# Call-down Contract

# Terms of Reference

## PO 8481 - Independent Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Unit for DFID's Investment in the Global Fund to End Modern Slavery

## August 2019 to April 2022

**Table of Contents**

**Annex**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Supplier is responsible for providing an independent Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Unit from August 2019 to April 2022 to support DFID's investment in the Global Fund to End Modern Slavery (GFEMS). The contract will deliver against **four core outputs**.

DFID's investment in GFEMS aims to improve the evidence base on modern slavery and develop and test new and innovative approaches to tackling slavery in targeted populations. Over the period 2018-2021, DFID will provide up to £20 million direct support to seed fund the GFEMS. In addition, up to £2 million is allocated for the establishment of an independent MEL unit to help ensure robust monitoring and evaluation, and support programme learning and adaptation.

## 2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this contract is to deliver an **independent monitoring, evaluation and learning function** on behalf of DFID that will implement the following four components:

1. **Independent monitoring** to complement and strengthen GFEMS own monitoring and learning through the provision of additional monitoring mechanisms for the two sector and / or country specific interventions.

2. Provision of **targeted technical advice** to GFEMS on MEL for adaptive management based on **partner MEL system assessments.**

3. Undertake an **independent performance evaluation** to assess the extent to which intended outcomes have been achieved and capture key lessons from implementing an adaptive programme designed to introduce new ways of working to tackle modern slavery.

4. Facilitate regular **structured learning mechanisms** between DFID and GFEMS to assess the quality of the programme's learning and adaptive processes and to create a space for changes to programme strategy as a result of evidence and learning. The MEL unit is critical to the adaptive approach envisioned under the programme. This approach involves support to systematic, planned and intentional use of emerging knowledge, learning and evidence in order to drive decisions on programme content and strategy.

5. The MEL unit is expected to actively deliver evidence and learning into the programme's governance framework every 6 months to support decision making. The unit will complement and strengthen both DFID and GFEMS own monitoring and learning processes and assist the programme in taking timely decisions on the success or failure of specific pilots against agreed success criteria. Owing to the weak evidence base around what works in tackling modern slavery, and the adaptive nature of GFEMS programme, it is critical to learn from both success and failure and to develop evidence on the approaches used and distinct elements of the programme.

The expected **impact** of the MEL unit is: Improved performance of the programme implemented through DFID's investment in GFEMS, and a contribution to the evidence base on modern slavery. The expected **outcomes** are:

a) Strengthened programme delivery and accountability through a greater understanding of the quality of programme implementation, highlighting of potential risks, and verification and triangulation of results;
b) Appropriate programme adaptation based on evidence and learning generated across the programme; and
c) Understanding and evidence of the programme's contribution to intended impact and outcomes

**Independent monitoring** is expected to provide DFID with a greater assurance of the results being achieved by GFEMS and its downstream partners operating in targeted sectors in Bangladesh and India, highlight potential risks and support programme adaptation and learning. This component will comprise verification and triangulation of partners' monitoring and results data, in addition to wider data collection and analysis. Insights gathered through independent monitoring will be used by DFID to improve understanding of implementing partners' activities, performance, and the quality of learning and adaptation processes.

Independent monitoring by the MEL unit is **not** designed to replace programme and project level MEL activity which is the responsibility of GFEMS **nor** will it replace DFID staff conducting regular monitoring visits. Furthermore, the independent monitoring mechanism is not designed to investigate or highlight fraud and is instead a tool to support the management of overall portfolio and programme risk. However, the Supplier has the duty to immediately report any suspicion of, or actual fraud, bribery, corruption diversion or any financial irregularity or impropriety to DFID's Counter Fraud Section.[1]

Based on an **assessment of partner MEL systems**, GFEMS will be offered targeted **technical advice** to strengthen MEL for adaptive management. This component of the contract is expected to improve the quality of MEL under the programme and support the iterative and adaptive programming approach.

The **independent performance evaluation** is expected to provide evidence of the programme's contribution to intended outcomes and impact, allowing DFID to assess the extent to which investment in this programmatic area generates value. Furthermore, the evaluation will contribute to the evidence and knowledge base on modern slavery by generating learning and evidence on key components of the programme theory of change.

**Regular structured learning mechanisms** are expected to consolidate and critically review learning under the programme, and to provide a forum to discuss programme adaptations and challenge decisions.

GFEMS and its partners will be responsible for undertaking their own MEL relevant to the programme log frame and to reports requested by DFID, as well as ensuring that MEL supports adaptive management. The MEL unit is therefore not expected to substitute or replace the partners' own MEL and reporting systems.

---

[1] At reportingconcerns@dfid.gov.uk or +44 (0)1355 843747.

<u>The Supplier is not accountable for the delivery of the outcomes or impact stated above</u> <u>(with the exception of 2.3.c:</u> Understanding and evidence of the programme's contribution to intended impact and outcomes<u>))</u>, rather DFID will assess the extent to which the Supplier contributes to them. The Supplier for the MEL Unit **is responsible for delivering the outputs presented in the 'Scope of Work & Requirements' section of this ToR and for reporting progress against an agreed results framework and work plan as part of quarterly narrative reports.**

. To maintain independence, the MEL unit Supplier must have a 'firewall' separating staff delivering support to strengthen MEL systems from the team undertaking the performance evaluation.

## 3. BACKGROUND

### Context

Modern slavery is still widespread and pervasive - according to the latest global estimates[2], there were 40.3 million people in modern slavery on any given day in 2016, and this is expected to be an underestimate. Women and girls were disproportionately affected, accounting for 28.7 million or 71 per cent of the overall total. One in four slaves were found to be children. The offences that constitute modern slavery vary and can range from those who are trafficked into sex industry, bound by debt bondage, or in forced labour[3]. The hidden nature of modern slavery makes it difficult to understand the total scope and scale of the problem.

A lack of actionable and insightful data on modern slavery is a major barrier to attracting the type of investment on the scale needed to fight it. Specifically, there are very limited studies that have measured prevalence of slavery at a granular level (e.g. sector or community). Such data is needed to influence decision making, target interventions, motivate stakeholders like the private sector, and to monitor and evaluate progress against interventions.

There is also limited robust evidence on what works in reducing modern slavery prevalence[4]. The anti-slavery sector suffers from a lack of clear understanding of what is effective in tackling modern slavery in specific contexts, or what the drivers of vulnerabilities or root causes of modern slavery are in these contexts. Numerous meta-evaluations of existing evidence support the assertion that there are no proven practices for the sector.[5] Furthermore, anti-slavery efforts to date can be described as small-scale, fragmented and limited by funding.

DFID's investment in GFEMS complements multilateral, bilateral and regional efforts of the UK to end modern slavery. This includes the *Call to Action to end Forced Labour, Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking*, launched by the UK Prime Minister at the meeting of the UN General Assembly in 2017. The Call to Action sets out specific

---

[2] ILO, 'The Global Estimates of Modern Slavery' 2017
http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@dgreports/@dcomm/documents/publication/wcms_575479.pdf
[3] Towards a Common Future: Achieving SDG 8.7 in the Commonwealth, Walk Free Foundation, 2018
https://www.walkfreefoundation.org/news/resource/achieving-sdg-8-7-in-the-commonwealth/
[4] Defined as the proportion of people in slavery or at risk of slavery in a given community
[5] Bryant, Katharine (2016) What works? 'A review of interventions to combat modern day slavery' Minderoo Foundation/Walk Free Foundation.

commitments to address modern slavery at the national and international level and has been endorsed by over 80 countries so far.

## DFID investment in GFEMS

GFEMS aims to create a $1.5 billion public-private partnership to catalyse and coordinate a coherent global strategy to end modern slavery by making it economically unprofitable. GFEMS was created to address the limited global coordination among fragmented initiatives, limited or reactive engagement of the private sector and limited impact assessment or actionable data.

DFID's programme with GFEMS aims to develop new and innovative approaches to tackling slavery in targeted populations. It is focussed on increasing the global evidence and resource base and working with new partners in the private sector to improve effective practice in tackling slavery. The programme is delivered by GFEMS and sub-granted downstream partners. Strategic themes for GFEMS and the programme are:

- o Rule of law: Tackling impunity with effective criminalisation and judicial punishment for all forms of trafficking;
- o Supporting victims: Ensuring survivor freedom is sustained through reintegration and economic opportunity (engaging survivors and vulnerable populations and providing victim protection services); and
- o Business engagement: Proactively reducing forced labour from supply chains at global, national and local levels.

The expected impact that the programme will contribute to is a reduction in the prevalence of modern slavery in the sectors and communities that the Fund is targeting (please refer to the business case including the programme theory of change). The programme has four outcomes under three areas of work:

- I. *Improving the Evidence Base*
  - ▪ Outcome 1: Key actors have an improved understanding of the scale and prevalence of modern slavery and global knowledge gaps are reduced;
  - ▪ Outcome 2: Increased evidence and learning on drivers of modern slavery and learning from the pilots is available and used by key actors to design modern slavery interventions;
- II. *Testing and scaling impactful interventions*
  - ▪ Outcome 3: Key beneficiary vulnerabilities (at individual or community level) that enable modern slavery are reduced in targeted communities and sectors
- III. *Harnessing innovation*
  - ▪ Outcome 4: GFEMS harnesses and captures innovative ways of working to reduce modern slavery and shares with key actors; innovation shapes future investment strategies

The programme uses a deliberate adaptive, testing and learning approach to contribute to strengthening the evidence base on modern slavery and delivering outcomes for beneficiaries. DFID's investment intends to test and adapt new innovative approaches and technologies to tackle modern slavery at scale. Depending on the existing relative standards of evidence, outputs may be refined after further scoping. Adaptive programme components will build in rapid feedback loops to test what works and make systematic use of beneficiary feedback to adapt interventions and respond to the specific needs of the most vulnerable and marginalised where possible.

The Fund is targeting prevalence reduction in specific sectors, and efforts to reduce prevalence in a targeted sector may consist of multiple projects that work in concert to

deliver the desired impact, targeting specific drivers and vulnerabilities. Proposed sectors targeted with DFID funding are sex trafficking, migration, and apparel. Bangladesh and India have been selected as priority countries under the programme. Sector and / or country specific theories of change will be developed by GFEMS during the programme design phase.

GFEMS will select a number of downstream partners in Bangladesh and India to co-create projects under each sector/country level theory of change (in relation to outcome 3 and 4). The number of downstream partners is still unknown, but for the purpose of this ToR is estimated at 9 partners across the two countries. Several organisations may be working together on a project. Downstream partners are expected to be identified by the end of July 2019 latest, with project implementation starting in August 2019. Downstream partners may include international NGOs, local civil society organisations, and social enterprises.

Projects are designed to jointly achieve the intended change at the sector level, and to allow for the testing and adaptation of innovative approaches. Project specific theories of change and MEL plans will be developed and implemented by downstream partners with the support and guidance of GFEMS. Project level outputs and outcomes will be identified, regularly reviewed, adapted as needed, and reported against by downstream partners. Project activities will be determined during the design phase but may include: public and private sector influencing and reform programmes (e.g. capacity building of police, prosecutors and buyers; child friendly justice systems); service delivery to victims of modern slavery (e.g. legal aid, skills training, reintegration support); building and testing of ethical business models.

The programme will be deliberately inclusive in an effort to test and improve the targeting of interventions to the specific needs of those most vulnerable to exploitation. Partners are requested to ensure that the programme takes account of gender related differences in need, and the need to reduce gender inequality. Data will be disaggregated by age, sex, geographical location and disability (using the short Washington Group questions) where possible and relevant. Beneficiary feedback is to be systematically used by partners to (a) inform intervention targeting, design and implementation, (b) to empower beneficiaries with a voice in decisions that affect them, (c) to strengthen donor and delivery partners' accountability to beneficiaries and (d) allow the measurement of more intangible benefits and pick up unintended consequences of the programme, including safeguarding risks. GFEMS and downstream partners will be required to provide evidence of adequate safeguarding arrangements with policies and mechanisms in place to give assurance on compliance, including ensuring particularly vulnerable and hard to reach groups are protected.

GFEMS has also received funding from the US State Department (JTIP) for the period October 2017 - September 2020, with focus countries India, Philippines, and Vietnam. Both programmes have separate MEL frameworks, but approaches will be harmonised where possible and considered appropriate.

The programme is currently in its design phase (September 2018 - April 2019). GFEMS will use this period to deepen analysis of structural drivers and individual / community vulnerabilities, validation of potential cross sectoral partnerships and ultimately propose a set of innovations to prototype and pilot or potentially scale during the implementation

phase. The design phase will result in more precise objectives for the remaining period of the DFID investment, and refined geography-sector-population targeting.

## 4. THE RECIPIENT

The **recipient of these services** is the DFID Migration and Modern Slavery Department.

The **primary target audience** for the products from this contract are the DFID programme management team in the Migration and Modern Slavery Department, the Programme Steering Committee, GFEMS and downstream partners, DFID country offices in Bangladesh and India.

The **secondary audiences** for the products from this contract are as follows:
1. For independent monitoring and technical advice: potential other donors to the Fund.
2. For the performance evaluation and learning mechanism a wider audience will be relevant including: DFID country offices; other Government departments working on modern slavery; other donors, private sector and civil society organisations working towards eliminating modern slavery; research organisations.
3. Where outputs are expected to be published the secondary audience would include the UK public.

## 5. SCOPE OF WORK & REQUIREMENTS

The work of the Supplier is divided into four key components further elaborated below, namely:
1. Provision of additional independent monitoring mechanisms for the sector-specific interventions in Bangladesh and India
2. Provision of targeted technical advice to GFEMS based on an assessment of existing partner MEL systems
3. An independent performance evaluation for DFID's investment in GFEMS
4. Facilitating structured learning mechanisms between DFID and GFEMS

The outputs of the contract, to be achieved by the Supplier over the period August 2019 – April 2022 are outlined in detail below. Milestones for outputs 1 and 2 are indicative and will be confirmed at the end of the design phase, pending the selection of partners and co- creation of projects. Priorities and deliverables for technical advice will be agreed on a quarterly basis between the Supplier and DFID.

The Supplier's approaches and methodology will deliver each of the four outputs and meet the requirements as outlined below, taking into account the scarcity of data and evidence on modern slavery, the challenge of measuring change in a largely hidden population and of establishing causality, the complex contexts in which interventions are implemented, potential sources of bias, and the adaptive nature of the programme. The use of innovative approaches and techniques to facilitate learning processes and solicitate the views and feedback of beneficiaries (including the most marginalised) and relevant stakeholders is encouraged.

The MEL unit is expected to present its findings in ways that are accessible and relevant to the different intended users. This involves ensuring that reports and information products under this contract are timely, concise, clear and accessible.

The Supplier is responsible for managing and storing all data it collects in line with ethical and data protection guidelines, including ensuring it meets GDPR requirements.

*Output table*

**Output 1: Independent verification and triangulation of results and support to quality assurance of programme delivery through documented field monitoring and additional data collection in Bangladesh and India**

| Sub-outputs | Year 1 (Dec 2019 - Mar 2020) | Year 2 (Apr 2020 – Mar 2021) | Year 3 (Apr 2021 – Mar 2022) | Year 4 (Apr 2022) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of projects requiring documented field monitoring and data collection visits | 8 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 10 projects (visited multiple times during project lifetime) |

**Output 2:  Partner MEL system assessments and targeted technical advice on MEL for adaptive management**

| Sub-outputs | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Partner MEL system assessments completed | 9 partners | | | | 9 partners |
| Follow-ups to partner MEL system assessments | | 9 partners | | | 9 partners |
| Pieces of technical advice delivered | Tbd | Tbd | Tbd | Tbd | Tbd |

**Output 3: Independent Performance Evaluation**

| Sub-outputs | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Interim Evaluation Report and dissemination | | | X | | 1 |
| Final evaluation report and dissemination | | | | X | 1 |

**Output 4: Facilitation of structured learning mechanisms and synthesis of MEL findings and insights**

| Sub-outputs | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MEL synthesis reports | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Learning forums organized and convened | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |

<u>Output 1: Independent verification and triangulation of results and support to quality assurance of programme delivery through documented field monitoring and additional data collection in Bangladesh and India</u>

Independent monitoring will involve working with GFEMS and downstream partners operating in targeted sectors (sex trafficking, migration and apparel) in countries of focus, i.e. India and Bangladesh (outcomes 3-4). GFEMS supports the proposed approach to independent monitoring and will inform and engage downstream partners.

The Supplier will verify and triangulate partner results data at the activity and output level as well as undertake wider data collection and analysis in relation to the project-level theories of change as relevant (e.g. assumptions, testing of evidence links). The Supplier will also collect data to assess the quality of learning processes. Real-time observations are likely to be required given the nature of the populations at risk of modern slavery that are being supported through this programme and the type of interventions that may be delivered. Effective beneficiary feedback mechanisms[6] are expected to be central to the independent monitoring approach and this will involve co-ordinating beneficiary feedback activities with GFEMS and downstream partners.

The methodology for independent monitoring integrates qualitative and quantitative techniques to ensure proper triangulation of information. The supplier will verify the quality of reported data, quality of outputs and learning processes, and collect a wide range of beneficiary and non-beneficiary feedback. This will include:

1. Verifying partner results reporting, including opportunities and challenges for data disaggregation by sex, age, disability, geographical location (and other potentially relevant variables such as caste).
2. Verifying the quality of targeting approaches, programme implementation, and outputs (considering e.g. gender sensitivity and inclusiveness).
3. Collecting a wide range of beneficiary, non-beneficiary and key stakeholder feedback through the use of key informant interviews, focus groups and other methods (e.g. in relation to relevance, appropriateness, quality of service).
4. Capturing and analysing potential unintended consequences of the programme (positive or negative).
5. Reviewing evidence of partner adaptation and learning processes.
6. Analysing, triangulating and synthesising the information into standardised reports and actionable summaries which include the use of dashboards and data visualisation as relevant.

The use of innovative monitoring and sampling methods and techniques is encouraged, including the potential use of digital data collection methods where appropriate.

---

[6] An effective beneficiary feedback mechanism in an aid programme is a context-appropriate mechanism that: (1) solicits and listens to, collates and analyses feedback; (2) triggers a response/action at the required level in the organisation and/or refers feedback to other relevant stakeholders; (3) communicates the response/action taken where relevant back to the original feedback provider- and, if appropriate, the wider beneficiary community

It is envisaged that a suite of monitoring tools will be used to meet the needs for independent monitoring services potentially including, but not limited to, field observations, focus group discussions, beneficiary interviews, and key informant interviews. The monitoring approach is expected to include a substantial component of beneficiary feedback, and to explore the perspectives of a wide demographic, including vulnerable groups.[7] Proposed approaches to beneficiary feedback must take into account relevant population characteristics (i.e. sex, age, disability and geographical location). In addition, they must ensure that beneficiary engagement is used not only to verify results but also to hold DFID and its partners accountable to affected populations where feasible. Non-beneficiary feedback to triangulate results might include key informant interviews with programme delivery staff, government officials and other key stakeholders as well as those who have not been exposed to the programme.

We expect that monitoring will go beyond simply measuring log frame indicators and fidelity to established workplans and implementation strategies but will embrace complexity, tracking the unpredictable, actors and results outside the programme that contribute to the overall objective beyond those originally noted in the results framework. The Supplier will produce short, timely, high quality independent monitoring reports after each project monitoring visit which provides actionable recommendations in an accessible manner which will be used to strengthen the programme, using dashboards and data visualisation as appropriate.

The recommendations from independent monitoring will be taken on board by the DFID programme management team and used as points for discussion with GFEMS. GFEMS will also be required to respond in writing to the findings highlighted by the independent monitoring.  GFEMS in turn is expected to share the independent monitoring findings and recommendations with downstream partners. As a result, we expect partners to learn and adapt implementation and strengthen their accountability systems. Where relevant, the insights and lessons from independent monitoring will be shared more broadly within DFID and other donors of GFEMS.

The methodological approach, tools and the sampling approach for independent monitoring and wider data collection will be agreed with DFID during the inception phase for this output. What is included as part of the field visits and monitoring reports will also be agreed with the Supplier during the inception period.

Criteria for sequencing of projects and sites will be agreed between DFID and the Supplier during the inception phase (e.g. projects with high risk, high spend). The frequency of monitoring visits may differ per project and will be determined and agreed based on the number of projects, partners, project sites, and other relevant considerations. The latter may include the findings of previous monitoring visits, partner MEL capacity, the start of new activities, and level of risk.

## Output 2: Partner MEL system assessments and targeted technical advice on MEL for adaptive management

GFEMS and downstream partners are expected to engage in ongoing reflection and respond to beneficiary feedback to support fast learning and within-year adaptation under outcomes 3 and 4. The testing of intervention hypotheses (as specified in the relevant

---

7 Suppliers will be expected to outline their approach to beneficiary feedback, ethical protocols and data management procedures to ensure data collection does not put staff/field monitors, partners and/or beneficiaries at risk, and ensures DFID's safeguarding standards are met.

theories of change) requires relevant M&E and embedding of rapid feedback loops at project and sector level to facilitate structured learning and adaptation. Downstream partners may not necessarily have prior experience working in an adaptive way. To provide DFID with an assurance of results being achieved and the quality of learning and adaptation processes, the Supplier will provide targeted technical advice to GFEMS on strengthening MEL systems for adaptive programming and learning purposes.

In year one of the contract, the Supplier will complete assessments of the MEL systems of all partners contributing to outcomes 3 and 4 (GFEMS and downstream partners). Downstream partners are expected to be selected by July 2019 latest, and assessments of their MEL systems are hence expected to take place between August 2019 and March 2020. An assessment will involve meeting with each partner (GFEMS and downstream partners) and making recommendations for improvement. Each MEL assessment will include pre-reading (of projects' proposals, theories of change, MEL plans, reports and other partner specific MEL related documents), face-to-face interviews with partners, review of partner data systems (where appropriate and feasible) and writing the partner specific assessment report with actionable recommendations. It is expected that assessments also include a review of the effectiveness of partners' complaints and beneficiary feedback mechanisms, including verification at the field level (where this is proportionate and required). Suppliers are invited to offer an alternative methodology but are advised to consider the above as indicative of the level of depth required.

Key parameters to assess partner MEL and beneficiary feedback systems must be developed and recommendations formulated against each of these parameters to enable partners to improve their MEL for adaptive management. The Supplier will also look at how partners assess, monitor and strengthen social inclusion, gender and conflict sensitivity of their interventions as well as the extent to which partners are able to sufficiently disaggregate data on gender, disability[8], age, and geographical location. It is important that the assessments are able to highlight where MEL systems could be further harmonised with DFID reporting systems as well as assessing data quality and providing DFID with an assurance of the strength of MEL. It is expected that all reports include a dashboard assessing performance against selected parameters.

Following the assessment, the MEL unit will provide targeted technical advice to GFEMS as required. This may involve expertise from the MEL unit being embedded into GFEMS at points in the programme to support the design of MEL approaches and analysis of MEL data. Priorities and deliverables for technical advice will be agreed on a quarterly basis between the Supplier and DFID. The Supplier will provide support to DFID in reviewing and quality assuring the MEL strategy and methodology developed by GFEMS, sector/country and project-specific theories of change, and other relevant products (*this support will start prior to the completion of the inception phase, i.e. after signing of the contract*).

In providing targeted technical advice on MEL for adaptive management the supplier will be expected to continually seek out evidence constraints to programme design and delivery; and advise on ways to proactively address them through appropriate methodological choices which will respond to programme needs, allowing for pluralism, eclecticism, innovation and improvisation. We expect that MEL for adaptive management have high methodological diversity and deploy a wide variety of data collection and

---

[8] Using the Washington group question set http://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/washington-group-question-sets/short-set-of-disability-questions/

analytical tools and methods. The Supplier is expected to ensure that considerations of methodological rigor, complete with timeliness, with the emphasis on ensuring good enough evidence for informed operational decision making.

In year two and three of the contract, the Supplier will follow up with the partners on the recommendations made in year one. Depending on the type of recommendations generated in the MEL assessment, this follow up may be remotely or through face-to-face meetings. Follow up to recommendations should be documented (including by updating the dashboard), and relevant supporting documentation annexed where appropriate.

DFID will sign off the approach proposed by the Supplier to assessing partner MEL systems during the inception phase. DFID will sequence the partner MEL assessments in consultation with GFEMS and the Supplier will set the initial and follow up schedule in consultation with GFEMS and downstream partners.

## Output 3: Independent Performance Evaluation

**Evaluation purpose and objectives**

The evaluation serves the dual purpose of accountability and learning, with emphasis on the latter. Given the anticipated challenges and difficulties in establishing clear attribution, the evaluation aims to assess contribution to stated outcomes and impact.[9] The evaluation is expected to provide evidence of whether DFID's investment has influenced intended outcomes and impact, allowing DFID to assess the extent to which investment in this programmatic area generates value. Furthermore, the evaluation will contribute to the evidence base on modern slavery by generating learning and evidence on key parts of the programme theory of change.  The supplier is expected to use learning from the evaluation and adapt accordingly, and actively seek out key evidence gaps that the evaluation will fill.

The specific objectives of this evaluation are to: i) Assess the programme's contribution to intended outcomes and impact and the prospect for sustainability of effects; ii) Identify whether the programme has contributed to any unintended consequences or effects (positive or negative); iii) Generate evidence and learning to inform programme design and implementation to maximize operational effectiveness iv) Assess the effectiveness of working adaptively and whether taking an adaptive approach to tackling modern slavery has contributed to results.

The programme theory of change and log frame will act as the reference point and guide the finalisation of evaluation questions. The evaluation will interrogate the (iterations of the) programme theory of change and investigate key parts of the theory of change, including whether assumptions underpinning the causal pathways hold true.  The evaluation is expected to provide external validation to, and build on, the evaluative work at sector and project level which is led by GFEMS. The programme will be evaluated

---

[9] DFID defines *Performance Evaluation* as the assessment of "an intervention on the basis of its contribution to development outcomes and impacts within its context". Typically, performance evaluation is primarily concerned with assessing the contribution of a programme to development outcomes and impacts and primarily focuses on questions of its contribution to change – 'has it made a difference?' rather than 'what impact did it have?'. A performance evaluation goes beyond assessing the delivery process to assess the contribution of a programme to observed changes in outcomes and impacts, and to assess whether a programme has achieved its objectives.

against the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability. Efficiency will not be covered in order to limit the scope of the evaluation and considering that value for money measures will be tracked throughout programme implementation.

**Evaluation questions**

Specific evaluation questions will be further refined during the inception phase and throughout programme implementation and be dependent on operational evidence needs. They will be agreed in collaboration with DFID and GFEMS, but are expected to include:

Relevance
- To what extent were iterations of the programme theory of change relevant given the programme's objectives and target groups?
- To what extent is the evidence generated through the programme potentially relevant to other modern slavery programmes elsewhere and the wider modern slavery sector?
- Can tested effective interventions be scaled? What contextual factors need to be considered for interventions to be impactful elsewhere?
- How successful was the programme in coordinating and collaborating with other actors in the modern slavery sector to ensure complementarity and additionality?
- How successful was the programme in continually adapting to the context and an evolving understanding of that context?
- What changes would be required to increase the relevance of the programme and interventions?

Effectiveness
- How and to what extent has the programme contributed to a reduction in the prevalence of modern slavery in the sectors and communities targeted by GFEMS?
- To what extent has GFEMS' portfolio of interventions contributed towards reducing the identified vulnerabilities of beneficiaries (at individual or community level) to modern slavery in the two targeted sectors?
- To what extent has the programme contributed towards an increased, credible evidence base on the prevalence and drivers of modern slavery in the two targeted sectors?
- Has the programme increased key actors' understanding of the scale and prevalence of the two sector specific areas of modern slavery and are actors using prevalence data and learning from the pilots to inform their programming? How is data being used and by who?
- Has the programme enhanced innovative ways of working on modern slavery that could be replicated elsewhere?
- Did the intervention(s) successfully target those most at risk, and the specific needs of the most vulnerable? If no, what prevented this?
- Were there any unintended (positive or negative) outcomes or effects of the programme?
- What changes would be required to increase effectiveness of the programme and interventions?

Sustainability
- To what extent are programme impacts in the two targeted sectors likely to be sustained without further intervention?
- What additional measures need to be put in place to maximise sustainability?

<u>Learning from adaptive programming</u>
- To what extent has the programme been able to identify key evidence gaps, address them and respond operationally to that emergent evidence? What were the barriers to maximizing operational effectiveness, and how could they be addressed?
- To what extent and how has working adaptively contributed to the ability to achieve results?
- What lessons have we learnt from attempting to implement an adaptive programme designed to introduce new ways of working to tackle modern slavery that would be applicable to other programmes?
- To what extent has the program integrated both adaptive designs as well as rigorous research components in a way that is complementary?

The evaluation will also consider cross-cutting issues such as gender, diversity and inclusion, power relations, and governance/anti-corruption.


**Methodology**

The Supplier will develop a rigorous evaluation design and methodology during the inception phase. DFID is anticipating an evaluation design that takes a mixed methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches. Furthermore, the evaluation should combine primary data collection (including on the two targeted sectors) with secondary evidence synthesis and analysis from existing sources (see information on data sources below). The evaluation design will need to be cognisant of, and appropriate for the flexible and adaptive nature of the programme.

The Supplier is responsible for proposing and implementing the most suitable approach and methodologies to respond to the proposed evaluation questions and the above-mentioned challenges (e.g. hidden population, difficulty in establishing causality). An evaluation design which draws on a theory-driven approach such as contribution analysis or realist evaluation could potentially be useful for examining outcomes 1, 2 and 4. DFID would also expect the evaluation to include a political economy analysis or to draw explicitly on political economy analysis principles to ensure it takes sufficient account of the political realities surrounding the two modern slavery sectors the GFEMS projects are operating within.

The evaluation should adhere to international best practice standards in evaluation, including the OECD DAC International Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, the OECD DAC Principles for Development Evaluation, and DFID's Ethics Principles for Research and Evaluation.

The following data will be generated during the course of the programme and should be drawn on by the evaluation team:

- Prevalence measurement baseline and endline* studies (GFEMS)
- Sector scoping studies and influence mapping (GFEMS)
- Baseline and endline analyses of structural drivers in targeted sectors and individual / community vulnerabilities, obtained via quasi-experimental methods* (GFEMS)
- Annual survey of key stakeholders/users and case studies to track use and uptake of GFEMS research, learning and evidence products in the wider sector (GFEMS)
- Mid-point check-ins and end-term project evaluations* to understand the extent to which different projects have contributed to overall changes at the sector level (GFEMS)
- Project MEL data (downstream partners)
- GFEMS quarterly progress reports

- DFID Annual reviews
- Deliverables and learnings of the MEL unit

It should be noted that several of these data and learnings will not be available until the end of the project*.

Limitations of the existing evidence base on modern slavery – both in terms of prevalence data and concerning the effectiveness of interventions - are elaborated in section 3.


**Key tasks and deliverables**

The key tasks and deliverables for this TOR are as follows:


Task 1:  Develop Evaluation Design and methodology (inception deliverable: Evaluation design Report)

Task 2:  Undertake Data Collection and Analysis

Task 3:  Develop Interim Evaluation Report and support to dissemination (deliverable: Interim Evaluation Report)

Task 4:  Develop Final Evaluation Report and support to dissemination of findings (deliverable: Final Evaluation Report)

Task 1:  Upon review of existing programme documentation and meetings with DFID and GFEMS, the Supplier will develop and draft an Evaluation Design Report during the inception phase. The Evaluation Design Report outline will be developed in consultation with the DFID Evaluation adviser. The report should set out:

   o   Finalised evaluation questions;
   o   Detailed evaluation framework outlining methodological approach, data sources, data collection and analysis, data quality assurance mechanisms;
   o   An engagement and dissemination strategy that focuses on maximizing the utility of the evaluation and ensures that it is embedded in the broader uptake strategy of the MEL unit. This strategy should be informed by the stakeholder and influence mapping exercise that will be carried out by GFEMS in conjunction with DFID country offices;
   o   A review of the main risks and challenges for the evaluation and how these will be managed;
   o   Outline of how ethical standards will be applied;
   o   Draft outline of the interim and final evaluation report; and
   o   An evaluation timeline and workplan with proposed times for revision (the Supplier will be responsible for sequencing this work plan with the other outputs of the MEL unit).Task 1:      To ensure the independence and effective governance of the evaluation, the design will be signed off by the DFID Evaluation Adviser and a Reference Group organised by DFID will provide technical input.  The Evaluation Design Report will also be quality assured by DFID's Evaluation Quality Assurance Service. All feedback and response to feedback will be documented by the Supplier in an annex to the final Evaluation Design Report. The Supplier will continue to maintain the Evaluation Design Report as the evaluation develops. It will remain a living document that is updated by the Supplier as necessary and resubmitted to DFID and the Reference Group as necessary.

Task 2: Tools and protocols for data collection and analysis will be shared with and approved by DFID prior to the start of data collection. The Supplier will be responsible for using a Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations matrix to document data synthesis and analysis.

Task 3: Development of an Interim Evaluation Report (May 2021) presenting findings from data collection and analysis activities, recommendations and lessons learned. The findings will be presented by the Supplier during one of the learning forums (output 4). The Supplier is invited to propose mechanisms for sharing evaluation findings and recommendations more regularly to support programme design and implementation.

Task 4: Development of a Final Evaluation Report (April 2022). The Final Report should include a description of the evaluation methodology and limitations, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned, as well as a concise executive summary. The report should be accompanied by a presentation and a facilitated session with DFID, GFEMS and other relevant stakeholders to feed back the results.  All feedback and response to feedback will be documented by the Supplier in an annex to the final evaluation report. In order to be able to inform DFID decision making processes the Supplier is encouraged to complete the evaluation as soon as possible after completion of programme interventions by GFEMS to contribute to the Programme Completion Review.

## Output 4: Facilitation of structured learning and mechanisms and synthesis of MEL findings and insights

The MEL unit will synthesise its insights into timely, accessible and decision-orientated reports every 6 months. The Supplier shall produce five reports throughout the duration of the programme, consolidating findings from independent monitoring, partner MEL capacity and follow-up assessments, and other relevant data sources. The MEL unit is expected to focus in particular on evidence of how effectively the programme is adapting and learning during the implementation of the adaptive outputs. The detailed requirement of the report will be agreed with the Supplier during the inception phase.

Synthesis reports will be shared with the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) prior to their bi-annual meeting. The synthesis of MEL data is expected to assist DFID and the PSC in taking evidence-informed decisions on the programme and will be used as a basis for the structured learning sessions between DFID and GFEMS described below. In addition, the Supplier will support GFEMS in designing approaches and/or products to share key insights and good practices with downstream partners to support learning.

The Supplier will provide an organizing and convening role for five learning forums which bring together DFID, GFEMS and the Supplier. Structured learning mechanisms will take place at six-monthly intervals and involve a critical review of what has been learnt, a review of programme adaptations and a space to challenge programme decisions and inbuilt biases. External experts will be invited to attend and input. These mechanisms will be facilitated by the MEL unit and will be informed by the above-mentioned synthesis of MEL findings. Learning sessions will be held in person on an annual basis when practically possible, with the others being virtual meetings.

The MEL unit is responsible for capturing the proceedings of the structured learning mechanisms and to support that lessons captured are actively accommodated in programme delivery.

## 6. OTHER SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

### Relationship between the Supplier, DFID and partners

GFEMS is responsible for managing the programme and monitoring progress against the agreed results framework. GFEMS is also responsible for coordinating evaluation and learning at the sector and project level. The Supplier is not expected to substitute or replace the partners' own MEL and reporting systems. Rather, as detailed above the Supplier is expected to complement partners' MEL systems, verify reported data using a sampling approach and collect supplementary data from beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries and other key stakeholders.

The relationship between the Supplier and the programme partners will be key to the success of the MEL unit. The Supplier will be responsible for establishing and maintaining cooperation between GFEMS and the MEL unit. GFEMS is responsible for ensuring that downstream partners agree in principle to cooperate with the MEL unit. Ways of working is part of the criteria that bids are reviewed against. It is expected that during the inception phase the Supplier will establish ways of working with GFEMS and DFID which support both learning from success / failure, programme adaptation, accountability for results and accountability to beneficiaries. It is recognised that the adaptive nature of the programme will require a close and iterative relationship between the Supplier, GFEMS and DFID to ensure that the work of the MEL unit lends itself to informing the iterations of the programme.

### *Ethical considerations*

Significant ethical issues may arise from efforts to monitor and evaluate the situation of those at risk of modern slavery. The Supplier and partners must follow the do no harm approach and DFID's Ethics Principles for Research and Evaluation.

## 7. REPORTING

The Supplier will submit formal reporting against an agreed results framework and work plan and attend quarterly meetings to discuss progress and future workplans with DFID. The content of the progress reports will be agreed between DFID and the Supplier during inception. Meetings will be face-to-face (in London) or by phone / video.

The table below sets progress reports and deliverables within a provisional timeframe, the exact dates of which will be finalised between the Supplier and DFID at the contract award stage and adjusted on an annual basis.

| Phase | Period | Progress report | Date | Deliverables |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Inception | 1 August 2019 – 30 November 2019 | Progress report 1 | 30 November 2019 | Inception Report + Evaluation Design Report |
| Implementation | 1 December 2019 - 29 February 2020 | Progress report 2 | 29 February 2020 | MEL synthesis report 1 + Learning forum 1 |
| | 1 March 2020 – 31 May 2020 | Progress report 3 | 31 May 2020 | |

| | 1 June 2020 – 31 August 2020 | Progress report 4 | 31 August 2020 | MEL synthesis report 2 + Learning Forum 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 September 2020 - 30 November 2020 | Progress report 5 | 30 November 2020 | |
| | 1 December 2020 – 28 February 2021 | Progress report 6 | 28 February 2021 | MEL synthesis report 3 + Learning Forum 3 + Interim Evaluation Report |
| | 1 March 2021 – 31 May 2021 | Progress report 7 | 31 May 2021 | |
| | 1 June 2021 – 31 August 2021 | Progress report 8 | 31 August 2021 | MEL synthesis report 4 + Learning Forum 4 |
| | 1 September 2021 – 30 November 2021 | Progress report 9 | 30 November 2021 | |
| | 1 December 2021– 30 April 2022 | Closure and learning report | 30 April 2022 | MEL synthesis report 5 + Learning Forum 5 + Final Evaluation report |

The MEL unit is expected to have a 'firewall' separating those delivering support to strengthen monitoring systems and the team undertaking the performance evaluation to support independence.


## 8. TIMEFRAME AND BREAK POINTS

The contract with the successful Supplier will commence **August 2019 and to April 2022.** The grant agreement with GFEMS is currently scheduled to end in August 2021. There will be an **inception period** from August 2019 to November 2019 before implementation by the Supplier starts (note that the provision of technical advice under output 2 will commence prior to completion of the inception phase).

The contract will contain a break clause at the end of the inception phase when, at DFID's sole discretion, DFID will decide whether to continue to the implementation phase.

 DFID reserves the right at DFID's sole discretion to extend the contract by up to 12 months with a value of up to £400,000 subject to Business Case addendum approval and additional funds being approved.


## 9. GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

The Supplier will report to the DFID Migration and Modern Slavery Department's Evaluation Adviser and Senior Manager. A Reference Group will be created and organised by DFID to provide technical input, and to ensure effective governance of the MEL unit. When considered necessary, the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) may request the MEL unit to share its findings directly with the PSC. Vice versa, the MEL unit can make representations to the PSC (subject to consultation with the Senior Responsible Owner) to flag issues or concerns related to the programme.

Key deliverables under this contract (including inception and evaluation design report, interim and final evaluation reports) will need to be reviewed and signed off by DFID's Evaluation Quality Assurance Service. In addition, DFID has engaged an external and independent 'critical friend' to provide technical input on MEL for adaptive programming

and to perform a challenge function to the programme (e.g. during annual reviews, structured learning mechanisms). The Supplier will be expected to consider technical input provided, e.g. with regards to approaches and tools for MEL for adaptive management purposes.

DFID will agree a work plan with the Supplier during the inception, which will be revisited regularly and adjusted when necessary. DFID will sign off on the design, methodological approach and tools proposed for independent monitoring, partner assessments, the performance evaluation, and learning mechanisms during the inception phase. It is expected that the Supplier will independently manage the implementation plan but will consult the DFID Evaluation Adviser and Senior Responsible Owner before decisions are taken.

DFID will support the Supplier in understanding the programme. DFID will also ensure that necessary connections are made between the Supplier, GFEMS (and downstream partners through GFEMS), and relevant DFID country office teams; but does not expect to play the role of relationship manager / liaison, nor will we hold any duty of care responsibility for the Supplier.

In line with the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), DFID requires partners receiving and managing funds to release open data on how this money is spent, in a common, standard, re-usable format and to require this level of information from immediate sub-contractors, sub-agencies and partners. Further information is available from: http://www.aidtransparency.net/. The Supplier should submit copies of its supply chain (sub-contractor) invoices and evidence of payment when invoicing DFID for its actual costs of procurement of local services and applicable management fee.

## Invoicing Arrangements

This will be an **output-based** contract and payment will be based on satisfactory delivery of the agreed milestones. Indicators will be included in the results framework to assess both the quantity and quality of deliverables.

## 10. RISKS AND CONSTRAINTS

The key risks and challenges that DFID has identified, and which the Supplier is expected to address in addition to other risks they have identified, include:

1. Delivery – Challenges include:
   i. Identifying and engaging with populations at risk of modern slavery and responding to their specific needs;
   ii. Risk of arrest and / or charges brought by authorities towards persons perceived to be conducting non-sanctioned data collection;
   iii. Need to work through local actors on the ground who may not have the skills and tools required to achieve minimum standards of monitoring / research etc.;
   iv. Limited capacity of implementing partners in M&E leading to the risk that data is not reliable, timely or relevant enough to monitor or evaluate performance; and
   i. Lack of complementarity between partners' MEL and the work of the MEL unit, compromising value for money and creating a potential data collection burden on beneficiaries.

2. External / Context – Challenges include:

i. Grant activities disrupted due to events beyond grantees control - e.g., conflict, extreme climate event, changes in government policy;
ii. Programme execution and / or MEL activities hindered by host government unwillingness to collaborate with or license programme efforts (for example, due to denial of prevalence or objection to GFEMS as a non-local entity); and
iii. Risk of death or injury of supplier personnel (including their employees, sub-contractors or agents).

3. Data – Challenges include:
i. The limitations in available, reliable and comparable data on modern slavery;
ii. Risks to data confidentiality, transportation and security; and
iii. Risks of identifying beneficiaries in data analysis and reporting.

4. Safeguards – Challenges include:
i. Activities create negative externalities for example inadvertently "doing harm", such as through displacement of trafficker activities' from one sector and / or geographical location to another (i.e. survivors displaced into different forms of slavery or geographical locations) or deepening inequalities;
ii. Risk of causing harm to beneficiaries and communities (e.g. social shaming, stigma, trauma), inability to offer support / services in impartial monitor role, managing expectations; and
iii. Risk of psychological distress from working with people with high vulnerability and protection issues (either realised or potential).

## 11. DUTY OF CARE

All Supplier personnel (including their employees, sub-contractors or agents) engaged under a DFID contract will come under the duty of care of the Supplier. The Supplier is responsible for the safety and well-being of their personnel and any third parties affected by their activities, including appropriate security arrangements. The Supplier 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. 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. The current Risk Assessment Matrix is attached at Annex 2.

### Do No Harm

DFID requires assurances regarding protection from violence, exploitation and abuse through involvement, directly or indirectly, with DFID Suppliers and programmes. This includes sexual exploitation and abuse but should also be understood as all forms of physical or emotional violence or abuse and financial exploitation.

This programme is targeting a highly sensitive area of work. The Supplier must demonstrate a sound understanding of the ethics in working in this area and applying these principles throughout the lifetime of the programme to avoid doing harm to beneficiaries. In particular, the design of interventions including monitoring and programme evaluations should recognise and mitigate the risk of negative consequence for women, children and other vulnerable groups. The Supplier will be required to include a statement that they have duty of care to informants, other programme stakeholders and their own staff, and that they will comply with the ethics principles in all

programme activities. Their adherence to this duty of care, including reporting and addressing incidences, should be included in both regular and annual reporting to DFID.

A commitment to the ethical design and delivery of evaluations including the duty of care to informants, other programme stakeholders and their own staff must be demonstrated.

The Supplier is responsible for ensuring that appropriate arrangements, processes and procedures are in place for their personnel, taking into account the environment they will be working in and the level of risk involved in delivery of the contract. The Supplier must ensure their personnel receive the required level of training prior to deployment (where applicable).

The Supplier must comply with the general responsibilities and duties under relevant health and safety law including appropriate risk assessments, adequate information, instruction, training and supervision, and appropriate emergency procedures. These responsibilities must be applied in the context of the specific requirements the Supplier has been contracted to deliver.

**Annex 1**

**Duty of Care**

**Risk Assessment Matrix**

DFID Overall Programme: **Modern Slavery - Supporting Global Action to End Modern Slavery**

Programme ID: **300466**

Summary Risk Assessment Matrix

Project/Intervention Title: Independent Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Unit to support DFID's Global Action to End Modern Slavery Programme

Location: India and Bangladesh (exact locations to be determined at the end of the overall programme's inception phase)

Date of Assessment: 12/02/2019

| Theme | DFID Risk Score | DFID Risk Score | DFID Risk Score |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Bangladesh except Chittagong Hill Tracts | India – Mainland except immediate border with Pakistan, Jammu & Kashmir, Manipur and Assam | India – Manipur and Assam |
| **OVERALL RATING[10]** | **3** | **2** | **3** |
| FCO Travel Advice | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Host Nation Travel Advice | Not available | Not available | Not available |
| Transportation | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Security | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Civil Unrest | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Violence/Crime | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Terrorism | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| War | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Hurricane | 3* | 3* | 3* |
| Earthquake | 3** | 2** | 4** |

---

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

| Flood | 4*** | 4*** | 4*** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Medical Services | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Nature of Project/Intervention | 3 | 3 | 3 |

41.

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

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

43. ** = Seismic risk varies across Bangladesh, the highest being in the east and north of the country, the lowest on the south-east. In India, too risk varies significantly across different states. Risk is low across the majority of India (particularly in Central, Western, South and East India. Risk is moderate along the border with Pakistan. Risk is high in the mountainous regions in the North (States of Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Punjab). http://asc-india.org/menu/hazard.htm and http://static.seismo.ethz.ch/GSHAP/eastasia/asiafin.gif

44. *** = India and Bangladesh are the 2 countries with the highest current annual affected population to flooding according the World Resources Institute (2015) https://wriorg.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/aqueduct_global_flood_risk_country_ranking_20150304.pdf?_ga=2.88831262.407141623.1546940122-1392213030.1546940122 Flood risk is higher in river floodplains and coastal areas, the entire country in Bangladesh, the Indian states bordering Nepal and Bangladesh, and the Indian North Eastern states. Risk of flooding is linked to the monsoon season from June to September; precipitation should be monitored closely during this period.

45.

46. **COUNTRY/PROJECT DUTY OF CARE RISK ASSESSMENT CIRCUMSTANCE MATRIX**

**47.**

| Theme | Risk rating* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1<br><br>Very Low | 2<br><br>Low | 3<br><br>Med | 4<br><br>High | 5<br><br>Very High |
| FCO travel advice | No travel advice warnings. | No travel advice warnings. | All but essential travel advised to parts of or whole area. | Advice against all travel to parts or whole of area. | Assisted departure schemes and or Non-Combatant Evacuation (NEO) operations in place. |
| Host nation travel advice | No travel advice warnings. | No travel advice warnings. | All but essential travel advised to parts of or whole area. | Advice against all travel to parts or whole of area. | Assisted departure schemes and or Non-Combatant Evacuation (NEO) operations in place. |
| Transportation | Safe reliable public transport freely available at any time.<br><br>Roads in good condition with lighting near settlements and intersections. | Public transport available, occasional accidents and unreliability.<br><br>Roads in fair condition.<br><br>Traffic regulated in large | Public transport only advisable during day light hours and if no alternative.<br><br>Roads in poor condition but passable all year round. | Public transport unsafe to use.<br><br>Roads in very poor condition and passable only in fair weather.<br><br>No street lighting.<br><br>Occasional road | No public transport available.<br><br>Roads largely impassable.<br><br>Frequent road blocks.<br><br>Protected mobility vehicles required or |

| Theme | Risk rating* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1<br><br>Very Low | 2<br><br>Low | 3<br><br>Med | 4<br><br>High | 5<br><br>Very High |
| | Traffic well regulated.<br><br>Vehicle condition regulated.<br><br>Roads well mapped/Good GPS coverage.<br><br>Frequent service/rest areas. | settlements.<br><br>Vehicle condition generally fair.<br><br>Roads mapped/fair GPS coverage.<br><br>Occasional service/rest areas. | Little or no street lighting.<br><br>Little traffic regulation.<br><br>Vehicles in poor condition.<br><br>Roads poorly mapped/patchy GPS coverage.<br><br>Infrequent service/rest areas. | blocks.<br><br>Vehicles mainly 4x4 or large utility vehicles.<br><br>Trained and/or experienced drivers recommended.<br><br>Guides necessary.<br><br>Maps scarce/scant detail/limited GPS coverage.<br><br>No service/rest areas.<br><br>Occasional banditry. | recommended.<br><br>Trained/experienced drivers essential.<br><br>Guides essential.<br><br>Roads unmapped/GPS unreliable.<br><br>Spares, fuel and sundries must be carried.<br><br>Frequent banditry. |
| Security<br><br>Contact DFID security for updated position.<br><br><br>*"high threat post" =<br><br>location requiring *security in high threat post SHTP* training.<br><br><br>**"very high threat post" = location requiring *hostile environment HET or hostile environment awareness training HEAT*. | Country threat is assessed as low- an attack is unlikely.<br><br>UK diplomatic threat is assessed as low- an attack is unlikely.<br><br>UK official/Military threat is assessed as low- an attack is unlikely.<br><br>UK linked organisations threat is assessed as low- an attack is unlikely. | Country threat is assessed as moderate- an attack is possible, but not likely.<br><br>UK diplomatic threat is assessed as moderate- an attack is possible, but not likely.<br><br>UK official/military threat is assessed as moderate- an attack is possible, but not likely.<br><br>UK linked organisation threat is assessed as moderate- an attack is possible, but not likely. | Location is defined as 'High Threat Post'.*<br><br>Country threat is substantial- an attack is a strong possibility.<br><br>UK diplomatic threat is assessed as moderate- an attack is a strong possibility.<br><br>UK official/military threat is assessed as moderate- an attack is a strong possibility.<br><br>UK linked organisation threat is assessed as moderate- an attack is a strong possibility. | Location is defined as 'High Threat Post'.*<br><br>Country threat is severe- an attack is highly likely.<br><br>UK diplomatic threat is severe- an attack is highly likely.<br><br>UK official/military threat is severe- an attack is highly likely.<br><br>UK linked organisations threat is severe- an attack is highly likely. | Location is defined as 'Very High Threat Post'.**<br><br>Country threat is critical – an attack is expected imminently.<br><br>UK diplomatic threat is critical – an attack is expected imminently.<br><br>UK official/military threat is critical – an attack is expected imminently.<br><br>UK linked organisations threat is critical – an attack is expected imminently. |
| Civil unrest | No public protest or tension. | Rising tension. Sustained, isolated, minor unrest.<br><br>Unrest in specific areas, effective policing, no widespread problems. | Sustained and serious unrest. Police control limited.<br><br>Threat of serious widespread unrest. | Sustained, serious and widespread unrest.<br><br>Police lose control of situation.<br><br>British Nationals are specifically targeted. | Sustained, serious and widespread unrest.<br><br>Police lose control of situation.<br><br>British Nationals are specifically targeted. No commercial transport available. |

| Theme | Risk rating* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1<br><br>Very Low | 2<br><br>Low | 3<br><br>Med | 4<br><br>High | 5<br><br>Very High |
| Violence/crime | Violence/crime assessed as '5' | Violence/crime assessed as '4' | Violence/crime assessed as '3' | Violence/crime assessed as '2' | Violence/crime assessed as '1' |
| Espionage<br><br>Contact DFID security for updated position. | Espionage threat assessed as 'e' | Espionage threat assessed as 'd' | Espionage threat assessed as 'c' | Espionage threat assessed as 'b' | Espionage threat assessed as 'a' |
| Terrorism<br><br>Contact DFID security for updated position. | Terrorism risk assessed as Foxtrot | Terrorism risk assessed as Echo | Terrorism risk assessed as Charlie/Delta | Terrorism risk assessed as Bravo | Terrorism risk assessed as Alpha |
| War | No identified threat | | Threat of intra or inter National war.<br><br>Identified pre- or post- conflict environment. | War declared/evident.<br><br>Controlled hostilities between martial forces. Limited civilian casualties and collateral damage to infrastructure. | All out war.<br><br>Uncontrolled hostilities including widespread civilian casualties and collateral damage to infrastructure. |
| Hurricane | No identified threat | Category 4 (or significant impact) Hurricane expected in 2-5 days | Category 4 (or significant impact) Hurricane expected within 72 hours. | Category 4 (or significant impact) hurricane expected within 48hrs.<br><br>Serious concern about British National safety. | Cat 4 (or significant impact) hurricane expected within 24-48hrs that threatens lives of British Nationals.<br><br>Post-hurricane devastation or insecurity causes serious concern about BNs safety. No commercial transport available. |
| Earthquake<br><br>Location, foundations and seismic design of buildings will have a mitigating effect. | No identified risk | 10% Probability of 0.2 – 0.7 m/s peak ground acceleration in 50 years. | Widespread damage to buildings, break-down in services (eg water, electricity,), or/and some breakdown in law and order.<br><br>10% Probability of 40.8 – 2.3 m/s peak ground acceleration in 50 years. | Devastation leads to widespread insecurity.<br><br>10% Probability of 2.4-3.9 m/s peak ground acceleration in 50 years. | Devastation leads to widespread insecurity.<br><br>No commercial transport available.<br><br>10% Probability of 4.0-4.8 m/s peak ground acceleration in 50 years. |
| Flood | No identified risk | Localised damage to buildings, break down in services, and/or some breakdown in law and order. | Widespread damage to buildings, break-down in services (eg water, electricity,), or/and some breakdown in law and order. | Devastation leads to widespread insecurity. | Devastation leads to widespread insecurity.<br><br>No commercial transport available |

| Theme | Risk rating* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1<br><br>Very Low | 2<br><br>Low | 3<br><br>Med | 4<br><br>High | 5<br><br>Very High |
| Medical Services<br><br>(TBC by HWW) | Full access to high quality medical services for emergency treatment and treatment of illness.<br><br>Safe and reliable ambulance services. | Limited access to quality medical services.<br><br>Road ambulances unreliable.<br><br>Air ambulance available. | Very limited access to emergency medical facilities.<br><br>Road ambulances unavailable.<br><br>Air ambulance available. | Very limited access to emergency medical facilities e.g. field hospitals for basic life-saving surgery.<br><br>No air ambulance available. | No access to medical facilities.<br><br>Reliant on own medics/equipment.<br><br>No air ambulance available. |
| **Nature of Project/**<br><br>**Intervention** | Intervention has full popular support, cultural compatibility, positive media coverage and backing of local and national civil leadership.<br><br>Intervention is welcomed and encouraged by influential religious/ideological groups.<br><br>Intervention has no relationship to governmental corruption, organised crime or narcotics. | Intervention has broad popular support, cultural compatibility, neutral or no media coverage, and backing of local civil leadership.<br><br>Intervention is tolerated by influential religious/ideological groups.<br><br>Intervention has no direct relationship to governmental corruption, organised crime or narcotics. | Intervention has some popular support, some cultural incompatibility, negative media coverage, and acquiescence of civil leadership.<br><br>Intervention is controversial to influential religious/ideological groups.<br><br>Intervention has a relationship to governmental corruption, organised crime or narcotics. | Intervention has limited popular support, some cultural incompatibility, unsupportive media coverage, and has some opposition by local or national civil leadership.<br><br>Intervention is opposed by some influential religious/ideological groups.<br><br>Intervention has a significant bearing on governmental corruption, organised crime or narcotics. | Intervention has very limited popular support, significant cultural incompatibility, unsupportive media coverage, and significant opposition by local or national civil leadership.<br><br>Intervention is strongly opposed by influential religious/ideological groups.<br><br>Intervention has strong bearing on governmental corruption, organised crime or narcotics |