Department for International Development

UKaid from the British people

Khulisa Management Services
26, 7th Ave,
Parktown North
Johannesburg 2193
South Africa

Abercrombie House
Eaglesham Road
EAST KILBRIDE
Glasgow
G75 8EA

Telephone: East Kilbride
Directline:

File Ref: PO7446

Your Ref:

Date: 21th September 2017

Contract Amendment No: 1

CONTRACT FOR: Strengthening African Networks for Governance, Accountability & Transparency (SANGAT II)

CONTRACT NUMBER: PO7446

With reference to the contractual letter dated 03rd November 2016 whereby your firm was engaged to carry out the Terms of Reference as set out at Section 3 of the contract, I confirm that the UK Government wishes to make the following further amendments to the letter of 03rd November 2016 in accordance with the revised Inception Report dated 15th May 2017 and subsequent revised Commercial Proforma 4, dated 15th August 2017.

Section 3, Terms of Reference

Delete: In Toto.
Insert: Terms of Reference (Addendum 1, Section 7 revised)

Section 4, Special Conditions

Insert: Condition 12 – Acceptance of Planned Milestones

"Implementation Phase milestones have been agreed and formally incorporated by way of Contract Amendment No 1. Due to the flexible and adaptive nature of the programme, there is a need for adequate provision to deal with variations on an ad hoc basis without affecting the service delivery. Any such changes that impact the Payment Schedule will be agreed and recorded with DFID, before implementation, with any necessary revisions to the Payment Schedule being formally captured with the next request for formal amendment. This should be monitored and managed on an ongoing basis (i.e. as a standing agenda item in routine progress meetings etc.), collaboratively with DFID Africa Regional Department."

Section 5 – Schedule of Prices

Delete: Proforma 4 (original)
Insert: Proforma 4 (attached)

2.   This amendment relates to the transition from Inception to Implementation Phase, incorporating a revised ToR and Milestone Payment Schedule accordingly. This revision is in accordance with the PO7446 Terms and Conditions, with no increase to the financial limit of the programme

3. Please confirm in writing by signing and returning one copy of this letter, within 15 working days of the date of signature on behalf of DFID that you accept the amendment set out herein.

4. Please note the provision in the contractual letter, that the financial limit of the UK Government's liability to the Supplier under this engagement shall not exceed the sum specified, unless the amount of any such excess has been agreed by the Department for International Development in writing before the Supplier takes any action which might result in the financial limit being exceeded.

For and on behalf of the

Name:

**Secretary of State
for International Development**

Position: Procurement and Commercial Specialist

Signature:

Date:

For and on behalf of

Name:

Khulisa Management Services

Position:

Signature:

Date:

Encl:
Revised ToR
Revised Proforma 4

Section 3
Terms of Reference (Addendum issued with CA#1)

Evaluation design and delivery

Strengthening African Networks for Governance, Accountability and Transparency (SANGAT II) Programme – Phase II

1. Introduction

General Background:

DFID Africa Regional Department (ARD (Pretoria)) seeks to appoint a supplier to provide evaluation services to the Strengthening African Networks for Governance, Accountability and Transparency Programme – Phase II (SANGAT II). The supplier will design and deliver an evaluation of the SANGAT II programme, tailored to the work of three regional governance networks. This will follow the approach set out in the business cases (SANGAT II and Twende Mbele) and evaluability assessment and guidance note, described further below and attached as annexes 1 (a and b) , 2 and 3 to the TOR. The TOR will include fine-tuning the M&E framework developed in the SANGAT inception phase as well as establishing clear, measurable and reliable baseline data at the outset of SANGAT phase II. The supplier will also provide a small amount of M&E technical support to partners, through the life of the programme, to ensure their monitoring processes are capturing the data required for evaluation.

Note:
DFID is no longer supporting the African Prosecutors Association (APA), one of the networks included in the SANGAT II business case. The Twende Mbele programme, on the other hand, referred to in the evaluability assessment and the M&E guidance, is now a standalone programme, but maintains links with the SANGAT II components with the Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network of Southern Africa (ARINSA) and the Collaborative Africa Budget Reform Initiative (CABRI). The external evaluation will cover these three networks' programmes.

Programme background:

Through the SANGAT II programme, the UK will support three regional networks to improve transparency and accountability in Africa. The intervention has a dual purpose of enhancing regional cooperation to tackle transnational organised crime and corruption, and strengthening national systems of governance for more effective management of public funds.

The UK will provide up to £3,330,556, between November 2016 and March 2018[1], with funding from ARD (Pretoria)'s Regional Programme. This programme will continue the support provided to two regional networks during a successful inception year (SANGAT I): the Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network of Southern Africa (ARINSA), and the Collaborative Africa Budget Reform Initiative (CABRI), as well as to the Twende Mbele programme. The South African Department for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation leads this programme in collaboration with the Centres for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR), based at the University of the Witwatersrand.

Programme activities:

The programme will take a regional networking and peer learning approach to tackle common governance challenges in Africa. SANGAT II focuses on increasing transparency and accountability to provide the institutional foundations that will allow for better development outcomes and inclusive growth for the poor. The main activities are:

---

[1] The external evaluation can continue up to November 2019 to cover the Twende Mbele programme, subject to satisfactory completion of the milestones; agreement with DFID about continuing past the agreed break clauses; and subject to changes in the individual programmes' implementation duration.

- Combatting transnational and domestic organised crime, and seizing illegal assets by: strengthening legislation, policies, systems and practices; training investigators and prosecutors; and enhancing information exchange, coordination and cooperation between regional actors;
- Strengthening public financial management (PFM) in a way that counters corruption and supports pro-poor budgeting by: increasing transparent and accountable management of public funds, both in public delivery sectors and in the management of revenues from extractives.

Twende Mbele will tackle common challenges to monitoring and evaluating government performance in Africa. The main activities are:

- Supporting the measurement of progress on implementing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through indicators aligned with National Development Plans; strengthening officials' analytical capabilities to account for government spending; collecting and using evidence to inform decision making; and evaluating government efforts to deliver development outcomes for women and girls, vulnerable and disadvantaged groups.

SANGAT II and Twende Mbele will focus on supporting partners in the region to find local solutions to common challenges. The three networks are led by South African institutions with expertise in combatting transnational crime and PFM, as well as monitoring and evaluating performance, and they have trusted and well established network partners across Africa.

Need for UK support:

UK support is required to strengthen and expand the work that the networks have done during the inception phase. Transnational crime and illicit financial flows (IFFs) are regional challenges that threaten the rule of law, weaken the fabric of the state, inhibit economic growth and the government's ability to generate revenues and deliver public services. Even conservative estimates show that African states lose billions of pounds annually through IFFs – funds that could have been spent on effective development. It is also in the UK's national security interests to combat IFFs and associated transnational crime, including money laundering and people trafficking.

Whilst there are many national efforts to address accountable and transparent governance, these follow traditional approaches largely driven by donors. They also focus on country level solutions without supporting regional solutions to transboundary problems. By contrast, supporting Pan-African regional networks, driven by South African technical expertise and political commitment, responds to national needs, supports regional problem-solving, and is a more sustainable approach for the UK.

Data collection and analysis remains a challenge in many developing countries in Africa. The countries participating in this programme will benefit from strengthening their M&E systems to determine how their interventions can most effectively reduce poverty, foster inclusive economic growth, and deliver better development. Improved data and analysis are needed to measure progress on implementing the SDGs, and to tackle the social and gender inequalities that most countries in the region face.

The publication of data can also help citizens hold their governments to account and demand better services. While there are many national efforts to address accountable and transparent governance, these follow traditional, largely donor-driven, approaches. By contrast, supporting Pan-African networks, driven by South African technical expertise and political commitment, is new and driven by peer learning benefits that national governments have realised.

Impact and outcome that we expect to achieve:

SANGAT II seeks to combat transnational crime and strengthen PFM in participating countries. It focuses on enhancing transparency and accountability in institutions to deliver:

Overall impact: Improved National Governance Systems.

Overall outcomes:

Short term (2018):

- Linked to network activities, evidence of implementation or changes in enabling environment (filling gaps)
- Strengthened legislation, policies, systems, practices and procedures

Medium Term:

- Network continues to
  - Develop
  - Adapt
  - Respond to needs
- Effectively implemented practices, systems, policies and procedures

This overall results framework also includes the Twende Mbele programme for the purposes of the external evaluation.

Programme components

Effective action to track, trace and seize the proceeds of corruption and crime will:

- contribute to better resource mobilisation for tackling poverty, for example when the state can accurately estimate expected income in the extractives sector and investigate and prosecute shortfalls;
- reduce impunity for those who abuse office; and
- pay for itself: a proportion of all assets recovered will be ring-fenced to fund maintaining and developing government capacity to disrupt, investigate and prosecute corruption and crime.

Twende Mbele seeks to strengthen government M&E systems and practices as tools for improving government performance and accountability.

The project has

a **wider outcome** (the medium-term results for specific beneficiaries, "what we wish to achieve"): Effective M&E systems (eg practices, policies, tools and procedures) implemented widely and sustained in partner and other countries with ongoing collaboration across Africa around M&E; and

an **immediate outcome** (the short-term results, "what we wish to achieve by end of project"): Improved M&E systems (eg practices, policies, tools and procedures) based on shared experience established in partner countries and more widely.

Background to Evaluation:

In order to build the evidence base in relation to regional peer networks, in 2014 DFID Southern Africa (DFIDSA)[2] commissioned an evaluability assessment (Annex 2), an M&E Guidance Note (which includes original Theories of Change and logframes) (Annex 3) and the evaluability final report for the SANGAT (and Twende Mbele) programmes. On the basis of this assessment, DFID SA decided that an evaluation of SANGAT II and Twende Mbele is feasible. Though the detailed evaluation design will be delivered through this TOR, the evaluability assessment provided

---

[2] DFIDSA was a standalone DFID overseas office running a regional programme. It was merged with DFID's Africa Regional Department (ARD) in October 2016.

DFIDSA with a credible analysis of the type of evaluation that will be both feasible for a regional intervention of this complexity and can start to answer the questions of most interest to DFIDSA. Evaluation options were developed so that they can be conducted in sequence or as stand-alone evaluative processes. In consultation with EvD, it has been decided that DFIDSA will first conduct a network analysis (process evaluation), followed by a performance evaluation. The planned evaluation stages are:

- network analysis (process evaluation); and
- performance evaluation.

2. Purpose and Objectives

These Terms of Reference (TOR) have been revised in May 2017 following the successful conclusion of the inception phase of the external evaluation. There are two remaining evaluation stages with distinct purposes.

1. **Network Analysis and Process Evaluation:**

   The purpose of the network analysis is to test two hypotheses:

   - Regional networks are an effective way for multiple actors to learn from each other and build commitment to improving processes and procedures; and
   - Peer-to-peer learning is an effective way of learning.

   The purpose of the process evaluation is to provide deeper understanding of the quality of SANGAT II and Twende Mbele's implementation to the level of its outputs.

2. **Outcome Evaluation:**

   The purpose of the outcome evaluation is to consider whether networks have achieved what they set out to achieve.

Khulisa will also continue to provide TA to ensure that the baselines (for Twende Mbele) and M&E systems (for all the networks) are robust and that network theories of change and logframes are aligned to the overall SANGAT II programme.

The three **objectives** are as follows:

Objective 1: Conduct Network Analysis/ process evaluation of the two Networks funded under SANGAT II and the network funded under Twende Mbele

The objective of the Network Analysis/ process evaluation is to better understand how regional peer networks deliver value to members and the extent to which they are improving governance outcomes. This will lay the foundations for the outcome evaluation. The process evaluation will provide deeper understanding of the quality of SANGAT II's and Twende Mbele's implementation to the level of its outputs. Specifically it should assess whether SANGAT II's and Twende Mbele's outputs are relevant and coherent in relation to what was originally agreed, planned and expected in terms of action.

Key evaluation questions for the network analysis would be embedded within three themes:

- Network Vibrancy: How healthy is the network along multiple dimensions (participation, network form, leadership, capacity, etc.)? What role had South Africa played?

- Network Connectivity: What is the nature of relationships within the network? Is everyone connected who needs to be? What is the quality of these connections? Does the network effectively bridge differences? Is the network becoming more interconnected? What is the network's reach?
- Network Effects: What progress is the network making on identifying and achieving its outputs, outcomes and impact? What role does South Africa have in this?

Khulisa refined the evaluation questions with the network partners during the inception phase. These include questions from DFID ARD's Macro-Evaluation of Regional Approaches (MERA) framework as far as they fit the work already started during the inception phase. See Section 4 - Scope for the refined and agreed evaluation questions.

In order to evaluate networks, the complexity and specific characteristics around them must be understood. This includes the need to develop appropriate network metrics around vibrancy, connectivity and effects, and gathering comparable and consistent data across the network and, where appropriate, between the networks. A network's current stage of development has implications for evaluation both in terms of what network metrics will be most meaningful and how much and what kind of progress towards outcomes can be expected. Therefore, network analysis will need to be applied flexibly across the different networks building on the inception phase findings (see final inception report, pp. 12-13) and section 5 – methodology of these TOR.

Objective 2: Design and deliver an outcome evaluation of the SANGAT II and Twende Mbele programmes:

The theory-based outcome evaluation would be based on the premise that:

- A robust identification and analysis of the external environment is carried out.
- The evaluation will focus at examining the results of individual partners and not at high level statements that incorporate each of their results.

An outcome evaluation would consider whether networks have achieved what they set out to achieve, i.e. delivered their outputs and outcomes, and contributed to impacts. It would evaluate SANGAT II's contribution towards its own stated outcomes and impacts within the context that it operates: i.e., effective practices, systems, policies and procedures implemented to a) contribute to better resource mobilisation for tackling poverty, for example the state can accurately estimate expected income in the extractives sector and investigate and prosecute shortfalls; b) reduce impunity for those who abuse office; c) a proportion of all assets recovered are ring-fenced and are now funding improved government capacity to disrupt, investigate and prosecute corruption and crime. The outcome evaluation will take place during the intervention's lifecycle. High level evaluation questions are also set out in section 4.

A mixed methods approach would assess whether any observed contribution could reasonably be attributed to the intervention. This would need to be considered for each of the partners individually. This approach should map out the following:

- The causal chain (programme theory of each partner's work). This already exists - see the M&E Guidance Note (Annex 3) for more details.
- Understanding of the political economy context in each of the member countries.
- How to anticipate heterogeneity of results, i.e. differences in social political setting, target groups and the existence of other interventions.
- Incorporation of appropriate approaches such as case studies, process tracing, contribution analysis, and participatory approaches such as outcome mapping. The approach will need to define how any attribution of results to the programme is understood.

– Incorporation of thematic comparative reviews which allow for comparison between the networks – e.g. on VfM and gender as DFID cross-cutting thematic areas; but also areas such as leadership and other aspects of technical assistance (TA).

Evaluating the work of individual partners will need a functioning M&E system in place (see objective 3) that would focus data collection at the output to outcome level, for example outcome mapping. The service provider will need to work with the individual networks to ensure this is in place.

The outcome evaluation would follow OECD-DAC guidelines and would be in line with the Paris Principles[3]. The service provider would be expected to involve key stakeholders including relevant government departments in Southern Africa region and civil society groups so there is ownership in the evaluation process. Key partners include the national prosecuting agencies of ARINSA member states, finance ministries in CABRI member states, the South African national Prosecuting Authority, The UNODC and the Foundation for Professional Development. Evaluation advisory input may be sought from South Africa's Department for Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation.

The service provider would expand upon the above and design and deliver an outcome evaluation of SANGAT II. The design should use the analysis presented in the evaluability assessment at Annex 2 as a starting point.

Objective 3: Provide proportionate technical assistance to ARINSA, CABRI and Twende Mbele networks to ensure that the baseline and M&E systems are robust:

Whilst there is M&E guidance, logframes and theories of change in place for each network (Annex 3), the service provider will need to allocate some technical assistance resources to support the networks in data collection and management. This includes:

– Fine tuning the M&E framework developed in the SANGAT inception phase as well as establishing clear, measurable and reliable baseline data at the outset of SANGAT phase II.
– Providing a proportionate and targeted amount of M&E technical support to partners, through the life of the programme, to ensure their monitoring processes are capturing the data required for evaluation.
– Regular coordination and liaison with M&E focal points in each network as each stage of the evaluation progresses.
– Targeted remote M&E support to network members (to be cleared with DFID in advance of each request).

It is not expected that objective 3 will require a large and sustained input throughout the programme although there would be a more concentrated investment of time in the inception phase to establish systems. The service provider would use the M&E guidance presented in Annex 3 as a starting point.

3. Recipient

---

[3] *There are 5 fundamental Paris Declaration principles:* *1. Ownership:* Developing countries set their own strategies for poverty reduction, improve their institutions and tackle corruption. *2. Alignment:* Donor countries align behind these objectives and use local systems. *3. Harmonisation:* Donor countries coordinate, simplify procedures and share information to avoid duplication. *4. Results:* Developing countries and donors shift focus to development results and results get measured. *5. Mutual accountability:* Donors and partners are accountable for development results.

The recipient for the network analysis and evaluation will be DFID Africa Regional Department and programme partners of the SANGAT II programme.

Target Audiences for the Evaluation:

- The South Africa National Prosecution Authority
- The Collaborative Africa Budget Reform Initiative
- ARINSA and CABRI member states
- The UNODC
- DFID Staff
- Donor partner agencies
- PFM networks
- Prosecutor's networks
- Academics and civil society focussed on governance reforms
- Asset forfeiture specialist agencies
- PFM specialised agencies
- U4 and other anti-corruption think-tanks
- Partners in the Twende Mbele programme:
    o the South African Department for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation;
    o the Centres for Learning on Evaluation and Results;
    o the partner countries participating in the programme.

The service provider will be expected to produce an accessible summary report or briefing paper/presentation highlighting the evaluation findings and lessons for a wider target audience (as identified above).

4. Scope

The service provider provided TA to the three networks to fine-tune their M&E frameworks, including logframes, to ensure they are fit for purpose. They discussed the approach to the network analysis in consultation with DFID and the networks during the inception phase

During the next phase (Network Analysis and Process Evaluation), Khulisa will

- design of the network analysis / process evaluation and outcome evaluation;
- continue to work with DFID, the SANGAT II and Twende Mbele partners to
    o develop a baseline for Twende Mbele;
    o assist ARINSA and CABRI, which are almost at the end of the programme, to retrofit their data in cases where baseline data are missing, where applicable
    o and ensure that the M&E frameworks, including logframes, are finalised and fit for purpose. This means that they must provide a viable basis for monitoring progress towards achieving the intended programme objectives as well as for the full external evaluation.
- Khulisa is expected to continue providing TA intermittently to the network partners throughout the duration of the programme.

The details of this engagement are laid out in section 7 on timeframe and deliverables below.

Key evaluation questions:

Khulisa refined the evaluation questions during the inception phase. These will be reviewed at each stage of the evaluation. The key high-level questions for the performance evaluation include:

1. **How effective are the networks in leveraging development outcomes and building regional capacity?**
   a. How do the different partners engage their networks to influence development outcomes?
   b. What were the most effective approaches to building capacity?
   c. To what extent are the outcomes sustainable?

2. **To what extent, if any, do regional peer-to-peer networks have a positive effect on the quality of governance at a national level in participating member states?**
   a. How do different peer-to-peer networks bring about change?
   b. To what extent are the networks sustainable?
   c. What role did context play in achieving these results?
   d. Are there tools and systems in place to measure how budgets impact the most vulnerable in society including women?
   e. Has the money derived from seized assets led to an increase in spending on programmes that benefit the most vulnerable, including women? For example: water and sanitation programmes?

These have been refined and agreed as follows:

Evaluation Phase	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Illustrative indicators / assessment criteria	Data source / collection method
Network analysis: network vibrancy	Q1. How healthy is the network along multiple dimensions (participation, network form, leadership, capacity, etc.)?	Q1.1 What role has South Africa played? Q1.2 What are the characteristics and roles of the network secretariats?	• Network health index score. • Quality (timeliness, openness, relevance, accuracy) of communications with South African secretariats/ management committees. • Level to which the South African secretariat/ management committee meets the needs of network members. • Regularity of communication with the South African secretariat/ management committee. • Responsiveness of South African secretariat/ management committee to member requests.	• Network health check survey • Network analysis/ process evaluation survey
Network analysis: network connectivity	Q.2 What is the nature of relationships within the network?	Q.2.1 Is everyone connected who needs to be?	• Stakeholder level of interaction on stakeholder map.	• Collaboration mapping exercise
		Q 2.2 What is the quality of these connections?	• Stakeholder level of interaction and strength of relationship on stakeholder map.	• Collaboration mapping exercise
		Q 2.3 What is the value to network members of relationships established as a result of participating in the network?	• Overall value of relationships between members as a result of participating in the network (member rating).	• Network analysis/ process evaluation survey
	Q3 (MERA EQ 1.7) To what extent have there been adequate linkages between the regional programme's country level activities and related regional activities?	NA	• Stakeholder strength of interaction on stakeholder map	• Collaboration mapping exercise
	Q.4 Does the network effectively bridge differences?	NA	• Perception of network secretariat on ways in which the network bridges differences.	• Key informant interview
	Q. 5 Is the network becoming more interconnected?	NA	• Stakeholder financial influence, non-financial influence, level of interaction, and strength of relationship on stakeholder map.	• Collaboration mapping exercise
	Q.6 What is the network's reach?	NA	• Network membership.	• Project documents (provided by networks)

Evaluation Phase	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Illustrative indicators / assessment criteria	Data source / collection method
	Q. 7 What network models are being used?	Q 7.1 (MERA EQ 3.1) How have the programme's operational forms been successful, or unsuccessful, in working regionally and supporting/building regional and national capacities in Africa, and why?	• Type of model that best describes the network (member rating).	• Network analysis/ process evaluation survey
Network analysis: network effects	Q.8 What progress is the network making on identifying and achieving its outputs and outcomes?	Q 8.1 What role does South Africa have in this?	• Number of network goals correctly identified by network members • Extent to which outcomes have been achieved (member rating) • Quality (timeliness, openness, relevance, accuracy) of communications with South African secretariats/ management committees. • Level to which the South African secretariat/ management committee meets the needs of network members. • Regularity of communication with the South African secretariat/ management committee. • Responsiveness of South African secretariat/ management committee to member requests.	• Network health check survey • Network analysis/ process evaluation survey
Process evaluation	Q.9 Are the activities and outputs of the networks consistent with SANGAT II's intended outcomes?	NA	• Level of coherence in the design of activities and outputs aiming to strengthen and implement (operationalise) legislation, policies, systems, practices and procedures; to develop, adapt and respond to needs; and to fill gaps (enact change) in the enabling environment.	• Document analysis (provided by networks) • Key informant interviews
	Q.10 To what extent have the networks achieved their activities and outputs?	Q 10.1 Did the activities forecast in annual work plans take place and according to schedule?	• Level of compliance of the implementation of activities with annual work plans.	• Document analysis (provided by networks) • Key informant interviews
		Q.10.2 Were the activities effective in achieving the intended outputs?	• Number of outputs achieved • Quality of outputs achieved (against rating matrix) • Perception of network secretariats and DFID on the effectiveness of activities in achieving the intended outputs.	• Document analysis (provided by networks) • Key informant interviews

Evaluation Phase	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Illustrative indicators / assessment criteria	Data source / collection method
		Q. 10.3 What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the networks' outputs and how did the networks respond?	• External factors (secretariat identification). • Existence of risk mitigation process (identification of the potential, risk mitigation framework, process of research /implementation of risk mitigation solutions) – External risks	• Document analysis (provided by networks) • Key informant interviews
	Q.11 Did the networks take local context into account and how?	NA	• Existence of processes for integrating local context into activities.	• Document analysis (provided by networks) • Key informant interviews
	Q.12 To what extent, if any, is the SANGAT II programme more effective and efficient than providing individual technical assistance support?	Q 12.1 What are the most effective approaches to building capacity and why?	• Perceptions of network members on most effective approaches to initiating change in –country (member rating) • Perceptions of network members on relative value of network versus traditional technical assistance (member rating) • Perception of network secretariats on the relative effectiveness of different approaches to building capacity.	• Network analysis/ process evaluation survey • Key informant interviews
		Q 12.2 (MERA EQ 3.1) How have the programme's operational forms been successful, or unsuccessful, in working regionally and supporting/building regional and national capacities in Africa, and why?		
Outcome evaluation	Q.13 How effective are the networks in leveraging development outcomes and building regional capacity?	Q 13.1 How do the different partners engage their networks to influence development outcomes?	• Existence of network engagement strategies. • Performance on progress markers measuring change in boundary partner behaviour (against rating matrix).	• Document analysis (provided by networks) • Outcome mapping workshop
		Q 13.2 To what extent are the outcomes sustainable?	• Existence of evidence of institutional knowledge and capacity (participation, satisfaction, learning) • Existence of technical, political and legislative champions (member identification)	• Network post-event surveys (provided by networks) • Network analysis/ process evaluation survey
	Q. 14 To what extent do regional networks have a positive effect on governance at	Q 14.1 How do different peer-to-peer networks bring about change?	• Comparison of network approaches • Perception of network members on the effectiveness of their networks in terms of bringing about change.	• Literature review • Key Informant Interviews/ Focus Groups

Evaluation Phase	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Illustrative indicators / assessment criteria	Data source / collection method
	a national level in participating member states?	Q 14.2 To what extent are the networks sustainable?	• Existence of evidence of institutional knowledge and capacity (participation, satisfaction, learning)	• Network post-event surveys (provided by networks)
		Q 14.3 What role did context play in achieving results?	• Documentation of role of context in achieving results.	• Key informant interviews
		Q 14.4 Are there tools and systems in place to measure how budgets impact the most vulnerable in society including women?	• Evidence of existence of tools and systems to measure impact of budgets on the most vulnerable.	• Document analysis (provided by networks)
		Q 14.5 What examples, if any, are there of national and/or regional change as a result of the networks?	• Evidence of impact	• Impact stories (provided by networks)
		Q. 14.6 Is there active participation between the targeted governments and each of the three regional networks?	• Performance on progress markers showing evidence of government participation	• Outcome mapping
		Q. 14.7 For ARINSA only: How have the partnerships contributed to national level governance and tackling trans-boundary problems?	• Performance on progress markers showing evidence partnerships' contribution to national level governance and tackling trans-boundary problems.	• Outcome mapping
		Q. 14.8 For ARINSA only: Has the programme contributed to more women with skills in government offices?	• Percentage of women trained compared to the percentage of men trained through the Prosecutor Placement Programme and Capacity Building Workshops	• Network training attendance data • Document analysis (provided by networks) • Network post-event surveys (provided by networks)
	Q. 15 Are regional networks an effective means of initiating change at national levels?	NA	• Perception of the value of networks for initiating change in accountability, participation, and transparency of national governance.	• Key informant interviews

As outlined in the table above, the service provider will also include evaluation questions from DFID ARD's Macro-Evaluation of Regional Approaches (MERA) framework as far as they fit the work already started during the inception phase (they were not included in the original SANGAT II evaluation TOR

The following questions related to the MERA EQs will be incorporated into the SANGAT II existing methodologies

MERA EQ	OECD DAC Criteria	Related SANGAT II EQ	Notes
1.7 To what extent have there been adequate linkages between the regional programme's country level activities and related activities?	Effectiveness	N/A	• Khulisa will add this question to the Collaboration Mapping in the Implementation Phase **Output/Process evaluation** • Responses will be obtained from the perspective of the network members • This assumes a definition of 'adequate linkages' is not required
3.1 How have the programme's operational forms been successful, or unsuccessful, in working regionally and supporting/building regional and national capacities in Africa, and why?	Relevance	Q6 What network models are being used?	• This question was slightly revised from the initial MERA evaluation question • The different network models will be the operational forms • This questions is also related to capacity building questions

Extensive review and discussion between DFID ARD and Khulisa concluded that none of the suggested Sustainability and Efficiency questions would fit well into the SANGAT II evaluation, which had already been commissioned while the MERA framework was being developed. However, Khulisa's work will feed back into the MERA framework, as Khulisa's evaluation questions 5 and 6 are of interest for MERA on the sustainability and efficiency of the different models.

The Service Provider will address the MERA EQs outlined above within the current financial constraints of the SANGAT II evaluation, and will integrate the MERA-related findings into the reports to DFID.

5. Methodology

6. Khulisa's work will be informed by the inception phase report, which in turn draws on the evaluability assessment carried out in 2015.

The service provider will take a mixed methods approach for delivering the objectives set out in section 2. DFID expects that delivering on this TOR will include a combination of desk based and in-country work as well as remote technical support and data gathering from partner focal points. Travel to member countries will need to be carefully targeted and strictly based on evaluation needs. The service provider should factor in the fact that each network has an annual general meeting in Africa (on rotation) which provides an opportunity for engagement and face to face meetings with a range of network partners in one location.

The SP will deliver:

Objective 1: Conduct Network Analysis and process evaluation of the three networks funded under SANGAT II and Twende Mbele

Khulisa reviewed the literature around network analysis during the inception phase. The implications of the literature review for the evaluation of the SANGAT II networks are as follows:

1. Identification of how network members contribute to and participate in a network is important towards understanding how well a network is functioning.
2. How networks connect with other networks is important towards understanding the health of a network.
3. Identification of common goals and a shared purpose is important towards measuring the success of a network.
4. Understanding the characteristics of a network steward (e.g. secretariat) is important for understanding the effectiveness of a network.
5. Understanding where networks lie on a continuum from formal to informal is necessary for understanding the potential of the network to innovate.
6. Identification of the extent to which a network is centralised versus decentralised is important towards understanding the ability of the network to solve simple versus complex problems.

These aspects will be incorporated into the network analysis for this evaluation along with the questions below:

- Network Vibrancy: What are the characteristics and roles of the network secretariats?
- Network Connectivity: What is the value to network members of relationships established as a result of participating in the network?
- Network Connectivity: What network models are being used?

Khulisa's work will be informed by the inception phase report, which in turn draws on the evaluability assessment carried out in 2015. Khulisa will use collaboration mapping as a participatory learning tool that will provide the evaluation team with a good sense of the vibrancy and connectivity of each network, and will indicate where the network secretariats should concentrate in terms of growing and developing relationships already fostered.

Khulisa completed a network "health check" during the inception phase. It has provided a baseline of the current status of the networks in relation to their connectivity, vibrancy and effects so that metrics can be tailored appropriately to each network in the next phase of the evaluation. To build on this baseline, Khulisa will run another survey with the networks further along in the implementation phase. For this survey, Khulisa will build on the original health check survey and will also use elements from the Keystone Accountability and Scaling Impact Feedback Survey for Transnational Social Change Networks as a basis for the development of the wider survey. The latter survey has been selected by the evaluation team for its comparative analysis features, which will enable the evaluation team to show "how each network performs relative to the other networks in the group" (Keystone Accountability & Scaling Impact, 2014). It will also help to identify where performance is strong and where it is weak, allowing the evaluation team and the networks to clearly see areas for improvement.

For the network analysis, the evaluation team will work with DFID to include appropriate network metrics in the SANGAT II TOC that capture the vibrancy, connectivity and effects of the networks. Metrics will not be collected by network partners as the inception phase revealed that the network partners do not have M&E personnel and/or sufficiently robust systems in place to do so. Instead, the evaluation team proposes using the Collaboration Mapping learning exercise with the network

secretariats to graphically portray the networks' relationships and to determine the networks' connectivity (strength of relationship) and vibrancy (frequency of interaction). Network metrics will therefore be based on the results of the Collaboration Mapping exercise as well as the Network Health Check survey carried out during the inception phase.

Process evaluation

Khulisa will examine the following questions for the process evaluation, in line with the OECD DAC criteria, which Khulisa will refine in the implementation phase in consultation with DFID:

- Are the activities and outputs of the networks consistent with SANGAT II's intended outcomes?
- To what extent have the networks achieved their activities and outputs?
  - Did the activities forecast in annual work plans take place and according to schedule?
  - Were the activities effective in achieving the intended outputs?
  - What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the networks' outputs?
- Did the networks take local context into account and how?
- To what extent, if any, is the SANGAT II programme more effective and efficient than providing individual technical assistance support?
- What are the most effective approaches to building capacity and why?

The evaluation team will work with the network secretariats to conduct a Process Evaluation. The process evaluation will provide deeper understanding of SANGAT II and Twende Mbele's implementation to the level of its outputs. Specifically, it will assess whether ARINSA, CABRI and Twende Mbele's outputs are relevant and coherent in relation to what was originally agreed, planned and expected in terms of action. The process evaluation approach will follow the OECD DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency in evaluating the progress of the networks to output-level. It will also emphasise the development of a few standardised performance indicators across the three networks so that each network can be assessed both individually and collectively (i.e. across and between networks). **This will include the development of common Value for Money (VfM) indicators using the 3Es approach: Effectiveness, Efficiency, Economy.** Additionally, the evaluation team will provide the networks with indicator tracking tables and other documents to support the collection of valid and reliable output-level network data. The evaluation team will rely primarily on data provided through the networks' M&E systems to inform the process evaluation. The preliminary process evaluation questions are outlined in the section above.

Tools The inception phase report provides more information on the evaluation tools to be used and developed by the service provider (see pp. 23-24):

- Collaboration mapping;
- Network health check – this tool will be expanded in the implementation phase of the evaluation (see Annex 2 in the inception phase report, which is Annex 4 to these TOR);
- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and/or Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with staff members of the three networks, as well as with DFID SANGAT II programme managers and key informants in each state/country in which the networks operate, where possible.

Objective 2: Design and Deliver an Outcome Evaluation of the SANGAT II Programme

The SP will use Outcome Mapping (OM) as specified in the implementation report. OM is an appropriate evaluation approach that deals with systems perspectives and non-linear change,

and with the challenges faced by implementers in evaluating the results of networks. The OM approach undertaken in this evaluation will include the following:

A robust identification and analysis of both the external and internal environments/ forces affecting the implementation context for each network.

- An in-depth analysis of the causal chain/TOC , Theory of Action, and logframes of each partner.
- Review of the political economy context in a selection of member countries.
- Anticipation of and addressing heterogeneity of results (i.e. differences in social political settings, target groups and other interventions.)
- How the networks have or have not achieved their specified outputs and outcomes.

There are two phases to the Outcome Evaluation:

1. **Design**: the evaluation team will conduct an Outcome Mapping Workshop with the network secretariats and DFID to map the network, identify the boundary partners, and identify expected changes in the behaviour of boundary partners. The OM workshop will include basic training on the OM approach and what it entails.
2. **Implementation**: the evaluation team will conduct six country case studies for the three networks, each comprising
   a. an in-depth analysis; and
   b. valuing of the results achieved during the implementation of SANGAT II.

Reporting of results from the Outcome Evaluation will target comparisons between and within the networks and summarise these in detail through the case studies. In addition to gender and Value for Money (VfM) results from the Outcome Evaluation, other key DFID focus areas, including leadership, will be investigated and reported using the case study method.

Expert advisors, including advisory board members, will play a key role in the Outcome Evaluation. Their knowledge of and experience with the political, social, and economic environments of the targeted countries in Africa will be paramount in providing in-depth analyses of the results from the Outcome Mapping process. The Advisors will also provide access to key public and private sector officials in each country for KIIs, FGDs, and/or surveys.

The Outcome Evaluation will follow OECD-DAC guidelines and be in line with the Paris Principles. For example, the Outcome Evaluation will include assessments of the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability and follow the definitions of each of these criteria detailed in the DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance and Results Based Management. Findings will be assessed against the networks' targets, set in their logframes, and against the progress markers agreed upon with DFID and the networks during the Outcome Mapping workshop.

Tools

As set out in detail in the inception report, the evaluation team will use:

a **Progress Marker Checklist** at the Outcome Mapping Workshop during the design phase of the outcome evaluation. Progress markers will be set collaboratively with the network partners and DFID;

a **Case Study Tool** to conduct six country case studies with the three networks to explore the "causal links between the program and observed effects" (Better Evaluation, n.d.) and will involve

multiple methods to collect data. The main focus of the case studies will be on the contribution (versus attribution) of the network activities and outputs towards their outcomes;

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and/or Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with staff members of the three networks, as well as with DFID SANGAT II programme managers and key informants in each state/country in which the networks operate. KII and FGD guides will be developed collaboratively with input from DFID and the networks.

The SANGAT II network secretariats will conduct **Impact Stories** with participants at network events. The evaluation team will share the Impact Story template with the networks, so that they understand the purpose of the tool, and provide training on how to administer the tool. These stories will be collected, verified and coded by the evaluation team using a standardised rubric. The stories will be analysed and valued together with other evaluation data.

Data Analysis Quantitative: The SP evaluation team will analyse quantitative data using indices, descriptive statistics such as mean, median, mode and frequencies, as well as inferential statistics were possible. The findings will be enriched by triangulating the quantitative data with qualitative data. The development of all indices and matrices will be done in collaboration with DFID and the networks.

Qualitative: The SP evaluation team will use qualitative data analysis techniques to synthesise and interpret the qualitative data gathered through surveys, observations and interviews. The evaluation team will code and categorize the data, and where relevant, the software (Atlas.ti).

Objective 3: Support the three networks to ensure their theories of change and M&E systems are adequate to collect and use quality baseline and progress data.

This will focus on providing targeted technical assistance and training to the three networks and implementing partners. Khulisa carried out a thorough needs assessment and analysis of the specific TA required by each network and partner during the inception phase. Areas of TA include data collection, analysis, reporting and management.

Khulisa will provide technical assistance to ensure that the baseline (for Twende Mbele) and M&E systems (for all of the networks) are robust and that network theories of change and logframes are aligned to SANGAT II.

In addition, the DQA process (at both Secretariat & Country-Level) brought up the following recommendations to be taken forward during the second phase of the external evaluation (network analysis and process evaluation):

Khulisa will provide some support to structuring M&E processes at a secretariat level through limited technical assistance over the course of the evaluation. However, the networks – particularly ARINSA and CABRI – are generally under-resourced when it comes to M&E expertise and tailored M&E support; a problem to which short term technical assistance will not be able to provide a long-term solution. The recommendations below are based on the assumption that Khulisa will provide tailored assistance to the network secretariats to structure their M&E processes and that the secretariats, in turn, will adopt these processes and take them forward with their member countries.

Clarification of indicators, especially those that are being collected by member countries:

- Specifically for ARINSA, the secretariat, in collaboration with Khulisa, needs to clarify the case process flow of each member country, in order to determine at which points in the case process, data is collected to be reported to the secretariat. This is important to ensure that

each of the indicators are clearly defined and understood across member countries to ensure consistency and reliability. This will further ensure that indicators are SMART (specific, measurable, agreed, realistic, time-related). Preferably this clarification process should be communicated with the member countries at the next Annual General Meeting.

- With input from Khulisa, definitions of each indicator should be clarified across all three networks and communicated with member countries. Preferably this could take place at the networks' next Annual General Meetings (AGMs). Khulisa will provide indicator definition and tracking sheets that will need to be filled out by the network secretariats and shared at the network AGMs.

Clear data management processes (verification and quality control) need to be put in place:

- There is currently no data verification taking place at the ARINSA secretariat level. At the secretariat level of all three networks, including ARINSA, cross checking of quarterly and annual data that is reported by member countries should be undertaken. This will provide a means of verification of data being reported by member countries. Khulisa will provide a data management checklist, which will assist network secretariats in streamlining their data verification processes.
- For ARINSA member countries, an electronic case management system would allow for easier control and counting of cases at different steps of the case process. With this system in place, cases could be tracked across different law enforcement agencies and judicial authorities. However, the implementation of such a system would need to be funded and carried out at the member country level; outside of the control of the ARINSA secretariat. In the interim, or as an alternate, the ARINSA secretariat will need to put in place processes to verify the quality of the data received from member countries. Again, a data management checklist would assist with streamlining data verification processes.

Reporting of data on indicators:

Reporting of data from member countries should be done consistently, on a quarterly basis for all networks. This would enable easier reporting to DFID on a quarterly basis.

- All networks should consider including reporting requirements for member countries as part of their commitment to the network.
- A standard mentor report template should be agreed upon by ARINSA with inputs from mentors. This would allow for consistent capturing of data that can inform quarterly and annual reports. This may result in developing more than one mentor reporting template, tailored to the different stages of mentor support. Khulisa will review and provide recommendations to improving this template.
- A standard template for country points of contact should be developed on the basis of the DQA findings, which demonstrate that indicators are not understood or defined in a standardised way across different countries. To improve comparability, and enhance sustainability and localisation of the ARINSA monitoring and reporting system, reporting should increasingly come from member state officials. Khulisa will review and provide recommendations to improving this template.

Data tools to be revised:

- There is a need for data tools that are currently in place to be reviewed to ensure that the relevant indicators in the revised logical framework are included and to determine if additional questions can/should be added. Khulisa will review and provide recommendations to improving all tools.

- DfID is interested in documenting stories of change that capture the benefits of the network activities and being part of a network. This may not be well captured in the form of online surveys which generally see lower than expected response rates. An alternative could be to obtain stories of change l using an Impact Story tool, which can "paint a useful picture of which changes the intervention contributed to" (Williams & Chilalika, 2014: 2). Khulisa will provide an impact story tool to all networks, including instructions on how to administer the tool.

The key risks and challenges identified at the tender stage for this external evaluation remain in place. Khulisa will continue to manage these risks in line with the approach outlined in the inception report.

Risks or challenges:

- A key risk is the number of member states involved and the ability of SANGAT II partners to collect and verify data through the life of the programme. This will be mitigated through the refined logframe and baseline ensuring that data is captured from the outset.
- There is a risk that M&E systems are not sufficiently well established or robust to be maintained through the course of the programme.
- There is a challenge that some data may be sensitive and may not be publically available.
- As a regional programme, gathering data and conducting interviews with a wide range of national level stakeholders may be difficult and the SP will need to think of innovative solutions to this problem.
- Each of the three networks will have different M&E systems in place. The SP will need to consolidate approaches to ensure a coherent overall evaluation product.

7. Existing information sources

The following documents are available to the evaluation team:

1. Strategic cases for the two programmes - Strengthening Regional Governance Networks for Accountability and Transparency – Phase II (SANGAT II); and Twende Mbele ('Going Forward Together' – Strengthening African Monitoring and Evaluation Systems (Annex 1a and b)*
2. SANGAT M&E Framework and Evaluability Assessment – final report (Annex 2) *
3. SANGAT M&E Framework Guidance Note, which includes each network's original Theory of Change and logframe (Annex 3)*
4. SANGAT II Evaluation Final Inception Report Final (Annex 4)**
5. The overarching SANGAT II/Twende Mbele programme logframe (Annex 5a)**
6. Each Network Partner's updated logframe (Annex 5b to d).**
7. Gantt chart setting out programme activities and time lines (Annex 6).**
8. Table summarising the revised payment milestones and success criteria. (Annex 7)**

*Annexes 1 to 3 as previously circulated, copies available on request.

**Annexes 4 – 7 incorporated within this revised Section 3 issued with CA#1

DFID will make other relevant documents available on request where possible.

8. Deliverables and timeframe

The key deliverables for this TOR are as follows:

The implementation and roll-out of SANGAT II is staggered and based on different approaches. ARINSA and CABRI have been operating formally for several years while Twende Mbele, though founded in 2012, is formalising in response to DFID funding which started in 2016.The evaluation work plan will therefore differ based on the phase of the programme and the expected end-date of DFID funding.

A Gantt Chart detailing the work plan for the implementation phase of the evaluation is available in Annex 6 as an Excel spreadsheet. The Gantt Chart captures the major evaluation activities, dates, responsible personnel and status for each activity. The major activities that will be undertaken in the implementation phase (summarised) include the following:

Network analysis and process evaluation

- Refinement and documentation of the evaluation plan for the network analysis, including metrics.
- Submission and DFID approval of the methodology and work plan for the process evaluation.
- Twende Mbele data collection for the network analysis and process evaluation at the AFREA conference in Uganda (completed).
- CABRI data collection for the network analysis and process evaluation at their next AGM on 18in May 2017 in South Africa (assuming Khulisa is able to get access to this event).
- ARINSA data collection for the network analysis and process evaluation at their next AGM from 6 – 8 June 2017 in Gaborone, Botswana. .
- Ongoing technical assistance to networks: logframe and TOC development.
- Monthly M&E support to networks to continue to collect data for the process evaluation.
- Outcome mapping and collaboration mapping workshops with the networks and DFID.
- Finalisation of TOCs and logframes, including VFM indicators by the end of June 2017.
- Submission of the draft and final network analysis reports.
- Submission of draft and final process evaluation reports.
- Submission and DFID approval of methodology, draft tools, and work plan for the outcome evaluation.

Outcome evaluation

- Pretesting of primary data collection tools for the outcome evaluation.
- Primary data collection for the outcome evaluation (CABRI and ARINSA) - field visits.
- Secondary data collection for the outcome evaluation (CABRI and ARINSA) - from network M&E systems.
- Submission of draft outcome evaluation report 1: ARINSA network (incremental reporting).
- Submission of draft outcome evaluation report 2: CABRI network (incremental reporting).
- Primary data collection for the outcome evaluation (Twende Mbele) - field visits.
- Secondary data collection for the outcome evaluation (Twende Mbele) - from network M&E system.
- Submission of draft outcome evaluation report 3: Twende Mbele network (incremental reporting).
- Submission of final outcome evaluation report: ARINSA, CABRI and Twende Mbele.

Ongoing activities

- Presentation of findings at advisory board meetings.
- Submission of anonymised datasets.
- Briefing papers for donors and other stakeholders on SANGAT II – lessons learned.
- Presentations to DFID.
- Preparation for, and hosting of, quarterly evaluation steering committee meetings.
- Submission of quarterly progress reports.

- Various dissemination events in South Africa.

A table summarising the payment milestones and specified deliverables is available at Annex 7..

The timeframe for delivery will be developed in consultation with DFID by the successful bidder during the inception phase, with reference to the indicative timeframe outlined in the evaluability assessment.

The timeframe:

1. The evaluation started on 7 November 2016.
2. The network analysis and process evaluation will start in July 2017.
3. The indicative end date for the evaluation is November 2019.

Please note that following a couple of portfolio reviews in DFID, the SANGAT II programme (support to ARINSA and CABRI) will now be completed on 31 March 2018. The Twende Mbele programme will continue to run until June 2019. Khulisa will take a phased approach to the outcome evaluation to take these revised time lines into account.

9. Abilities & Expertise To Deliver This Requirement

The team undertaking this work will need to demonstrate significant experience in the following areas:

Essential

- Experience of designing and implementing evaluations of complex, multi-component programmes and funds – particularly programmes that are regional in scope.
- Proven track record in developing and implementing single M&E frameworks across multiple stakeholders
- Experience and proven innovation in using open source or low cost IT solutions for M&E
- Sector experience in governance programming and/or research,
- Proven track record in using a range of evaluation methods (quantitative and qualitative),
- Using evaluations and evidence as a tool for lesson learning with different audiences
- Experience of network analysis and outcome mapping
- Experience of conducting Theory Based Evaluations.
- Experience applying a gender lens to evaluation.
- Experience in process, performance and impact evaluations.

Desirable

- Demonstrated understanding of relevant evaluation standards and norms, including OECD-DAC standards on evaluation.
- Understanding of Global Development Partnership principles
- Familiar with relevant evaluation codes of conduct and ethics.
- Knowledge and experience of M&E in relation to governance sub-sectors: public financial management; anti-corruption and illicit financial flows; and transnational crime.

Bidders must include **CV's of proposed consultants and their role in delivering this TOR** as part of their bid.

10. Logistics and procedures

ARD (Pretoria) will provide the supplier with contact details for all relevant partners; the supplier will be responsible for liaison with partners to arrange all in-country appointments and work. The supplier will be responsible for all consultants' logistics and travel arrangements.

The supplier will liaise with ARD (Pretoria) in relation to identifying cost effective ways to host the planned dissemination events and should assume minimal outgoings for this work. Once venues are identified the supplier will be responsible for all liaison with partners, planning and facilitation of these events.

All participants from partner organisations are Pretoria based and will take care of their own travel arrangements. ARD (Pretoria) does not expect that any significant in-country costs will be incurred other than subsistence and travel for consultants.

Annual general meeting locations for each network remain to be confirmed but will be in Africa in a location with relatively easy transport links and in a capital city. DFID SA will liaise with the supplier to provide logistical information about these events well in advance. For budgeting purposes the supplier should expect a core team to attend these annual events.

11. Reporting and contracting arrangements

The suppliers will report to the Programme Manager and Regional Governance Adviser for DFID ARD. Suppliers will provide a 1 page quarterly progress report throughout the contract period and will host evaluation steering committee meetings every quarter either by telephone or in person.

The contract will extend across the full 3 year period to allow for the engagement of all partners and flexibility to work within busy schedules, however, it is not expected that the supplier would need to deploy resources throughout this time and resources should be used in a way that guarantees maximum Value for Money.

12. Budget

The supplier must provide a budget summary that breaks down all costs in delivering on this TOR separated according to each of the three objectives described above., The budget must include fee rates and any other charges for all personnel involved in the delivery of this TOR, including the exact time that they will be expected to spend on this contract over the contract period. DFID will not meet costs of business class travel; all travel costs expected to be paid by DFID must be budgeted as economy class.

The evaluability assessment provides an indicative budget for the delivery of each component of the evaluation. Bids should use this as guidance but are not obliged to adhere to this budget but rather should make their own assessment of what they would need to deliver this TOR.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) will be agreed between ARD (Pretoria) and the contracted supplier during the inception phase. *Break Clauses:*

Suppliers should be aware that there will be three break clauses built in at the contracting stage, as follows:

Break clause 1: After the inception phase.- based upon DFID assessment of the agreed Inception Phase deliverables

Break clause 2: At the successful completion and delivery of the Network analysis final report in the express opinion of DFID

Break clause 3: At the time the SANGAT II programme will be taken on by the CIFFs Facility for Africa based upon DFID's assessment of the suitability of the transfer

13. Duty of Care

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

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

The Supplier is responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security briefings for all of their Personnel working under this contract and ensuring that their Personnel register and receive briefing as outlined above. Travel advice is also available on the FCO website and the Supplier

must ensure they (and their Personnel) are up to date with the latest position.
Bidders must develop their response on the basis of being fully responsible for Duty of Care in line with the details provided above. They must confirm in their Response that:
a.   They fully accept responsibility for Security and Duty of Care.
b.   They have made a full assessment of security requirements.
c.   They have the capability to provide security and Duty of Care for the duration of the contract.

	1 Very low risk	2 Low risk	3 Medium risk	4 High risk	5 Very high risk
	Low		**Medium**	**High risk**	

	DFID Risk Score – South Africa	DFID Risk Score – Malawi	DFID Risk Score – Zimbabwe	DFID Risk Score – Zambia	DFID Risk Score – Mozambique
FCO Travel Advice	1	1	1	1	2
Host Nation Travel Advice	1	1	Unknown	1	Unknown
Transportation	1	3	3	1	3
Security (SS)	4	2	3	1	2
Civil Unrest	4	1	2	1	2
Violence/Crime (SS)	4	2	3	1	4
Terrorism (SS)	1	2	1	1	2
War	1	1	1	1	2
Hurricane	1	1	1	1	1
Earthquake	1	2	1	1	1
Flood	1	2	1	1	2
Medical Services	1	3	2	1	4
OVERALL RATING	**1**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**2**

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

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

a) Have you completed an initial assessment of potential risks that demonstrates your knowledge and understanding, and are you satisfied that you understand the risk management implications (not solely relying on information provided by DFID)?

b) Have you prepared an outline plan that you consider appropriate to manage these risks at this stage (or will you do so if you are awarded the contract) and are you confident/comfortable that you can implement this effectively?

For further information please consult the FCO travel advice:

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

c) Have you ensured or will you ensure that your staff are appropriately trained (including specialist training where required) before they are deployed and will you ensure that on-going training is provided where necessary?

d) Have you an appropriate mechanism in place to monitor risk on a live / on-going basis (or will you put one in place if you are awarded the contract)?

e) Have you ensured or will you ensure that your staff are provided with and have access to suitable equipment and will you ensure that this is reviewed and provided on an on-going basis?

f) Have you appropriate systems in place to manage an emergency / incident if one arises

RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX

Locations: South Africa, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Mozambique

The latest DFID/FCO risk assessment data for other countries that may require visits as part of the delivery of the project that is not mentioned here will be provided.