at individual review level and at programme level, across all work underway. The table below sets out the reporting requirements required of the Supplier.

The Supplier will report to the ICAI Head of Secretariat on all aspects of performance and compliance to the Service Provider Contract.

Requirement	Requirement

Theme	
Individual Review level management	From receipt of the terms of reference until the completion of any parliamentary hearings or engagement events, the Supplier must produce and maintain a project work plan with the date and status for all activities being undertaken on the review. This must be accessible to the ICAI Review Manager via software compatible with standard Microsoft Office software. The use of alternative shared online platforms compatible with government access policies may be considered.
Individual Review level management	From receiving the terms of reference until the completion of any parliamentary hearings or engagement events, the Supplier must meet weekly (unless mutually agreed otherwise at certain points) with the ICAI Review Manager to discuss the progress of the review, key milestones, risks and issues and any mitigation.
Individual Review level management	From receiving the terms of reference until the completion of any parliamentary hearings or engagement events, the Supplier must make all material for the review available to the ICAI Review Manager in order for the ICAI Review Manager to make ongoing assessments of the quality of the work. This includes all evidence, drafts of reports and project management documentation.

Programme review	From the start of the contract, the Supplier must
	• provide a schedule for all contract milestones for all reviews. This schedule shall be accessible by the secretariat via software compatible with standard Microsoft Office packages. The use of alternative shared online platforms compatible with government access policies may be considered. The Supplier must provide a monthly written update to the ICAI Head of Secretariat setting out progress against this schedule.
	• comply with the ICAI change control procedure when proposing changes to contractual milestones. (See Annex D).
	• provide a monthly written update via software compatible with the standard Microsoft Office suite to the ICAI Head of Secretariat:
	  • on the staff working on each review and the status of security clearances and Conflict of Interest register (including individuals status and details of any other ODA funded contracts being undertaken by the Supplier or any sub-contractor to the Supplier).
	  • summarising any fraudulent activity discovered in the course of their reviews and the actions taken by the Supplier to report any such instances.
	  • summarising any safeguarding issues discovered

	in the course of their reviews and the actions taken by the Supplier to report any such instances. • summarising any gifts or hospitality received in line with ICAI's published gifts and hospitality policy. See Annex D. • on status of programme Key Performance Indicators. • summarising the programme level risks, issues and mitigating actions. • on actual and forecast programme expenditure based on review milestone payments. • meet monthly with the ICAI Head of Secretariat, or his or her nominated representative, for a performance management review of progress against KPIs, milestones, compliance with contractual conditions and review of programme risks

Other requirements

Self-Employed Individuals

The Supplier is responsible for determining the tax status of all team members/individuals delivering the services. The Supplier is responsible for ensuring full compliance with HMRC Regulation IR35 for any self-employed individual or any individual identified as "employed by tax purposes" through the HMRC Employee Status Indicator Tool. The Supplier will immediately report to DFID on any cases where IR35 applies.

General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)

The Supplier will be responsible for ensuring compliance with the GDPR.   The supplier must read the Crown Commercial Services guidance on the commercial aspects of GDPR in their PPN02/18 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/procurement-policy-note-0218-changes-to-data-protection-legislation-general-data-protection-regulation and the ICO GDPR guidance https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/guide-to-the-general-data-protection-regulation-gdpr/

Branding

The Supplier must ensure that only ICAI branding appears on any published or publicly used material relating to ICAI work.

Transparency

DFID has transformed its approach to transparency, reshaping its working practices and influencing others across the world to do the same. DFID and ICAI require the

Supplier receiving and managing funds, to adhere to DFID's transparency approach and release data on how this money is spent, in a common, standard, re-usable format and to require this level of information from immediate sub-contractors, sub-agencies and partners.

It is a contractual requirement for the Supplier to comply with this, and to ensure they have the appropriate tools to enable routine financial reporting, publishing of accurate data and providing evidence of this to DFID and ICAI. Further International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) information is available from http://www.aidtransparency.net/

Delivery Chain Mapping

The Supplier must;

- identify all partners in the delivery supply chain.
- state clearly their roles and accountabilities in delivering Supplier deliverables.
- document the status of all relationships in the supply chain.
- describe the delivery supply chain management process, governance and management and quality control systems.
- maintain robust and rigorous COI Policies/Registers for the full supply chain.

Small to Medium Sized Enterprises (SME)

DFID is expected to report on the levels of contracted work being allocated to SME. It is now a requirement to provide details regarding the levels of direct and indirect departmental SME spend with major Suppliers to the cross-government SME Small Business Policy team.

DFID are also interested in gathering details of the organisations working within the delivery chains of directly contracted partners. As part of the contractual compliance checking process, the Supplier will be required to submit returns providing these details.

Scale Up/Down (if appropriate)

The Supplier shall commit to being fully prepared in the event any decision is made to scale up (increase) or scale down (decrease) the scope of the programme.   There is the potential to increase by up to 50% of the original budget.

Timeframe

The contract will run from 11 January 2019 until 30 June 2023.   Subject to the satisfactory performance of the Supplier, continuing need and availability of funding, the contract may be extended, utilising a negotiated procedure, for a period of up to 24 months and up to the contract values shown above.

The timescales for individual reviews will be agreed between ICAI and the Supplier and agreed in the specific Review Work Orders.

ICAI and DFID co-ordination

The client for the contract is the ICAI Chief Commissioner. Individual reviews may be led by the Chief Commissioner or one of the 2 part time Commissioners. The final authority to publish any review rests with the Chief Commissioner. The Commissioners are supported by the ICAI Secretariat. The ICAI Head of Secretariat is accountable for the operational running of ICAI and the management of the contract. The contract manager who deals with all day to day contractual and performance issues is the ICAI Head of Delivery.

All reviews are assigned to ICAI Review Managers who work for the ICAI Head of Reviews. The ICAI Review Managers role is to be the day to day point of contact with ICAI for the Supplier review teams. They will facilitate access to government departments, advise Supplier teams on the review process, and undertake quality control for Commissioners on the review and support the Commissioners in ensuring reviews are delivered to time and quality. The ICAI Head of Reviews oversees all reviews, supports Commissioners in constructing the scope and scale of the review programme and undertakes quality and consistency control across all reviews in support of the Commissioners.

The ICAI Head of Engagement is responsible for all of ICAI's press, print and digital media, parliamentary relations and industry engagement. The ICAI Head of Engagement monitors Supplier compliance to ICAI style guide and publication standards

ICAI has the support of DFID procurement to manage the Supplier contract and a DFID link team who sponsor ICAI within DFID.

Duty of Care

The Supplier must retain Duty of Care for all their employees, associates and contractors at all times. This includes country visits to fragile and non- fragile states. Even when, on occasions, logistical arrangements may be shared with ICAI, Commissioners or DFID country teams, the Supplier retains duty of care for their staff.

The Supplier will not, at any stage, be required to assume Duty of Care for Commissioners, ICAI secretariat or DFID employees.

The Supplier is responsible for the safety and well-being of their Personnel (as defined in Section 2 of the Contract) and Third Parties affected by their activities under this contract, including appropriate security arrangements. They will also be responsible for the provision of suitable security arrangements for their domestic and business property.

DFID will share available information with the Supplier on security status and developments in country where appropriate.

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

Examples of DFID Duty of Care Risk Assessments are provided in Annex F.

Conflicts of Interest

In undertaking its scrutiny role, ICAI recognises the risk of conflicts of interest and their impact on how our decisions and operations are perceived. Any failure to address a conflict of interest could compromise the independence, impartiality and integrity of our work, or give the impression that ICAI is not acting in the public interest. This would result in damage to our reputation and undermining of confidence in ICAI's role as a scrutiny body.

Such a conflict of interest may arise where it could be perceived that any Supplier to ICAI has financial or professionally relevant reputational interests which may influence their independent judgement and integrity in carrying out their scrutiny role.

Conflicts may arise if the Supplier involved in an ICAI review has, for example:

- Worked for DFID or other government department on the particular programme or policy under review;

- Has team members who were former advisers or employees for DFID or other government department programme or policy under review;

- Has worked for a non-governmental programme funded by DFID or other government department working on UK ODA funded work;

- Have other contracts to deliver UK aid services.

The Supplier must;

- avoid any action that gives rise to an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest in respect of any ICAI review on which they are engaged and will notify ICAI of any circumstance that might give rise to such a conflict of interest as soon as it comes to light and provide plans for mitigations for ICAI approval.

- adhere to a robust COI policy/process.

- maintain COI registers and regularly check the COI of staff and supply chain partners.

- maintain COI policy and robust ethical walls for 1 year beyond the end of the contract.

- support regular testing of the Ethical Walls and incorporate any feedback from DFID/ICAI to strengthen the Ethical Walls where needed.

- grant DFID/ICAI the right to access and review the Ethical Walls and COI processes at any time.

Annex A ICAI Organisational Background and Context

Operating context

1. The Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) was established in 2011 to provide independent scrutiny of the impact and value for money of UK Government Official Development Assistance (ODA). ICAI is an Advisory Non-Departmental Public Body (aNDPB) sponsored by DFID. Governance arrangements are set out in a published DFID-ICAI Framework Agreement[6].

2. ICAI currently comprises a Board of Commissioners, currently led by the Chief Commissioner, Dr Alison Evans, who reports to the International Development Committee. The Chief Commissioner is supported by two other commissioners: Richard Gledhill and Tina Fahm. A secretariat of civil servants is responsible for the day to day running of ICAI, and manages a contracted service provider that produces the reviews. Recruitment of the incoming Chief Commissioner is intended to be completed by autumn 2018, after which the remaining two Commissioners will be recruited. The incoming Chief Commissioner is expected to be in place to work with the service provider from early 2019.

Strategic context

3. As the UK Aid Strategy sets out, all UK Government aid spending is shaped by four strategic objectives: strengthening global peace, security and governance; strengthening resilience and response to crises; promoting global prosperity; and tackling extreme poverty and helping the world's most vulnerable. Furthermore, the government is committed to ensuring the value for money of all its ODA spending. Government departments are responsible for the quality and impact of their ODA provision. They are all required to ensure their programme design, management, monitoring and evaluation represent international best practice, and to demonstrate how they are using rigorous evidence to underpin spending decisions. There must be clear lines of accountability for all ODA projects, and project performance must be regularly assessed.

4. In addition to internal government arrangements for ensuring the quality and impact of ODA provision, the International Development (Official Development Assistance Target) Act 2015 sets out that the Secretary of State must arrange for the independent evaluation of the value for money of UK ODA[7]. ICAI contributes to fulfilling that statutory obligation. Furthermore, ICAI's work is recognised in the Government's UK Aid Strategy[8], to which ICAI's priorities respond.

---

[6] The current Framework Agreement.

[7] S5 of the International Development (Official Development Assistance Target) Act 2015

[8] Paragraph 4.2 of UK Aid: tackling global challenges in the national interest

5. ICAI's formal remit is to "provide independent evaluation and scrutiny of the impact and value for money of all UK Government ODA". Its functions are to:

- carry out a small number of well-prioritised, well-evidenced, credible, thematic reviews on strategic issues faced by the UK Government's aid spending;
- inform and support Parliament in its role of holding the UK Government to account; and
- ensure its work is made available to the public[9].

6. Cabinet Office policy is that departments review all Arm's Length Bodies once every Parliament to challenge the need for them in function and form. DFID undertook a "Tailored Review" of ICAI in 2017.

- The review – approved by the Secretary of State and published in December 2017 – concluded that ICAI had effectively delivered its functions, is a valuable component of the UK aid landscape, and distinguishes itself from other scrutiny bodies by focusing on assessing aid impact.

ICAI Service provider

7. The service provider performs an invaluable role in enabling ICAI to achieve these functions. ICAI needs to deliver credible, in-depth reviews across a diverse range of subject matter[10]. It needs to do this flexibly. ICAI procures an external service provider to deliver this demanding set of requirements. This arrangement is central to the value attached to ICAI by Parliament and other external stakeholders, as well as by Government itself.

ICAI's current delivery model

8. ICAI uses a tri-partite delivery model to deliver intended outcomes and impact. This has involved:

- a board of publically-appointed Commissioners providing strategic direction and oversight of reviews;
- a private sector Supplier (in both phases with a lead company supported by others) which sources review teams and carries out reviews, with some associated management and technical support functions; and
- a Secretariat providing support to Commissioners, managing the Service Provider contract, overseeing external relationships and engagement, and quality assuring reviews.

ICAI's Secretariat works closely with the service provider and Commissioners. The Secretariat's Review Team provides an ongoing quality assurance function on reviews in support of Commissioners and contract management, and lead engagement with government teams under review. Secretariat Review Managers work with Supplier teams on managing review timelines.

---

[9] Established in the Tailored Review of ICAI, December 2017.

[10] Reviews have for example examined education programmes, delivering aid in Somalia, tackling tax avoidance, irregular migration, and global health threats.

The Secretariat's Engagement team leads on external communications, including relations with the IDC and media, oversees ICAI's style guide and provides advice on drafting and reputational risks. The Secretariat's Delivery team leads on contract management and oversight of the Supplier relationship. The Secretariat expects to work on a constructive, partnership basis with the Service Provider, with a "no surprises" approach.

ICAI has conducted its reviews and worked with the HMG subjects of its reviews based on many of the principles of "user-focused research/ evaluation", adapted to a scrutiny context. This has included engaging with HMG to understand their priorities and strategic direction to help inform the selection of review topics; providing regular updates on review progress; conducting "emerging insights" meetings to reflect back findings to government before drafting; providing an opportunity to HMG teams to fact check draft approach papers and final reports; and discussing emerging recommendations with HMG. At all stages, ICAI makes independent judgements on evidence and considers HMG inputs alongside all other sources.

Supplier History

The first Supplier contract (led by KMPG – with Agulhas as a sub-contractor) ran from 2011 to 2015. The second contract (led by Agulhas – with Ecorys and Integrity as sub-contractors) runs from 2015 to June 2019. In undertaking the retendering exercise ICAI is building on the experience of running the contract in and the experience of the previous transition between Suppliers.

Scheduling of the transition

The scheduling of the new Supplier contract (and of incoming commissioners) includes a period of overlap with the current Supplier and commissioner, as agreed by the Secretary of State. This has been specifically designed to mitigate the risks to the ICAI production schedule of having both Supplier and Commissioner contracts ending at the same time with no reviews underway by successor commissioners. This period of overlap will allow the new Commissioners to have direction over the new workplan.

Annex B ICAI Reviews by Type

ICAI currently carries out five different types of reviews:

- **Impact reviews** involve a thorough assessment of what underlies DFID's results claims and the significance of its development impact. They include a strong focus on evidence of results and the quality of the systems that DFID uses to capture that evidence.

- **Performance reviews** take a robust look at the effectiveness and value for money of aid programmes, with a strong focus on accountability. They also explore the adequacy of DFID's systems, processes and capacity, exploring how these are linked to patterns of performance in different sectors and areas.

- **Learning reviews** explore new and emerging areas of the aid programme to capture emerging learning and inform future decision-making. They pay particular attention to how well DFID generates and shares knowledge on how to tackle new challenges. While part of the independent scrutiny process, these reviews involve close interaction with DFID to promote the uptake of lessons.

- **Rapid reviews** are short, real-time reviews of an emerging issue or area of UK aid spending that is of particular interest to the UK Parliament and public. While we examine the evidence to date and comment on issues of concern, our rapid reviews are not intended to reach final conclusions on performance or impact, and are therefore not scored.

- **Follow Up Review** is an annual follow up on the recommendations made and accepted in the previous year's reviews. This reviews the effectiveness of the implementation by the government of the review recommendations. Aid-spending departments that are the subject of a recommendation are required to produce departmental responses to the ICAI review, indicating whether they accept, partially accept or reject each recommendation and setting out the management actions that they propose to take in response. All government responses to ICAI reviews can be found online.

The precise mix of reviews can vary by year according to the workplan subject. As an indicator, in the current year ICAI has completed 6 performance reviews, 1 learning review, 2 rapid reviews and 1 follow up review.

All ICAI reviews are published at https://icai.independent.gov.uk/reports/

Annex C: ICAI's Theory of Change

Following the 2017 Tailored Review, ICAI developed a theory of change for its work, intended to clarify focus, improve learning and enhance and better capture ICAI's impact.

ICAI's role and functions

ICAI's role is to provide independent evaluation and scrutiny of the impact and value for money of all UK government aid.

ICAI's functions are to:
- Carry out a small number of well-prioritised, well-evidenced, credible thematic reviews on strategic issues faced by the UK government's aid spending
- Inform and support Parliament in its role of holding the UK Government to account
- Ensure its work is made available to the public

The change we seek

The primary change that ICAI seeks is evidence-based improvements in UK aid spending. Such changes include modifications to strategy, programmes and business processes and the addition or discontinuation of programmes or components of programmes. Changes may be directly in response to ICAI findings and recommendations, or indirectly through the application of good practice and improved assurance and accountability processes. Ultimately, such changes should contribute to improvements in the impact of UK aid programmes on people in developing countries, and on increasing the value for money of the spending. As a consequence of this change, the public and Parliament should be increasingly assured that UK aid is being effectively scrutinised.

The changes sought in specific areas of aid spending are determined through the evidence-gathering and analysis process, and set out in review recommendations.

ICAI has a secondary objective of providing assurance to Parliament and the UK public that aid spending is well scrutinised. This requires that ICAI's workplan considers overall coverage of aid spending, in addition to considering areas of greatest risk or strategic relevance.

Pathways: How change happens

Changes in government aid spending practice are influenced by a range of factors, including policy priorities which are outside ICAI's mandate to review, and evidence or analysis of what works or is likely to work to achieve stated strategies and objectives. Government receives evidence from a wide range of sources, including internal monitoring, research, evaluation, learning and audits, external evidence from research bodies, other actors involved in aid and scrutiny bodies such as ICAI, the NAO and the IDC. In such a 'noisy' decision-making environment, we believe that to

bring about evidence-based improvements in UK aid programmes, ICAI must use a combination of five pathways:

1. ICAI must produce credible, independent evidence of the performance of UK aid programmes, as the basis for recommending improvements. The availability of such evidence, however, is typically necessary but not sufficient for government to make recommended improvements.
2. ICAI must adopt good practice from the fields of research/ evaluation-uptake and 'evidence-into-action' about how to engage with government, conduct its reviews and present evidence and recommendations. In particular, this means carrying out strategically relevant reviews, engaging constructively with the government during the review process and presenting and communicating findings to government in clear, succinct and actionable ways.
3. Formal accountability mechanisms help to promote uptake by Government of findings and recommendations from ICAI's reviews. Specifically the requirement for a public government response to reviews and recommendations provides a commitment to action, the holding of hearings by Parliament's International Development Committee holds senior officials accountable for performance in the area under review, and the production by ICAI of an annual 'follow-up' report on progress against review findings and recommendations can help sustain attention on and accountability for making improvements)
4. The transparent and public nature of ICAI's reports and associated accountability mechanisms can promote uptake of findings and recommendations by government, by enabling other parties such as national media and sector influencers to hold government to account its performance and action on recommendations. The public sharing of ICAI's work is also an end in itself, serving our function of making information on aid available to the public.
5. Government's awareness of and experience of ICAI scrutiny can in turn encourage pre-emptive improvements in UK aid in anticipation of future scrutiny by ICAI

How we maximise the likelihood of ICAI scrutiny being impactful

We ensure our reviews are relevant to both the IDC and to government by:
- updating a rolling workplan of thematic reviews on a six-monthly basis, with topics selected by considering level of aid spending, strategic relevance, riskiness and coordination with the plans of other scrutiny bodies (i.e. IDC and NAO)
- engaging with DFID and other aid-spending government departments on a regular basis to understand their strategic priorities and plans, contributing to informing ICAI's planning
- engaging the IDC in work planning and having our workplan signed off by the IDC
- using a range of review types, suited to both the maturity of the aid portfolio being reviewed and the need to inform decision-making processes in a timely manner (e.g. carrying out rapid reviews of new government funds)

ICAI ensures it, and its reviews, are credible through a combination of:

- using skilled and experienced Commissioners, Service Provider reviews teams and Secretariat staff: Commissioners must provide clear direction on scope of reviews and steer throughout the review process; the Service Provider teams must provide thematic expertise and research skills; and the Secretariat provides management support and quality assurance;
- keeping the scope of reviews focused enough to generate in-depth, valid findings and actionable recommendations, while broad enough to provide assurance to Parliament and the public that ICAI is adequately scrutinising UK aid spending;
- adopting robust policies to ensure our independence and avoid conflicts of interest;
- using appropriate and robust methods for scrutiny, and publishing these in Approach Papers;
- adopting a user-focused approach to scrutiny (including through early engagement on review topics with government; adopting a 'no surprises' approach; fact checking of approach papers and draft reviews and having early discussions on recommendations to ensure their intention is clear and that they are actionable);
- implementing rigorous quality assurance processes;
- presenting its work, and itself, professionally, using high-quality design processes;
- using effective financial management and governance practices; and
- adopting a 'continuous improvement' approach, reflecting and gaining feedback on opportunities to be more efficient and effective in our work.

We make use of three formal powers and processes to ensure ICAI's reports are given due attention and to hold Government to account for responding to our findings and recommendations:
- Requiring a formal Government response to each review (published by the Government); these set out government commitments to action for which they can subsequently be held accountable
- The International Development Committee's sub-committee on ICAI holds a public hearing on each review; ICAI supports the Committee in preparing for these hearings
- ICAI carries out and publishes a follow-up report annually to assess progress by Government in response to our reviews, in keeping with good practice on returning to issues to keep up pressure for improvement; the follow-up report is made public and discussed in a public hearing by the IDC alongside ICAI's annual report.

We engage in a range of communications and engagement activities to promote awareness of our findings and recommendations among other parties, such as the media, aid delivery partners and sector influencers. These serve the functions of increasing learning among those involved in aid delivery, promoting accountability in government for addressing ICAI recommendations and providing assurance to the public and parliament that UK aid is subject to robust scrutiny. Key activities include:
- Making all our reports and methodological approach papers public

- Producing press releases and communication strategies for each review, focused on engaging national media and key sector influencers on social media, and based on balanced representation of review findings
- Hosting selected learning events after review publication with government and convening bodies, and engaging with key stakeholders outside the review cycle, where relevant
- Engaging with media to mitigate the risk of misreporting of our work, and to promote our key messages about the importance of scrutiny to UK aid

In addition to maximising the likelihood of impact of each ICAI review, these actions also can increase the likelihood that Government will proactively implement higher quality aid programming, in the expectation of being scrutinised by ICAI. By increasing awareness and understanding of ICAI's work, demonstrating the credibility, relevance and independence of ICAI's work, and showing that government will be held accountable for taking action on ICAI's findings, we expect government to proactively improve the quality of aid spending over time.

Assumptions

Our theory of change makes some key assumptions:
- ICAI's mandate, framework agreement and status as a non-departmental public body sponsored public body remain substantively unchanged
- Decision-making on aid programming is not solely based on evidence but also takes into account, for example, political and operational factors that are beyond ICAI's mandate or scope to influence
- Formal accountability powers and processes will increase the likelihood of government giving due attention to ICAI findings and recommendations amid the 'noise' of other evidence sources and influences; awareness of and support for ICAI's findings and recommendations from media and sector influencers can similarly enhance the sense of government accountability to act on ICAI findings.
- Constructive engagement with government will enhance the likelihood of ICAI's recommendations being acted upon, as long as the integrity and independence of ICAI's scrutiny is maintained. Thematic expertise, evaluation/ research expertise and knowledge of government among ICAI teams and Commissioners can enhance the relevance and credibility of reviews, but must be balanced with the avoidance of conflicts of interest and retention of independence
- Third party reporting of ICAI's reviews is often not neutral, and while ICAI will always communicate solely based on its findings, ICAI has limited influence over how third parties may report on our work

Annex D ICAI Contract Milestone Change Control Procedure

ICAI has a standard process for managing any change required to contractual milestones. The process is

- The Supplier proposes a change in date to a contractual milestone and sets out the rationale for the change
- ICAI will review the proposal in the context of ICAI's wider workplan and financial planning
- ICAI will recommend to the lead Commissioner to accept or reject the change to milestone

In the event the milestone is changed this becomes the new baseline for all performance management and KPI payments. If it is rejected the old milestones are used for all performance management and KPI payments.

ICAI will accept changes to milestones where these are outside of the control of the Supplier or are at ICAI's request. In recent times these have included examples such as, general election changing publication schedules, late changes in Commissioner availability, ICAI or other government departments not completing their parts of the process to time. Likewise there have been occasions where ICAI, rather than the Supplier, has sought to reschedule review milestones to balance ICAI workload or prioritise publication of a particular review.

Annex E Conflict of Interest and Gifts and Hospitality policy

ICAI is committed to ensuring the highest standards of conduct in all that it does. We aim to always act fairly and transparently and in the best interest of both UK aid beneficiaries and the UK taxpayer. We also aim to provide confidence in the probity, integrity and fairness of our assessments. ICAI's current policy sets out how we currently identify and manage conflicts of interest across all levels of our work and manage our existing Supplier. It also sets out of gifts and hospitality policy. The policy is written to reflect the existing arrangements with current Suppliers. ICAI will update this policy in the light of the tender award. Suppliers must set out how they propose to avoid or mitigate any conflict of interest that could arise.

https://icai.independent.gov.uk/corporate-documents/conflict-of-interest-policy/

Annex F DFID Duty of Care Risk Assessments

Examples of Duty of Care Risk Matrixes are provided for:

Kenya
Bangladesh
Uganda
Burma

A specific Duty of Care Risk Matrix will be issued as part of the ToR for each Work Order.

DFID Overall Country Risk Assessment matrix - Location: **Kenya**

Date of assessment & assessing official**: 10th July 2017**

Theme	Risk Score	Risk Score	Risk Score
	Kenya (excluding areas listed separately)	Advise against all but essential travel to within 15km of the coast from the Tana River down to the Sabaki River North of Malindi. It covers Lamu County and those areas of Tana River County north of the Tana river itself. Lamu and Manda Islands are now back in bounds.	Advise against all but essential travel to Mandera, Daadab and Garissa plus anywhere else within 60km of the Somali border (including areas North of Pate Island on the coast)[11] and Eastleigh in Nairobi
OVERALL RATING	4	5	5
FCO travel advice	4	5	5
Host nation travel advice	Not available	Not available	Curfew in Place
Transportation	4	4	4
Security	4	5	5
Civil unrest	4	4	5
Violence/crime	4	4	5
Terrorism	4	5	5
Espionage	4	2	2
War	1	1	3
Hurricane	1	1	1
Earthquake	1	1	1
Flood	3	2	2
Medical Services	3	4 (nurses strike)	4

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

[11] **For these areas specific travel advice should be sought.
See latest FCO travel advice for Kenya**

DUTY OF CARE - SUMMARY RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX

DFID Overall Project/Intervention
Summary Risk Assessment Matrix

Country: Bangladesh

Date of re-assessment: August 2017

Theme	DFID Risk score	DFID Risk score
	Bangladesh except Chittagong Hill Tracts	**Chittagong Hill tracts**
OVERALL RATING[12]	3	3
FCO travel advice	2	3
Host nation travel advice	Not available	Not available
Transportation	3	3
Security	4	4
Civil unrest	2	4
Violence/crime	3	3
Terrorism	4	4
War	1	1
Hurricane	3*	3*
Earthquake	3**	5**
Flood	2	3
Medical Services	3	3

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

* = At the time of preparing this risk assessment there was no imminent threat of a hurricane. Bangladesh experiences regular cyclone activity and at times this has led to significant impacts, in particular across the coastal region. Cyclone activity in the Bay of Bengal should be closely monitored from February to April, and from October to December: http://www.rsmcnewdelhi.imd.gov.in/index.php?lang=en

** = Seismic risk varies across Bangladesh, the highest being in the east and north of the country, the lowest on the south-east: http://asc-india.org/maps/hazard/haz-bangladesh.htm

---

[12] The Overall Risk rating is calculated using the Mode function which determines the most frequently occurring value. In most cases in Bangladesh this will reflect highest occurring group of numbers containing 2 or below and/or 3 and above as basis for the calculation of overall Risk Marking.

DFID Uganda Overall Project/Intervention Summary Risk Assessment Matrix –
Oct 17
Read in conjunction with the Travel Advisory on Uganda

Theme	DFID Risk Score	DFID Risk Score	DFID Risk Score	DFID Risk Score	DFID Risk Score	DFID Risk Score
	Kampala	North-east Uganda Karamoja Region	Northern Uganda	South West Uganda	Western Uganda	Eastern Uganda
Overall Rating	3	3	3	3	3	3
FCO Travel Advice	2	4	2	2	2	2
Host Nation Travel Advice	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available
Transportation	5	5	5	5	5	5
Security	3	3	3	3	3	3
Civil Unrest	3	2	2	2	2	2
Violence/crime	3	4	3	3	3	3
Terrorism*	4	4	4	4	4	4
War	1	2	1	1	1	1
Hurricane	1	1	1	1	1	1
Earthquake	1	1	1	2	2	1
Flood	2	1	2	2	1	3
Medical Services**	4	4	4	3	3	3

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

Risk Assessment – Burma

DFID Overall Project/Intervention

Summary Risk Assessment Matrix
Location: Burma

Date of assessment: (September 2016)

Theme	DFID Risk score	DFID Risk score
	Burma Excluding Rakhine State except the southern townships of Kyaukpyu, Ramree, Munaung, Toungup, Thandwe (including the tourist resort of Ngapali) and Gwa. Excluding Kachin State (except the towns of Myitkyina, Bhamo and Putao) Excluding Shan State (North), except Lashio town (which includes the airport), Kyaukme town, Hsipaw town, and the train line from Mandalay to Lashio. Excluding the border areas with Thailand, Laos and China.	Rakhine State except the southern townships of Kyaukpyu, Ramree, Munaung, Toungup, Thandwe (including the tourist resort of Ngapali) and Gwa. Kachin State (except the towns of Myitkyina, Bhamo and Putao) Shan State (North), except Lashio town (which includes the airport), Kyaukme town, Hsipaw town, and the train line from Mandalay to Lashio. The border areas with Thailand, Laos and China.
OVERALL RATING[13]	2	3
FCO travel advice	1	3 (4 for Kachin and Northern Shan state)
Host nation travel advice	1	3
Transportation	2	3
Security	1	2
Civil unrest	2	3
Violence/crime	2	3
Terrorism	3	3
War	1	3 (4 for Kachin and Northern Shan state)
Hurricane	1	1
Earthquake	3	3
Flood	2	2

[13] The Overall Risk rating is calculated using the MODE function which determines the most frequently occurring value.

Medical Services	2	3
Nature of Project/ Intervention	2	3

https://www.gov.uk/foreign-travel-advice/burma

Latest update: Safety and security - possibility of violent clashes in several states; land mines and improvised explosive devices pose a threat in conflict areas.

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

Section 3, Appendix A

Schedule of Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects

This schedule is for use with the standard GDPR clause where DFID is Joint Controller and the Supplier is the Joint Controller and Processor.

It shall be completed by the Controller, who may take account of the views of the Processors. The completed schedule must be agreed formally as part of the contract with DFID and any changes to the content of this schedule must be agreed formally with DFID under a Contract Amendment.

The Supplier shall comply with any further written instructions from DFID with respect to compliance with the Clause 32 and the agreed schedule below. Any such further instructions shall be incorporated into this Schedule by way of a formal DFID Contract Amendment.

Description	Details
Identity of the Controller and Processor	DFID, ICAI and Agulhas Applied Knowledge are the Joint Controllers. Agulhas Applied Knowledge are the Processor.
Subject matter of the processing	The processing is needed in order to ensure that the Processor can effectively deliver the contract to provide a service to scrutinise all UK Official Development Assistance (ODA).
Duration of the processing	11 January 2019 until 30 June 2023.
Nature and purposes of the processing	The nature of the processing will cover collection, recording, organisation, structuring, storage, adaptation or alteration, retrieval, consultation, use, disclosure by transmission, dissemination or otherwise making available, alignment or combination, restriction, required in the gathering and use of evidence to provide thorough, evidence-based reports. The purpose is the gathering and use of evidence relating to all UK ODA funded programmes to provide thorough and evidenced reports.
Type of Personal Data and Special Categories of Personal Data	The types of personal data will depend on the data reviewed and asses and may include name, address, date of birth, NI number, telephone number, pay, images, biometric data etc.
Categories of Data Subject	Staff (including volunteers, agents, and temporary workers), customers/ clients, suppliers, patients, students / pupils, members of the public, users of particular websites and anyone delivering or in receipt of UK ODA funding that is being reviewed.
Plan for return and destruction of the data once the processing is complete. UNLESS requirement	The data will be held in a secure location for a period of at least seven years following the expiry or termination of this Contract and will then be securely destroyed in accordance with the exit

under European Union or European member state law to preserve that type of data	strategy agreed in the Inception Phase.