

CALLDOWN CONTRACT

Framework Agreement with:	Global Evaluation and Monitoring Framework Agreement (GEMFA)
Framework Agreement for:	Tropical Health Consulting LLP LOT 4
Framework Agreement ECM Number:	4759
Call-down Contract For:	WISER MEL
Contract ECM Number:	PUR1058852

FAO: [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

I refer to the following:

1. The above-mentioned Framework Agreement dated 1 February 2023
2. Your proposal of 16 June 2023

and I confirm that FCDO requires you to provide the Services (Annex A), under the Terms and Conditions of the Framework Agreement which shall apply to this Call-down Contract as if expressly incorporated herein.

1. Commencement and Duration of the Services

- 1.1 The Supplier shall start the Services no later than 29 September 2023 (“the Start Date”) and the Services shall be completed by 15 October 2024 (“the End Date”) unless the Call-down Contract is terminated earlier in accordance with the Terms and Conditions of the Framework Agreement.

2. Recipient

- 2.1 FCDO requires the Supplier to provide the Services to the Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (the “Recipient”).

3. Financial Limit

- 3.1 Payments under this Call-down Contract shall not, exceed £ 305,097 (“the Financial Limit”) and is inclusive of any government tax, if applicable as detailed in Annex A.

When Payments shall be made on a 'Milestone Payment Basis' the following Clause 22.3 shall be substituted for Clause 22.3 of the Section 2, Framework Agreement Terms and Conditions.

22. PAYMENTS & INVOICING INSTRUCTIONS

- 22.3 Where the applicable payment mechanism is "Milestone Payment", invoice(s) shall be submitted for the amount(s) indicated in Annex B and payments will be made on satisfactory performance of the services, at the payment points defined as

per schedule of payments. At each payment point set criteria will be defined as part of the payments. Payment will be made if the criteria are met to the satisfaction of FCDO.

When the relevant milestone is achieved in its final form by the Supplier or following completion of the Services, as the case may be, indicating both the amount or amounts due at the time and cumulatively. Payments pursuant to clause 22.3 are subject to the satisfaction of the Project Officer in relation to the performance by the Supplier of its obligations under the Call-down Contract and to verification by the Project Officer that all prior payments made to the Supplier under this Call-down Contract were properly due.

4. **FCDO Officials**

4.1 The Project Officer is:

[REDACTED]

4.2 The Contract Officer is:

[REDACTED]

5. **Key Personnel**

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

Job Title	Level of Expertise	Team Member
Team Leader	Principal Expert	[REDACTED]
Senior Climate MEL Expert	Principal Expert	[REDACTED]
Senior Weather Information Thematic Expert	Senior Expert	[REDACTED]

6. **Reports**

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

7. **Duty of Care**

All Supplier Personnel (as defined in Section 2 of the Agreement) engaged under this Call-down Contract will come under the duty of care of the Supplier:

- I. The Supplier will be responsible for all security arrangements and Her Majesty's Government accepts no responsibility for the health, safety and security of individuals or property whilst travelling.
- II. The Supplier will be responsible for taking out insurance in respect of death or personal injury, damage to or loss of property, and will indemnify and keep indemnified FCDO in respect of:
 - II.1. Any loss, damage or claim, howsoever arising out of, or relating to negligence by the Supplier, the Supplier's Personnel, or by any person

employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier, in connection with the performance of the Call-down Contract;

- II.2. Any claim, howsoever arising, by the Supplier's Personnel or any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier, in connection with their performance under this Call-down Contract.
- III. The Supplier will ensure that such insurance arrangements as are made in respect of the Supplier's Personnel, or any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier are reasonable and prudent in all circumstances, including in respect of death, injury or disablement, and emergency medical expenses.
- IV. The costs of any insurance specifically taken out by the Supplier to support the performance of this Call-down Contract in relation to Duty of Care may be included as part of the management costs of the project and must be separately identified in all financial reporting relating to the project.
- V. Where FCDO is providing any specific security arrangements for Suppliers in relation to the Call-down Contract, these will be detailed in the Terms of Reference.

8. Call-down Contract Signature

- 8.1 If the original Form of Call-down Contract is not returned to the Contract Officer (as identified at clause 4 above) duly completed, signed, and dated on behalf of the Supplier within **15 working days** of the date of signature on behalf of FCDO, FCDO will be entitled, at its sole discretion, to declare this Call-down Contract void.

No payment will be made to the Supplier under this Call-down Contract until a copy of the Call-down Contract, signed on behalf of the Supplier, returned to the FCDO Contract Officer.

Signed by an authorised signatory
for and on behalf of
Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth
and Development Affairs

Name: [Redacted]

Position: [Redacted]

Signature:

Date:

Signed by an authorised signatory
for and on behalf of the Supplier

Tropical Health Consulting LLP

Name: [Redacted]

Position: [Redacted]

Signature:

Date:

Annex A
Terms of Reference
WEATHER AND CLIMATE INFORMATION SERVICES
A thematic evaluation across three regions

Contents

Terms of Reference..... 4

1. Introduction..... 6

2. FCDO and strategic, thematic evaluation..... 6

3. FCDO support to WISER..... 6

4. About WISER..... 7

5. Purpose and objectives..... 7

6. The Recipient..... 8

7. WISER MEL architecture and evaluative products..... 8

8. Scope, methodology and approach..... 9

9. Methods..... 10

10. The Requirements..... 1

11. Submitting a proposal..... 2

12. Skills and experience required..... 3

13. Budget..... 4

15. Performance Requirements..... 4

16. Reporting and timeframe..... 5

17. Use and Influence..... 5

18. Break points..... 6

19. FCDO coordination and governance..... 6

20. FCDO Mandatory Requirements..... 6

1. Introduction

FCDO is seeking a supplier to conduct a three-part thematic evaluation of 5 (concluded and active) FCDO programmes supporting delivery of UK Met Office's Weather and climate Information Services (WISER) across three regions (Middle East and North Africa, Africa, and Indo-Pacific). The work consists of three elements:

- i. *Evidence & Learning summary* based on the evaluative products from 2 historical programmes. The summary will inform development of three new regional programmes by highlighting which approaches have proved most effective in co-producing useful, relevant, and accessible weather and climate information services and in ensuring this information was actively used for evidence-based decision making. The review should also highlight the mechanism behind change happening: why and how changes occurred, particularly in Fragile and Conflict Afflicted States (FCAS) and -where relevant- how change might have happened differently for women and girls.
- ii. *Sustainability of results* from two historical programmes to assess which results have proved sustainable after programme closure and why.
- iii. *Opportunity to support additional data collection exercises* for three new regional programmes supporting WISER. With possibility to seize opportunities for rapid testing of interventions to maximise value for money, demonstrating impact, and filling-in evidence gaps around the theory of change

2. FCDO and strategic, thematic evaluation

Strategic, centrally managed thematic evaluations are a priority for evaluation at FCDO. Thematic evaluations draw together evidence and learning from FCDO funded programmes on 'what works' across different contexts to address high priority development challenges, such as what has worked to address the primary and secondary impact of the Covid19 pandemic in LMICs, climate change and other key Ministerial priorities.

Thematic evaluations are commissioned by the FCDO's Evaluation Unit, within the FCDO Economic and Evaluation Directorate, but are led on by the relevant policy, regional and programme teams within FCDO. In the case of this specific thematic evaluation, work is led by Middle East and North Africa (MENA), Pan-Africa, and Indo-Pacific Regional Departments

3. FCDO support to WISER

Funded by UKAid, WISER intervention was first implemented in East Africa ([Weather and Climate Information Service for Africa](#), 2015-2021) and then in Asia as part of Asia Regional Resilience to Changing Climate ([ARRCC](#)) Programme (2018-2022).

WISER intervention will now be implemented as part of 3 new regional climate programmes at their very early stages:

- Pioneering a Holistic approach to Energy and Nature-based Options in MENA for Long-term stability programme ([PHENOMENAL](#)) for MENA region;
- Africa Region Climate and Nature ([ARCAN](#)) for Africa; ARCAN will partner with Ecorys for monitoring and evaluation services.
- Climate Action for Resilient Asia ([CARA](#)) for the Indo- Pacific region.

Within each programme/geographic area, a set of projects are delivered across a range of priority countries.

Note that WISER is one of the components delivered by each of the three regional programmes alongside other components promoting climate adaptation and resilience and better natural resource management. More information about other components delivered by PHENOMENAL, ARCAN and CARA can be found in business cases in the dedicated

DevTracker websites linked above.

4. About WISER

High-quality and accessible climate and weather information are pivotal to build resilience to climate change: from informing farming decisions to improving early-warning systems, reliable and user-oriented climate information services provide vital data to enable evidence-based decision making¹.

The UK Met Office's WISER is working in collaboration with FCDO to deliver transformation in the generation and use of co-produced weather and climate services tailored to user needs, to support decision making at local, national, and regional levels, building resilience to the impacts of climate change.

5. Purpose and objectives

WISER promotes a co-production model, where climate information generated is tailored to user needs. Evaluative work to date has been mostly partner-led and has been conducted within the boundaries of East Africa and Asia. However, we have no independent evaluation of WISER across geographies to understand i) which approaches have been more effective in co-generating weather services -in relation to local contexts- particularly in Fragile and Conflict Affected States (FCAS) and humanitarian settings, ii) whether these have been effective in informing decision making at various level and iii) whether uptake of results have proved sustainable.

A thematic evaluation of WISER, cutting across 3 regional programme portfolios, will put FCDO in the unique position to produce rich and nuanced conclusions on how weather and climate information services can be co-produced and used in a variety of different contexts in order to shed light not only on "what works" but also on "what works where and for whom".

Following an evaluability assessment, the envisaged evaluation questions are:

- I. Which approaches have been more effective in co-producing useful, relevant, and accessible weather and climate information services across contexts, particularly FCAS? What contextual factors enabled or limited successful programme delivery / effectiveness, particularly for women and girls?
- II. What were the key operational and delivery lessons learnt from delivering the WISER model across differing contexts for future programming?
- III. To what extent, and in what ways, were improved climate information services effective in informing decision making at local, national, and regional levels across contexts? What approaches or combination of improved climate service activities were successful in supporting this and how was gender a consideration?
- IV. What factors, internal or external to the programmes, may have limited or accelerated the application of improved climate services supported evidence informed decision-making across levels?
- V. What lessons can be drawn on the role of FCDO in supporting similar programmes in future to maximise uptake, sustainability and impact – as well as maintaining institutional knowledge of work funded – particularly in FCAS?
- VI. Following the closure of the WISER and ARRCC programmes, what programme results have been sustained, for whom? And why?
- VII. What were the more successful monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) systems and tools used across the previous programmes? What challenges and lessons

¹ See for example [Fosu et al. \(2018\)](#). Also, Appendix B contains a list of evaluative studies around effectiveness and benefits of disseminating weather information.

around MEL can be learnt for the most successful use of MEL resources in later programming?

The evaluation questions will be subject to further refinement and sequencing at inception stage (see paragraph 8 below).

6. The Recipient

The recipient of these services is the FCDO. The primary target audience for the thematic evaluation products are the Climate Team in MENA Regional Department, the Pan-Africa Regional Department, the Indo-Pacific Regional Department, and FCDO climate cadre.

Secondary target audiences include:

- FCDO Posts, particularly climate teams and attaché.
- FCDO Energy, Climate and Environment Directorate.
- FCDO Research Department
- FCDO Evaluation unit
- Other donors and potential donors funding WISER.
- For published outputs, audiences will include partners on the climate agenda, academic institutions and international community operating in this field and the UK public. COP 28 will be a key forum to socialise some of the findings from this thematic evaluation.

7. WISER MEL architecture and evaluative products

WISER thematic evaluation should be integral part of a wider, interrelated data and evidence network. As the three new programmes are at very early stage of implementation there is an opportunity to enhance coherence of WISER MEL framework. The partner for this thematic evaluation is expected to work in close collaboration with WISER embedded MEL team as well as with programme-specific MEL partners to identify areas where a cross-regional lens can add the highest value (rather than duplicate effort) and where complementarities with WISER and programmes-specific MEL activities can be exploited (for example using a collaborative approach to collection of data points across space and time).

Table 1 below shows an overview of existing MEL architecture associated with WISER. At inception stage, the mapping should be further refined and roles and responsibilities clarified to ensure complementarity of efforts across different levels of MEL.

Table 1: Overview of WISER MEL architecture.

Level	Function
Thematic, cross-programmes and cross-geographies evaluation (provided through this evaluation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of evaluative products synthesising thematic evidence and learning across regional programmes • Should draw on data / evidence from every layer and synthesis as part of the evaluation. • Recommendations for alignment of MEL across programmes, including potentially development of ToC / change areas / progress markers or indicators.
External programme-level MEL (currently an independent MEL partner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To help support evidenced based decision making and learning across the various components within programme portfolio, and to deliver a robust independent monitoring and evaluation function. • Complementing and strengthening Met WISER own monitoring and learning, through the provision of robust monitoring, evaluation, learning and VfM assessment at programme level

Level	Function
has been identified for ARCAN)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should synthesise learning from within regional programme and support uptake of learning across programmes (working in partnership with the programme delivery teams).
Delivery partner-led, programme-level MEL	<p>Programme delivery team supported MEL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report against logframe to FCDO, used for risk analysis etc Aggregation of project level MEL to report to FCDO Annual Reviews / Reports Data when analysed should also be used for programme management Support MEL capacity building of project delivery partners and their use of project level MEL data for programme management
Delivery partner-led, project-level MEL	<p>Project by project level M&E activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in MEL activities as directed by their Programme MEL delivery teams, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Routine reporting of MEL data and KPI data (including context specific data) Project level narrative reports MEL capacity building as required Project / Intervention-specific results chains to be developed, reported, and mapped to programme ToC / specific causal changes identified to be gathered data on. Data / evidence for any higher-level change areas agreed at the programme / global level.

8. Scope, methodology and approach

FCDO programmes in the scope of this review are 2 closed FCDO programmes (WISER and ARRCC) and the 3 new regional climate programmes: PHENOMENAL, ARCAN, and CARA. The thematic evaluation should cover three geographic areas: MENA, Africa and Indo-Pacific.

The thematic evaluation is built around three key blocks:

- i. Evidence and learning summary from the two completed programmes and recommendations on how to better tailor implementation and MEL of the three new programmes based on findings. FCDO is particularly interested in lessons learned from implementing WISER in FCAS and, where relevant, using a gender lens. This should constitute roughly 25% of the evaluation budget².
- ii. Testing sustainability of results from two historical programmes through targeted follow-up primary level data collection. Appendix C contains a preliminary list of existing datasets (collected under concluded WISER programmes) offering the opportunity for a follow-up data collection exercise. The list will be refined and further tested at inception stage. Which data point(s) offer the best opportunity(-ies) for a follow up will be discussed and agreed with thematic evaluation partner, FCDO teams, Met Office and

² Note that budget allocation is indicative and it will vary depending on the proposal and the concrete options the thematic evaluation will pursue.

MEL providers at inception stage, but we envisage it should be focused on results for final beneficiaries (e.g. farmers) and should allow gender disaggregation of data. Note that, If feasible, it is anticipated that for some areas where evidence is gathered for the historic programmes, following rounds of data collection might take place while the results chain mature under the new programmes (see phase 3). This should absorb roughly 36% of the evaluation budget.

- iii. Additional data collection exercise(s) to continue longitudinal series from historical programmes and/or test specific hypothesis or casual chains. Also in this case, it is anticipated that primary level data collection will be user-focused, with particular attention to final beneficiaries (such as farmers) and should be designed using a gender lens. Exact shape and scope should be determined at inception stage but we envisage 2 options: i) baseline for one or multiple Met projects, with responsibility for endline falling under Met Office and/or programmes' MEL partners' remit, and/or ii) nimble testing on selected project(s) to identify delivery option(s) that ensure best VfM. Options should be assessed based on need, data collection feasibility and possibility to test innovative data collection mechanisms, opportunity to produce gender-disaggregated evidence, policy relevance of results, Met office project timelines, and synergy to the rest of the MEL architecture. This should constitute roughly 37% of the evaluation budget.

In order to ensure the thematic evaluation produces outputs in a timely way to inform decision making and shape the 3 new programmes, we envisage activities will happen in three phases as outlined in Table 2. Exact shape and timelines will be defined at inception stage but as far as possible, the evaluation partner should ensure each phase build on earlier phases.

9. Methods

The thematic evaluation will cover a range of diverse projects, partners, and country conditions, and it is likely that from country to country there is significant heterogeneity of project design and delivery. Single projects' impact will be affected by programme and project design and implementation and is likely to be different across contexts and stakeholder groups. As such we envisage a theory-based approach to evaluation, gathering and analysing evidence against programme theories of change, together with situational analysis to evidence results and change in differing contexts. Specific themes for the case studies should be identified and agreed with by FCDO, Met Office and evaluation partner at inception stage, but could include institutional change and/or building, evidence-based decision through uptake of climate information and impact on final beneficiaries as result of these changes/decisions. These should have a particular focus on informing operationalisation of WISER in fragile and conflict afflicted settings.

A preliminary Evaluability Assessment commissioned by FCDO suggests primary data collection is feasible in the context of this thematic evaluation, building on existing investment in data from the Met Office and previous evaluation contracts. As such, we envisage the evaluation would be a theory based mixed method evaluation. Suggested methods include political economy analysis, outcome harvesting and contribution tracing; and multiple methods may be used to answer different questions. Possible data collection methods for case-based analysis include Key Informant Interviews (KII) as well as household- level surveys with farmers and other end users. Primary data collection should be undertaken for each programme (closed and active), however, there may need to be some difficult decisions on where to collect data, given budget constraints. Hence why a collaborative approach to the WISER MEL framework, developed in concert with other MEL partners will be crucial to deliver maximum value.

An outline of the proposed methods and data collection strategies, with related budget considerations, should be included in the bidding proposal. At inception stage, the thematic evaluation partner is expected to develop and refine approach, guided by the nature of the

evaluation questions included above under paragraph 5. The evaluation partner will also be asked at inception stage to identify specific WISER projects -among the 5 FCDO programmes- that offer the best opportunities (or lower risks) for data collection in Phase 2 and 3; this should be based on expected results relevance and rigour vis a vis data collection feasibility. FCDO would encourage use of any innovative approaches to data collection (or data sources) that may reduce costs.

Table 2: Three phases for WISER thematic evaluation³

Timelines		Key activities	Output
Inception	By End Nov 2023 two months & two weeks	a. Evaluation Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapid Literature & Evidence Review (Global & Regional / Country Level). • Methods/Approaches to answer the evaluation questions and corresponding data collection strategies • Stakeholder Engagement as needed and early outcome mapping of historic programmes with key stakeholders. • Scope need and opportunity for primary data collection for Phase 2 and 3. • Evaluation Protocols Developed, outlining processes to ensure evidence strength and build confidence in final results. b. MEL <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping of current MEL architecture for the three programmes and WISER. • ToC review – including development of key causal change chains across concluded and active programmes. This will enable identification of opportunities to test casual pathways in the continuum between historical and current programmes. • Development of roles and responsibilities for MEL based on complementarities and identify synergies. 	A. Inception report
Phase 1: Rapid evidence synthesis	By End 1 st Week Jan 2024 three months and three weeks	a. Rapid evidence mapping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping evidence and learning from the historic programmes around evaluation questions I. to IV. drawing lessons from across programmes and geographies. A preliminary list of evaluative documents from the two concluded programmes is in Annex B. • Stakeholder Engagement as needed, including some KIIs. • Test whether the current programmes have reflected these learning and recommendations in their ToCs and designs and whether any adaptation is needed. b. MEL <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and pre-test opportunities to strengthen and enhance coherence of the MEL framework associated with WISER and formulate recommendations (evaluation question VII). 	B. Short learning and reflection report (20 pages, with supporting slide-deck)
Phase 2: Sustainability	By Mid Apr 2024	Sustainability of results from closed programmes	C. Results sustainability report

³ Timelines are indicative and subject to change and refinement during inception. Particularly to accommodate sufficient time for iteration between FCDO and Evaluation partner.

Timelines		Key activities	Output
of results	Subject to seasonality Seven months	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Primary level data collection at country level, including household-level surveys, KIIs / FGDs with key stakeholders.Data analysis and validation with Met Office and FCDO stakeholders.Report development summarising evidence around evaluation questions V and VI	
Phase 3: additional primary data collection and/or nimble testing (tbc)	by Mid Oct 2024 Thirteen months	Additional data collection points and/or nimble testing of delivery options (subject to inception and Phase 1 report findings) <ul style="list-style-type: none">Primary level data collection at country level from end-users, including household-level surveys, KIIs / FGDs with key stakeholders.Data analysis and validation with Met Office and FCDO stakeholders in validation exercises.Report development	D. Phase 3 Report (tbc) E. Evaluation digest



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



10. The Requirements

- A. Inception report: outlining final evaluation framework, approach and methods and protocol. The report should also identify where follow-up data collection to assess sustainability of results (Phase 2) will take place and rationale behind selection based on feasibility of data collection, relevance and rigour of results. Similarly, inception report should provide option and recommendations to seize opportunities to support evidence building for the three new programmes under phase 3, which may include continuance or data collection from the historic programmes. Options for data collection in Phase 2 and 3 and their assessment should be discussed with FCDO, Met Office and programmes' MEL partners.

The Inception report should also offer a refined mapping of the MEL environment associated with the three new programmes and outline proposed roles and responsibilities for MEL.

Results of the report should be shared and discussed and agreed with FCDO and Met Office reference group.

- B. Short learning and reflections report: this rapid review should be in Word format and achieve the following objectives:
- Provide an evidence summary around evaluation questions I. to V. from the two closed programmes.
 - identify where there is room to better align the ToC of the three new programmes with emerging evidence and offer clear recommendations to be discussed with FCDO and Met Office.
 - Refine Phase 2 and 3 plans to consider findings from Phase 1.
 - Identify gaps and offer recommendations on how to strengthen the MEL framework and architecture, particularly whether there are opportunities to capture results across FCDO programmes through standardized/harmonized elements of MEL (evaluation question VII.). Insights should be specific to the WISER framework and not generic principles.
- An accompanying slide-deck should also be produced for internal communication purposes. Results of the report should be shared and discussed with the thematic evaluation reference group.
- C. Results sustainability report: this report should be in Word format and provide FCDO and Met partners insights around evaluation question VI. and clear recommendations on how to increase sustainability of findings across the three new programmes and role of FCDO (question V.). Results of the report should be shared and discussed with FCDO reference group. A pptx presentation should also be developed to feed into a session with FCDO advisers led by evaluation partners.



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



- D. Final shape of output D. will depend on which option is progressed for phase 3 after inception stage. At the very minimum we expect a report in Word format summarising findings and recommendations and a pptx presentation to be delivered to a broader audience in FCDO.
- E. Evaluation digest: this is a 2-page summary of the finalised evaluation reports using FCDO's template for publication on FCDO's website.

11. Submitting a proposal

Proposals should clearly set out the supplier's suggested approach to conducting the thematic evaluation, in line with the requirements set out in this terms of reference, team skills and experience and proposed team composition. The final evaluation questions, scope, sample countries and methodology for project delivery will be agreed between FCDO and the selected supplier at the end of the inception stage.

By way of indication, and in addition to other items as appropriate, the bidding proposals should include:

1. A cover letter introducing the evaluator/s/organisation and how the skills and competencies described in paragraph 12 are met, with concrete examples.
2. A clear outline of the proposed evaluation approach, including:
 - Proposed outline methodology and data collection strategies.
 - Management arrangements, including individual leads.
 - Roles and responsibilities within the evaluation team, including management arrangement and day rates.
3. Indicative distribution of costs of activities and outputs expected by FCDO.
4. An initial communication and stakeholder engagement plan, conducive to uptake of evaluation findings.
5. Ethical considerations and envisaged risks associated with the evaluation and envisaged mitigation strategy.
6. A CV of each member of the evaluation team.
7. Total budget inclusive all taxes.

Criteria for review of the bids include:

- Adherence to the parameters set by this ToR in terms of evidence need.
- Methodological rigour.
- Adherence to budget (see paragraph 13).



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



- Alignment of skills and experience with those outlined in paragraph 12.
- Value for money considerations.
- Inclusion of gender considerations in the design of the proposed evaluation design.
- All regions under the scope of this thematic evaluation are considered and covered by the proposal.
- Consideration of non-traditional data collection methodologies to improve value for money and ability to collect data in difficult to access areas.
- Due considerations of ethics requirements as set by this ToR.
- Ability to deliver in a timely way to inform three new programmes without compromising integrity of the evaluation rigour and design.
- Due consideration of overall M
- EL architecture for WISER as set out in Table 1.

12. Skills and experience required

The expertise required within the evaluation team should ideally include:

- Theory based evaluation expertise (ideally FCDO in African / Asian / MENA context)
- Senior expertise in: Weather services, organisational capacity development, climate resilience, WISER geographies, evidence uptake and evidence-based decision making.
- Junior Evaluator / Researchers to work with wider senior team.
- Regionally based team members (with any of the skills above).
- Demonstrable understanding of the key issues related to use of evidence for programme design, implementation and policy influencing.
- Significant experience in portfolio-level evaluation, quantitative and qualitative research, synthesis and analysis skills, with understanding and experience managing nimble experimental evaluation to test delivery options.
 - Excellent communications skills, including writing for policy audiences and ability to distil succinct conclusions presented in non-technical language.



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



13. Budget

Maximum budget £305,097 excluding VAT but inclusive of all other taxes.

14. Constraints and dependencies

Stakeholder availability – FCDO staff will be able to facilitate connections with relevant partners but schedules should allow flexibility to accommodate likely constraints on availability due to heavy workloads and competing urgent priorities.

FCDO wishes to commission an independent objective evidence review and evaluation. It is recognised that some team members proposed by the Supplier may have prior experience with one or more of the interventions to be examined by the study. Prior involvement with programmes likely to be included within the sample should be declared in the proposal for all team members and the Supplier should demonstrate in the proposal the mechanisms that will be put in place to ensure the integrity and independence of the evidence review and evaluation.

15. Performance Requirements

FCDO will set key performance indicators (KPIs) to ensure that the evaluation is delivered in a timely manner and meets expected quality standards. KPIs will relate to:

- Timeliness and quality of outputs delivered.
- Provision of relevant recommendations for FCDO to address challenges identified, share learning and best practice, and support scale up and implementation of solutions proposed.
- Evaluation outputs are presented in formats that are accessible to a range of FCDO audiences (especially those without specialist knowledge) and contain summaries, with appropriate summaries and infographics to aid use and communication
- Clear communication and timely, accurate financial reporting throughout contract (forecasts provided on time)

Payments may be withheld if outputs do not meet expected quality standards and/or if are delivered late. The supplier should arrange regular check in meetings with FCDO at key stages to provide progress updates.



16. Reporting and timeframe

Assuming procurement of evaluation partner is concluded by end of September, reports are expected as per Table 3.

Table 3: Thematic evaluation timeline

	Date expected (after contract signing)	Disbursement
Kick off meeting	1 week	
Inception report	2 months and 2 weeks	15%
Phase 1 Final Report and Q&A session for FCDO reference group	3 months and 3 weeks	40%
Phase 2 Results sustainability report (and potential baseline report) and Q&A session with FCDO advisors	7 months	30%
Phase 3 (tbc) Final report and presentation	13 months	15%

17. Use and Influence

The thematic evaluation will primarily influence shape of the three new regional climate programmes (PHENOMENAL, ARCAN and CARA) ensuring they are on their effectiveness and efficiency frontier.

Encompassing the three regions, findings from the thematic evaluation will not only contribute to build the narrative of how FCDO is delivering against the International Development Strategy and IR sub-strategies' climate pillars; by taking an adaptive approach and learning lessons from a variety of geographies. Findings would also be used to course-correct, inform and shape programmes' delivery in order to optimise and improve effectiveness. Results could also be used for any future programme or policy (within and beyond HMG) aiming to boost climate and whether information systems or to scale up WISER.

Findings can also be used for COP28 given the specific focus on FCAS in order to engage partners, stimulate demand for this type of



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



evidence and help meet the need at the same time.

18. Break points

The contract will be subject to a break point after completion of the inception report and after completion of Phase 1 and Phase 2a. Continuation of the services after these periods will be based on renewed agreement of deliverables and on satisfactory performance and the progress of the supplier against the specified outputs.

After successful completion of each phase FCDO will notify the supplier in writing that delivery and performance is satisfactory and that FCDO wishes to proceed to the next phase.

19. FCDO coordination and governance

The supplier will report to the FCDO MENA Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser. A reference group will be established by FCDO to provide technical advice to the evaluation, and it will be composed by:

- FCDO MENA Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser
- FCDO MENA Regional climate team
- FCDO Pan-Africa Regional Department Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser
- FCDO Indo-Pacific Regional Department Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser
- Met Office MEL adviser
- Evaluation Unit Thematic Lead

To ensure effective governance of the evaluation, the scoping report and reports will be signed off by the FCDO Evaluation Advisor and the Reference Group convened by FCDO. The inception report and the final reports will also be quality assured by the FCDO Evaluation Quality Assurance Service (EQUALS).

20. FCDO Mandatory Requirements

20.1 Duty of Care



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



The Supplier will be expected to meet the appropriate UK and overseas duty of care in relation to its employees and other personnel it retains, and logistical arrangements. If deemed necessary, FCDO may need to be convinced that systems and procedures that the Supplier has in place are adequate, if there is travelling to conflict affected or similar high security risk countries.

All Supplier personnel (including its employees, sub-contractors or agents) engaged under a FCDO contract will come under the duty of care of the Supplier. The Supplier is responsible for the safety and well-being of its personnel and any third parties affected by its activities, including appropriate security arrangements. The Supplier will also be responsible for the provision of suitable security arrangements for its domestic and business property. FCDO will share available information with the Supplier on security status and developments in-country where appropriate. Travel advice is also available on the FCDO website, and the Supplier must ensure it (and its personnel) are up to date with the latest position.

The Supplier is responsible for ensuring that appropriate arrangements, processes and procedures are in place for its 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 its 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 (if successful in being awarded the contract).

The Supplier must confirm in their proposal that:

- They fully accept responsibility for Security and Duty of Care.
- They understand the potential risks and have the knowledge and experience to develop an effective risk plan.
- They have the capability to manage their Duty of Care responsibilities throughout the life of the contract.



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



FCDO will not award a contract to a Supplier which cannot demonstrate that it is willing to accept and has the capability to manage its duty of care responsibilities in relation to the specific procurement.

20.2 Ethics and Compliance

Full compliance with GEMFA Lot 4 Consortium Agreement obligations, including in respect of ethics and compliance issues, is a requirement of participation in this assignment. The following information and requirements are set out to complement and highlight some key features of these obligations in respect of the work to be delivered.

20.3 Conflicts of interest

Written outputs from this assignment will be made available to the market ahead of any future procurement related to the programme in order to mitigate potential conflicts of interest. The supplier(s) should set out additional measures that will be taken, where necessary, to further mitigate such conflicts of interest.

20.4 Compliance with Gender Equality and Public Sector Equality Duty

The supplier will give due regard to the Gender Equality Act and the Public Sector Equality Duty when designing and implementing the project. The supplier will consider the impacts on gender equality and on groups with protected characteristics under the Equality Act. Doing so, the supplier will identify opportunities to eliminate discrimination and promote equality of opportunities for groups identified as marginalised (elements to consider include gender/sex, age, disability status, and dynamics around ethnic groups who may face exclusion).

20.5 Do No Harm and Safeguarding

FCDO requires assurances regarding protection from violence, exploitation and abuse through involvement, directly or indirectly, with FCDO suppliers and programmes. This includes sexual exploitation and abuse but should also be understood



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



as all forms of physical or emotional violence or abuse and financial exploitation.

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. The design of interventions including research 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 adhere to FCDO's policy with respect to Safeguarding.

20.6 Anti-fraud and anti-corruption

The supplier must apply suitable approaches in delivery of this assignment both to ensure the identification of intervention options for the NbSA is undertaken free of bias, and that the designs of potential options are developed with due attention to mitigation of any fraud and corruption risks.

20.7 General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)

Please refer to the details of the GDPR relationship status and personal data (where applicable) for this project as detailed, for indicative purposes, in Annexes B and C as well as the standard clause 33 in section 2 of the Framework Agreement.

The assignment contract will include completed versions of Annexes B and C as appropriate for the work being carried out.

20.8 Transparency

In line with the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), FCDO 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 on International Aid Transparency Initiative. The supplier should submit copies of its supply chain (sub-contractor) invoices and evidence of payment when invoicing FCDO for its actual costs of procurement of local services and applicable management fee.



20.9 Delivery Chain Mapping

Delivery chain mapping is a process that identifies and captures, usually in visual form, the name of all partners involved in delivering a specific good, service or charge, ideally down to the end beneficiary. Delivery chain mapping is a key component of FCDO's Due Diligence Framework, which adopts a four-pillar approach in assessing a potential partner's capacity and capability to deliver our work and manage UK taxpayer's funds. The four pillars assess an organisation's i) Governance and Internal Control; ii) Ability to Deliver; iii) Financial Stability; and iv) Downstream Activity. This process allows teams to understand potential delivery chains and where the greater risks and assurance will be required to successfully implement our contracts. The delivery chain is assessed at pillar four, Downstream Activity. 96. FCDO's competitive tendering processes are designed to test suppliers' capability/capacity to ensure risks are managed and mitigated, and to provide assurances on the successful delivery of the programme. This will include a requirement to provide visibility of the flow of FCDO monies via a Delivery Chain Map with a requirement to update and report throughout the length of the contract.

Appendix A: of Contract Section 3 (Terms of Reference) - Schedule of Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects

This schedule must be completed by the Parties in collaboration with each-other before the processing of Personal Data under the Contract.

The completed schedule must be agreed formally as part of the contract with FCDO and any changes to the content of this schedule must be agreed formally with FCDO under a Contract Variation.

Description	Details
-------------	---------



Foreign, Commonwealth
& Development Office



Identity of the Controller and Processor for each Category of Data Subject	<p>The Parties acknowledge that for the purposes of the Data Protection Legislation, the following status will apply to personal data under this contract</p> <p>1) The Parties acknowledge that Clause 30.2 Protection of Personal Data and 30.4 (Section 2 of the contract) shall not apply for the purposes of the Data Protection Legislation as the Parties are independent Controllers in accordance with Clause 30.3 in respect of Personal Data necessary for the administration and/or fulfilment of this contract.</p>
---	---



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



Appendix B: WISER and ARRCC programmes' evaluative documents

Note that this is an initial list compiled at evaluability assessment stage that will need refinement at inception stage.

Asia Regional Resilience to a Changing Climate (ARRCC) Met Office Partnership

1. ARRCC (2020?), *ARRCC Met Office Annual Report Year 2*
2. ARRCC (2021?), *ARRCC Met Office Annual Report Year 3*
3. ARRCC, (2022), *ARRCC Programme Completion Report*
4. ARRCC / OPM (?) (2022) *Strengthening climate services in South Asia: Learning from the ARRCC programme* September 2022
5. CIMMYT (2021), *Climate services to avoid food security threatening crop disease epidemics in South Asia*
6. ICIMOD (2022), *Baseline Survey Report Weather and Seasonal Climate Services for Agriculture in Pakistan*
7. ICIMOD (2022), *Weather and climate information services in Pakistan Assessing benefits and impacts on key farm outcomes from a user perspective*
8. ICIMOD (2022), *Socioeconomic benefits of weather and climate services in Pakistan*
9. OPM (2020), *Asia Regional Resilience to a Changing Climate (ARRCC) Case Study: Understanding capacity gaps in National Meteorological and Hydrological Services - seasonal and climate forecasting* August 2020
10. OPM (2020), *Asia Regional Resilience to a Changing Climate (ARRCC) Case Study: Role of regional forums in facilitating cooperation on climate services in South Asia* August 2020
11. OPM (2021), *Asia Regional Resilience to a Changing Climate (ARRCC) Case Study: Innovation in climate services* September 2021
12. OPM (2021), *Asia Regional Resilience to a Changing Climate (ARRCC) Mid-Term Review*
13. ARRCC Milestone and Results – 2018- 2022.
14. OPM (2022), *Asia Regional Resilience to a Changing Climate (ARRCC) Case Study: Political economy of strengthening climate services* May 2022
15. OPM (undated), *ARRCC Impact Stories: Early systems warning for wheat diseases*
16. OPM (undated), *ARRCC Impact Stories: Responding to Covid-19*
17. OPM (undated), *ARRCC Impact Stories: The climate innovation challenge*
18. Met Office and RIMES (2022) *Final report on SASCOF enhancements under the ARRCC Programme*



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



19. WFP (2022), *Food security assessment for Afghanistan and Nepal*

Weather and Climate Information Services for Africa (WISER)

- 20. A list of WISER 2 online resources
- 21. NIRAS (2021), *WISER Resilience Indicator Project Impact Report*
- 22. WISER Annual Review 2016
- 23. WISER Annual Review 2017
- 24. WISER Annual Review 2018
- 25. WISER Annual Review 2019
- 26. WISER Annual Review 2020
- 27. WISER Annual Review 2021
- 28. WISER Scoping Report (2022)
- 29. WISER 1 & 2 PCR (March 2022)
- 30. Final SEB report for WISER 1 & 2 (2020)
- 31. HIGHWAY Transformation Report (2020)
- 32. Tetra Tech DSR (Data System Review) (2021)
- 33. Tetra Tech AVV-BF (Activity Verification Visit – Beneficiary Feedback) (2021)
- 34. WISER Learning Event Briefs (x 4) (2021)
 - a. Co-production
 - b. Gender
 - c. Funders
 - d. NMHSs
- 35. WISER (2022), *East Africa, Extension Closure Report* (July – December 2021 & Further extension to end Feb 2022)

Pioneering a Holistic approach to Energy and Nature-based Options in MENA for Long-term stability (PHENOMENAL)

- 36. FCDO (2021), Phenomenal Business Case
- 37. FCDO (2022), FCDO-MO MoU
- 38. MENA Scoping Study, Appendices
- 39. MET Office (2022), WISER MENA unnamed



Foreign, Commonwealth
& Development Office



- 40. WISER MENA (2022), WISER MENA Scoping Report
- 41. WISER MENA (2022), Building resilience to hazards in the MENA region through enhancing use of weather and climate information A summary of the WISER MENA Scoping Report August 2022

Appendix C: primary data collection opportunities



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



Table 4 and Table 5 are based on where primary data had been collected from end users within monitoring and evaluation activities from both ARRCC and WISER.

Please note though that this list will need to be reviewed again and prioritised by the evaluation team when they are commissioned. When, whether and how to collect data again will need to be re-evaluated based on the time of the year and making best use of the opportunity.

No final decision on whether, whom and what data collected should be undertaken without further FCDO and Met Office feedback and engagement.

Table 4: WISER Africa Primary Level Data Collection Opportunities

Project	M&E
DARAJA (Kenya and Tanzania)	<p>Scoping report, Mid-line report, Endline report</p> <p>WISER Resilience Impact (WRIP⁴) data collection undertaken</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• HH survey (50% women's, FGDs (50% Women) house-hold surveys and media coverage BL / EL.• KIIS with city decision makers, disaster risk managers, NMHS, media groups, community leaders and teachers• Reduced endline based on baseline experience• Information ecosystem mapping• Data on avoided losses due to use of WCIS

⁴ The WRIP methodology holds five indicators, four of which were designed to measure changes amongst direct beneficiaries, such as farmers, fishers, and residents of informal settlements, in terms of their use and satisfaction with new and improved WCIS as well as resulting ability to anticipate and prepare for high impact weather or climate events and disasters. A fifth indicator measured improvements in anticipation and preparedness



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



Project	M&E
CRISPP (Kenya)	Project M&E framework, Baseline report, endline report WRIP data collection undertaken HH survey conducted in Kilifi, including baseline and endline survey. Socio-Economic Benefit study
Iteganyagihe Ryacu (Rwanda)	Baseline, endline survey of farmers, 5Q test results, case studies WRIP Used the 5Q approach across 30 districts. 7000 taught how to respond to survey using IRV. Respondents were selected randomly from a database of 10,000 farmers distributed across Rwanda 5Qs also employed to collect endline feedback from 57 DRR actors.
Strengthening weather and climate information services in Uganda	End of project report, end evaluation No WRIP, No baseline and endline reports. Conducted an evaluation which provided information on resilience impact

amongst indirect beneficiaries reached through intermediary organisations, such as national and local government ministries, agencies and extension services, private sector, and media bodies. It is important to note that baseline data as used in WRIP was not collected before programme activities had taken place.



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



Project	M&E
HIGHWAY (multiple countries)	<p>Baseline report Kenya, Monitoring Evaluation, Reporting and Learning (MERL) plan.</p> <p>Results of the survey on deaths from drowning and other accidental causes in the Kenyan sector of Lake Victoria 2017-2020.</p> <p>Transformational Change Impacts of the HIGHWAY project, Resilience study in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• WRIP• Socio-economic benefit study and in Kilifi, as part of the coastal component of CRISPP.• Highway Transformational change impacts study.• AVV-BFF very limited sample – 11 KII and 4FGDs
W2SIP (multiple countries)	<p>W2-SIP Implementation evaluation survey.</p> <p>Evaluation in this project would focus on the transfer of technical knowledge /capacities to NMHSs through foundational training. It may also focus on acceptance and use of the objective forecast method piloted through the project and the use of the coproduction manual also developed through the project and participation in the Community of practice</p>
Tanzania National Project	No surveys carried out
Weather Wise (Greater Horn of Africa)	Evaluative report



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



Project	M&E
WISER Western (Kenya)	Case studies. Baseline assessments (qualitative), CCOFs participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches principally through questionnaires

Table 5: ARRCC primary data collection opportunities

Project / Prog	Opportunities
CIMMYT <i>Climate services to avoid food security threatening crop disease</i> <i>epidemics in South Asia</i>	<p>Covering the period November 2021 – March 2022 (so near end of programme), it was reported in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bangladesh Data was collected from 678 Sub Assistant Agriculture Officer (SAAO), randomly selected from 1500 listed SAAOs, and from 388 wheat farmers randomly selected out of a total of 2,098. On average, each SAAO shared the information with 385 farmers, and it was estimated that 207,130 wheat farmers were reached directly by the SAAO's surveyed. With an estimated 504,000 farmers being reached with messages Nepal 43 government extension officials and 1,157 farmers randomly selected from a total of 5000 were surveyed. Key results: 49% of the government officials surveyed received 10 the advisory information (mainly from the Krishi bulletin, but also from SMS), of these 67% then shared the message with farmers.



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



Project / Prog	Opportunities
Regional Enhancements under ARRCC: The South Asia Climate Outlook Forum (SASCOF) & Climate Services User Forum (CSUF) Final Project Report – June 2022	Opportunities to collect evidence around the Enhanced Seasonal Climate Outlook Statement. Because this went operational quite close to the end of the programme, we didn't have a chance to observe how this is routinely produced or gather evidence on how it's been applied to decision-making.
ARRCC Impact Based Forecasting Pilots. (Nepal, Bangladesh, Pakistan)	Generally, it would be helpful to know how these pilots are being continued, implemented etc post programme. Is there evidence which can be learnt, or best practice suggested in how relationships are developed among collaborating institutions in any one of the countries. E.g., do mechanisms exist to ensure it is/can be sustained after the intervention of any one programme.
University of Leeds (2022), Assessing the use and benefits of weather and climate information services in Pakistan: Final report for the Asia resilience to a changing climate programme, August	Pakistan project Mixed methods – 2 x hh (1 st for hh and cotton crop in April / May and then cotton in September) and FGD Multistage stratified random sampling to develop study representative to the cotton-wheat cropping areas in Pakistan. FGD tool available within study but not hh survey. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 612 hh survey<ul style="list-style-type: none">➢ 413 were based in Punjab and 199 were based in Sindh➢ 311 were male respondents whilst 301 were female



Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



Project / Prog	Opportunities
2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ 340 were users /272 nonusers (mostly in Sindh) of weather and climate informationWomen interviewed within hh for every second survey• Two key PMD sources of information - weather news on national TV and PMD SMS service - are consistently used by approximately 40-50% of current users of WCIS to inform their key farming activities e.g., planting times, harvesting times, threshing times, irrigation, choice of planting varieties, use of pesticides and chemicals, and drying
Work Package 2: SCIPSA agromet- decision support pilots (Nepal, Bangladesh)	Similar to follow-up for the IBF pilots, there may be potential to follow-up on use, effectiveness and learning
Work Package 3 – CARISSA (Nepal)	Some of the activities (e.g., sea level work, hydropower work - Nepal, WFP climate food security analysis for Nepal) produced a range of outputs. It would be useful to assess how well these outputs met the needs and expectations of FCDO and project stakeholders, and what (if any) their long-term benefits have been.