

Section 3

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terms of Reference for PO 7977 - Support to the Implementation of the World Trade Organisation Trade Facilitation Agreement (SITFA) Programme

INTRODUCTION

1. The Support to the implementation of the World Trade Organisation Trade Facilitation Agreement (SITFA) programme is an initiative to help least developed and other developing countries to implement trade facilitation reforms to reduce trade costs and waiting times at the border; and in the long term to contribute to inclusive growth.
2. DFID is providing £15 million in funding over a 7 year period (2015-2022), to a number of global funds such as the World Bank Trade Facilitation Support Programme [TFSP] £10.5m, Global Alliance on Trade Facilitation [GATF] £1.5m, and WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Facility [TFAF] £0.5m, to enable DFID priority countries to receive the right type of support they require to implement the agreement including identifying needs at country level and matching these needs (that cannot be met through existing country and regional programmes) to the right global sources of trade facilitation reforms finance.
3. DFID will monitor the implementation of the SITFA programme to assess its performance in achieving its intended outcomes, its value for money, its gender responsiveness and equity, and other DFID priorities.
4. DFID will evaluate the SITFA programme to support DFID's programme management and policy orientation, to support programme implementation, to assess its overall value and to generate knowledge about successful trade facilitation.
5. DFID's Trade for Development Department (TfD) is procuring monitoring and evaluation (M&E) expertise to support TfD with the functions noted in paragraph 3 and 4 above, as such DFID is the client and principal beneficiary of the M&E work that will be carried out by the external service provider, i.e. the "M&E unit."

CONTEXT

6. The Support to the implementation of the World Trade Organisation Trade Facilitation Agreement (SITFA) programme is an initiative to help developing countries to implement trade facilitation reforms to reduce trade costs and waiting times at the border; and in the long term to contribute to inclusive growth. DFID is funding this programme over a 7-year period (2015-2022), with £15 million, to:
 - identify needs at a country level and match these needs (that cannot be met through existing country and regional programmes) to the right global sources of trade facilitation reforms finance;
 - provide funding to a number of global funds such as the World Bank Trade Facilitation Support Programme [TFSP], Global Alliance on Trade Facilitation [GATF], and WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Facility [TFAF], to enable DFID priority countries to receive the right type of support they require to implement the agreement;
 - monitor and evaluate this initiative to assess extent of delivery of results against the DFID logframe, value for money and disseminate research, best practice and tools for monitoring and evaluating trade facilitation programmes.
7. The programme's aims as articulated in the logframe, are as follows:
 - Impact: GDP and trade volumes increase in developing countries, and growth becomes more inclusive.
 - Outcome: WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement implemented, contributing to trade cost reductions in developing countries.
 - Outputs: Technical assistance and capacity building that improves developing countries' implementation of the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement [World Bank Trade Facilitation Support Programme (TFSP)]
 - Businesses organised to advocate for and contribute to implementation of trade facilitation reforms, in developing countries. [Global Alliance on Trade Facilitation (GATF)].
 - Trade Facilitation assistance coordinated and information about available assistance shared with developing countries. [WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Facility (TFAF)].
8. The specific SITFA results that will be delivered by the programme are:
 - Implementation of key articles of the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement (TFA) in line with country commitments presented to the WTO;
 - Reform Action Plans for TFA implementation for each country formulated with next steps and timeline;

- Reduced trading costs as a result of improved trade facilitation and logistics services and systems.

9. The SITFA is implemented by:

- World Bank Trade Facilitation Support Programme [TFSP], which supports developing countries to understand, plan, sequence and implement their obligations under the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement. Funding envelope: £4 million
- Global Alliance on Trade Facilitation [GATF] (under design and piloting) which is a public private partnership to bring in the voice and expertise of the private sector to contribute to trade facilitation reforms in developing countries. Funding envelope: £1.5 million
- WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Facility [TFAF] contributes to coordinating donors and agencies trade facilitation related development assistance, and sharing information about available assistance to developing countries. Funding envelope: £0.5 million

10. The specific activities are as follows:

World Bank Trade Facilitation Support Programme (TFSP)

- Provides technical assistance and capacity building to improve developing countries' implementation of the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement
- TFSP provides support for countries seeking assistance in aligning their trade practices with the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement.
- TFSP helps developing countries implement trade facilitation reforms aimed at improving trade systems, services, and practices, potentially leading to increased trade, investments, job creation, and private sector competitiveness.

Global Alliance on Trade Facilitation (GATF)

- Launched in December 2015
- Businesses organised to advocate for and contribute to implementation of trade facilitation reforms, in developing countries.
- Recognizing that neither governments nor the private sector can deliver on the full potential of the TFA on their own, the [World Economic Forum](#), the [International Chamber of Commerce](#) and the [Centre for International Private Enterprise](#) together with the governments of Australia, Canada, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States have joined forces in the Global Alliance for Trade Facilitation.

- The Alliance partners have established a public-private platform to leverage business expertise, leadership and resources to support effective trade facilitation reforms measured by real-world business metrics.
- The core activities of the Alliance include:
 - Building understanding of the benefits of trade facilitation within both the public and private sectors;
 - Establishing sustainable multi-stakeholder dialogues on trade facilitation;
 - Mobilizing public-private partnerships to drive change, engaging local businesses and associations;
 - Technical and financial assistance in support of capacity building;
 - Benchmarking and evaluation based on established business metrics.
- It is envisioned that the Alliance will support efforts in 4 to 10 developing countries on an annual rolling basis—while also working at global and regional levels to enhance stakeholder awareness of the importance of TFA and of the role of public-private cooperation in implementing customs and border reforms.

WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Facility (TFAF)

- TFAF coordinates trade facilitation assistance and provides information about available assistance shared with developing countries.
- The TFAF aims at enhancing WTO Members' understanding of the Agreement, the steps needed for its implementation, and the requirements to benefit from the special and differential treatment provisions. To this end, it makes available training materials, case studies, and best practices.
- The Facility delivers national and regional workshops aimed at key stakeholders in the implementation of the Trade Facilitation Agreement, so as to enable them to exchange strategic views and experiences for harmonized and effective implementation of the TFA, as well as enhancing a cooperative relationship among key stakeholders.
- Activities carried out in 2015 and 2016 include:
 - Matchmaking: linking WTO least and developing country members that face challenges finding funding to potential donors
 - Developing rules and procedures for grant funding operations
 - National and regional workshops on trade facilitation, TFA ratification, TFA implementation (notifications etc.)

- National needs assessments
- Trade facilitation courses, training material, website
- Outreach for TFAF promotion and coherence

OBJECTIVE

11. These Terms of Reference (ToR)¹ are for a four-year M&E external supplier support for DFID (2017-18 to 2020-21) that will provide independent monitoring and evaluation of the SITFA programme to:
- i. support DFID in its management of SITFA and its oversight of the implementation programmes it is funding, i.e. TFSP, GATF and TFAF;
 - ii. support DFID in meeting its fiduciary and due diligence responsibilities in respect of the performance and value of SITFA;
 - iii. provide guidance and oversight to the implementation programmes in meeting their performance monitoring and reporting obligations to DFID;
 - iv. conduct at least two evaluations of SITFA;
 - v. generate knowledge about SITFA and trade facilitation that is relevant and useful to DFID programme management, to DFID policy processes and to the trade facilitation community at large;
 - vi. support efficient coordination and exchange between contributors to the TFSP multi-donor trust fund, to GATF and to TFAF, to mitigate the risk of duplication of monitoring and evaluation, to exchange monitoring and evaluation information and to support joint evaluation where possible and appropriate.
 - vii. support and collaborate with DFID on internal DFID annual reviews and project completion activities.

¹ The SITFA programme business case and logical framework (attached) should be read in conjunction with these ToR.

THE RECIPIENT

12. The M&E support delivered by the independent provider will strengthen the SITFA programme design, delivery and lesson learning, and development of a stronger evidence base. The principal recipients are therefore the implementation entities: the World Bank (TFSP), the World Trade Organisation (TFAF), the World Economic Forum secretariat for the Global Alliance for Trade Facilitation (GATF) which also includes the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) Global, and the Centre for International Private Enterprise (CIPE), Governments and Alliance partner private sector organisation in SITFA supported beneficiary countries.

KEY STAKEHOLDERS

13. Key stakeholders include:
- a) **The SITFA implementation entities:** so far these include (i) the World Bank, (ii) the World Trade Organisation; (iii) the World Economic Forum secretariat for the Global Alliance on Trade Facilitation (which also includes the International Chamber of Commerce Global, and the Centre for International Private Enterprise).
 - b) **Developing country governments:** including Ministries of Commerce; Trade and Investment Support Institutions/Boards; Customs and other border agencies.
 - c) **Private sector companies** - both multinationals, and small to large enterprises in developing countries.

SCOPE

14. Evaluation:
- The scope of the M&E Unit is the entirety of activities funded under SITFA, i.e. the activities of the [World Bank Trade Facilitation Support Programme, Global Alliance on Trade Facilitation and the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Facility]. The M&E Unit will seek to judge the effectiveness and impact of DFID's funding to these programmes and therefore will need to consider the activities as a whole and the extent to which DFID funding has enabled the activities and DFID's contribution towards programme outcomes and impacts.

THE REQUIREMENTS

15. **Evaluation**
- (a) The M&E unit is expected to carry out at least two evaluations:

- A formative evaluation at about the mid-point of the current funding period, e.g. 2018/2019, for the primary purpose of improving the implementation of the SITFA programme, including its strategic orientation and priorities, and the quality of its management. As well, to assess overall progress towards intended outcomes, and, where possible, seek indications of possible effects on specific groups such as women, small traders, small and medium enterprises, and populations living in poverty. The evaluation would seek to generate and communicate knowledge about what activities appear to be more effective in which contexts. See Annex A for more information and possible high level questions.
 - A summative evaluation towards the end of the current funding period, with the primary purpose of assessing the overall value of the SITFA programme in terms of its effects on key stakeholder groups and communities, i.e. changes to people's lives. Or, in other words, understanding and assessing the overall value generated by DFID's investment in SITFA in terms of social, economic, political and environmental impacts among others. This with a view to deepening our knowledge of trade facilitation initiatives, to presenting reliable and relevant information for policy and to providing accountability. See Annex A for more information and possible high level questions.
- (b) Given the complexity of the environments in which the SITFA programme is being implemented a systems perspective should inform evaluation approaches and methodologies, rather than simple linear causal models. The theory of change should be articulated in a way that shows SITFA's contribution to a system change, i.e. theory of system change.
- (c) In addition, given the weak internal validity of the SITFA programme relative to broad goals of increased trade volumes and GDP, as well as of poverty reduction, methodologies should focus on realistic and valid assessments of value, particularly for key groups and populations. Evaluation processes should prioritise knowledge generation and communication.

16. **Risks and challenges:**

- (a) At the inception stage we will assess key risks across the three implementing projects and develop a plan to mitigate these.
- (b) A key challenge for us and with any trade development programmes is the limitations to being able to link high level impact objectives with results. Secondly, the other area is around the political will to actually implement the reform agreements by countries at large.
- (c) We would expect the provider to propose approaches and methodologies and considerations on some of the challenges for the evaluation at the inception stage.

17. **Programme Evaluation criteria:**

- The nature of the programmes that are implemented is such that they operate in complex environments, i.e. in which critical determinants of programme value are context driven rather than under the control of programme management and in which sequences of events such as intended outcome trajectories as well as unintended effects are relatively unpredictable.
- The overriding challenge for programmes in these types of contexts is to add real value on the ground, i.e. making de facto positive change in people's lives through outcomes and impacts, rather than just limiting the appreciation to programme outputs, i.e. de jure changes.
- Consequently, their evaluation requires a systems based approach that takes into account the predominance of context and the uncertainty factor, rather than simply a linear causal approach that sets out an intended results chain to which the programmes are expected to comply and such as which the OECD DAC criteria are based on largely.
- As part of the inception phase, the M&E service provider will be expected to review and refine the evaluation questions for both the formative and summative evaluations, and to articulate analytical frameworks for each that will allow for the assessment of findings against principles of sound management and DFID expectations.
- For the formative evaluation the thrust of the main question is the extent to which the programmes are well managed. OECD DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency and, to a lesser degree effectiveness, may be applied however the inception phase should also articulate expectations consistent with principles of sound adaptive management, e.g. PDIA (<https://www.hks.harvard.edu/centers/cid/publications/faculty-working-papers/cid-working-paper-no.-240>), gender responsive and equity based management, environmentally responsive management. In particular the evaluation should assess the extent to which programmes are managed consistent with principles of results based management, i.e. programme resources are allocated and programme processes & outputs are adapted based on sound outcome monitoring data and on systematic context information, respecting the no one size fits all (NOSFA) principle. The formative evaluation should provide developmental evaluative information to programme implementers to improve their management and the likelihood of achieving intended outcomes and expected impacts. It should also provide information to further adapt and refine SITFA's theory of change as well as provide DFID with accountability information on the performance of the programmes.
- For the summative evaluation the thrust of the main question is the extent to which the suite of SIFTA programmes has achieved intended outcomes and expected impacts, and the extent to which the positive benefits of these appear sustainable. In particular, the evaluation should consider the achievements of the programmes using gender responsive and equity based evaluation methodologies as well as other approaches and methodologies referred to in the preceding section.

18. **Monitoring:**

While the logical framework can be a useful tool for identifying those building blocks of programme performance that require measurement to track changes and assessment against expected results, not all key aspects of performance are captured by logic modelling so that appropriate performance monitoring and reporting framework will be required to meet DFID requirements and to support implementation management.

For example, performance information should be provided on key dimensions of value for money, i.e. economy, efficiency and effectiveness, of gender responsiveness, of equity, among others that may be of significant interest to DFID.

As some of these dimensions cannot be captured through logic modelling, some form of short narrative, and the use of rubrics, supported by data, should form part of the performance monitoring and reporting output expected of each implementing agency.

The M&E unit is expected to:

- support, e.g. to the programme implementer in providing required performance information;
- oversight, i.e. that performance information meets DFID requirements, ties in with financial reporting information, and is useful for SITFA oversight and due diligence purposes;
- assurance, i.e. that the performance information provided by the programme implementer is reliable and timely;
- collaboration, e.g. with DFID annual reviews and other DFID monitoring requirements.

The M&E unit will primarily use reporting data provided by the implementing partners. This will include project and programme level data on finance and results (including, but not limited to the indicators in the logframe). The inception phase will explore in more detail the data that it would be cost-effective for the M&E unit to collect.

The monitoring and evaluation should draw on both qualitative and quantitative data. This will include quantitative data on results, but detailed quantitative data at the outcome and impact-level may be limited. The M&E unit will conduct beneficiary and partner interviews to supplement reporting data.

The M&E unit is expected to develop during the inception phase a performance monitoring framework for SITFA that distinguishes between those data that the programme implementers are expected to provide and those that the M&E unit will itself gather. As well, the M&E unit should specify how it will collect additional monitoring data including that gathered through DFID's annual reviews.

See Annex B for potential monitoring questions

DELIVERABLES FOR INCEPTION

19. Within the first month of the contract (inception stage) – An inception process and a report to include,
- a) an accountability framework between DFID and programme implementer, specifying who is accountable to who, for what, how and when, consistent with DFID requirements and priorities and with each programme implementer's performance monitoring and reporting framework; this should include revision, update and inclusion of the logical framework.
 - b) a framework for provision of assurance to DFID on accountability for performance information provided by programme implementers, to meet fiduciary obligations and due diligence requirements.
 - c) a systems based Theory of Change, i.e. a theory of system change, that meets accepted standards together with a description of the process for integrating it into SITFA;
 - d) an updated DFID SITFA performance monitoring framework taking into account the recommendations of the evaluability assessment;
 - e) an evaluation plan;
 - f) in consultation with DFID and SITFA implementing entities, as well as with key stakeholders, produce a concept note and terms of reference for a midterm formative evaluation;

LINES OF COMMUNICATION

20. At the inception phase DFID will work with the provider to agree point of contacts for M&E for each of the 3 implementing partners.

BUDGET, TIMING AND CONTRACTUAL MATTERS

21. The contract value for this work is up to a maximum of £480,000 excluding VAT) over 50 months (including the inception phase). DFID reserves the right to extend the contract by a further 12 months subject to approval.
22. The contract for this work to deliver on these terms of reference will be split into an inception phase to prepare and explain how the independent M&E Unit will carry out its work; and an implementation phase which will include conducting at least two evaluations.

23. The inception stage is for a maximum of 2 months (starting mid 2017), the implementation contract is for 4 years (2017-18 to 2020-21). The contract will have a two break points, one after inception and one midpoint (at the end of the second year, 2019), at which DFID will decide based on the performance of the service provider and need whether to proceed to the final 2 years.
24. DFID will pay the supplier for delivery of specific outputs, to agreed standards of quality and of timeliness subject to satisfaction.
25. The M&E Unit's performance will be monitored through DFID's assessment of the timeliness, quality and value for money of inputs and outputs delivered as per the output based contract schedule to be negotiated during the inception phase.
26. The provider will work sensitively and cooperatively with private sector companies on development interventions as necessary.
27. The M&E unit will need to work with private sector entities, taking into consideration sensitivities around sharing and publishing confidential commercial information. Private sector partners will need to be consulted at the beginning and throughout the lifetime of this contract to ensure they are explicitly clear and formally agree on the data collection, delivery and timing for these to contribute to the monitoring and evaluation of SITFA. Note over the lifetime of SITFA other implementing entities may be funded from this programme to contribute to achieving its objectives.

SERVICE PROVIDER REQUIREMENTS

28. The service provider should demonstrate that it has the following evaluation qualifications:
 - (a) **Knowledge** – Expert knowledge of, and familiarity with, contemporary evaluation theory and practice as it relates to systemic approaches, GEM methodologies and particularly inferential case study, to evaluating sustainability and changes in people's lives.
 - (b) **Experience** – Demonstrated track record in conducting successfully GEM framed evaluation, developmental evaluation, applying systems thinking to evaluation, gender responsive and equity based evaluation.
 - (c) **Communication Skills** – Demonstrated track record of effective communication of evaluation, innovation and use modern media.

29. The service provider should demonstrate that it has the following trade sector qualifications:

- (a) **Skills** - in monitoring complex aid for trade programmes, preferably those related to trade facilitation, customs and border management reforms. In addition, they have skills in managing complex stakeholder relationships to leverage results.
- (b) **Knowledge** – expert knowledge of trade facilitation, customs and border management issues. In addition, extensive knowledge of broader trade issues, business and investment enabling environment issues, supply and value chain management.
- (c) **Experience** – proven and successful experience of monitoring and evaluating aid for trade and private sector development programmes, preferably those involving private sector companies, not only as beneficiaries, but also as co-financiers, and as development actors (implementers).
- (d) **Networks** – extensive professional networks in the public and private sectors with organisations that deal with policy development and implementation of aid for trade, trade facilitation, customs and border management issues.
- (e) **Credibility** – The evaluator should have the experience and knowledge of the business sector, as well as the credibility to be accepted as an agent that understands the realities of private sector enterprise and takes them into account.

CONSTRAINTS AND DEPENDENCIES

30. SITFA is being implemented by three very different entities (World Bank, World Trade Organisation, and a consortium led by the World Economic Forum). The M&E Unit will be dealing with different reporting formats, M&E capacities and timelines. These need to be addressed carefully and planning for delivery of M&E outputs should take these into consideration.

31. Collecting firm level data in some instances, countries and sectors will be a challenge, as some companies are averse to sharing commercial in confidence data (e.g. revenue, profit, costs). However, it will be important to collect business/economic performance data from various sources to demonstrate the impact of SITFA on firms. The M&E Unit should consider at inception innovative ways to collect and report such data, in consultation with and respecting commercial confidentiality of the private sector. These should be included in the evaluation plans.

REPORTING

32. The M&E Unit will report to DFID. Specific delivery dates of reports (e.g. 6 monthly monitoring reports and the independent midterm evaluation) will be agreed as part of negotiations of the output based contract and output schedule. Reports have to be clear, concise and written in plain English, as some of these M&E reports may be published subject to a decision by DFID.

Reporting	Content
Inception Report	An inception report aligned to the needs and scope of the work to be undertaken.
6 monthly Narrative Progress & Expenditure Reports	<p>Progress report format should be aligned with the logframe, i.e. reporting against specific activities, outputs, key deliverables/indicators and expenditures;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified risks with monitoring/mitigation measures. • Clearly identified action points with timelines. • Progress against previously identified action points. • Coordination and governance issues. • Performance of key partners and any partnership issues including how these have/will be managed.
Annual Reports	<p>Which contribute to DFID's Annual Review process, drawing on information from across the research portfolio and should highlight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress against the Outputs in the logframe, including how valid were the Assumptions and Risks. • Progress against research plans, research uptake and capacity building strategies. • Lessons learned and how these have been shared. • Actions taken against the recommendations in the last annual review. • How the partnership has performed. • How value for money has been demonstrated. • Performance against original budget. • How risks have been managed.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery against the planned timeframe. • Feedback received from beneficiaries. <p>In addition, Annual reports should also include a forward workplan for the subsequent year as well as financial forecasts.</p>
Formative Report	A formative report to provide DFID and the implementing partners with evaluative information on implementation strategies and their actualisation, as well as on the performance management systems of the three supported initiatives, with a view to improving SITFA's performance and value.
End of contract report	<p>Which contributes to DFID's Project Completion Report, drawing on information from across the research portfolio and for the duration of the contract should respond to the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance against the Outcome. • Performance against the Outputs in the logframe, including how valid were the Assumptions and Risks. • Lessons learned and how these have been shared. • Actions taken against the recommendations in the last annual review. • How the partnership(s) has performed. • How value for money has been demonstrated. • Performance against original budget. • How risks have been managed. • Delivery against the planned timeframe. • Feedback received from beneficiaries.
Summative Report	A Final summative report would be to assess the overall value of SITFA programme.

33. If the M&E Unit are contacted by the media or press about the SITFA programme, they should direct them to DFID's press team and inform the DFID programme manager and lead adviser.

DFID COORDINATION

34. The principal persons in DFID for coordination on all matters regarding this contract are, the Programme Manager, Lead Adviser and Senior Responsible Officer

DUTY OF CARE

35. 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.
36. 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.
37. This procurement may require the supplier to operate in a seismically active zone and is considered at high risk of earthquakes. Minor tremors are not uncommon. Earthquakes are impossible to predict and can result in major devastation and loss of life. There are several websites focusing on earthquakes, including <http://geology.about.com/library/bl/maps/blworldindex.htm>. The Supplier should be comfortable working in such an environment and should be capable of deploying to any areas required within the region in order to deliver the Contract (subject to travel clearance being granted).
38. This procurement may require the Supplier to operate in conflict-affected areas and parts of it are highly insecure. Travel to many zones within the region will be subject to travel clearance from the UK government in advance. The security situation is volatile and subject to change at short notice. The Supplier should be comfortable working in such an environment and should be capable of deploying to any area required within the region in order to deliver the Contract (subject to travel clearance being granted).
39. The supplier is responsible for ensuring that appropriate arrangements, processes and procedures are in place for their personnel, taking into account the environment they will be working in and the level of risk involved in delivery of the Contract (such as working in seismically active, dangerous, fragile and conflict-affected environments). The Supplier should ensure their personnel receive the required level of training and, if appropriate, complete a UK government approved hostile environment training course (SAFE)[1] safety in the field training prior to deployment.

40. As the countries/areas of work involved in this intervention are currently undetermined, DFID is not in a position to be able to provide a Duty of Care assessment at this point. On this basis, DFID assumes that this programme will be rated as 'Medium/High' risk.

41. During the programme, it is DFID's expectation that any contracted supplier will provide a full Duty of Care assessment for each potential country/area of work where in-country ground work is expected to be necessary. If the programme activities take place in medium or high risk locations, DFID will share available information with the Supplier on security status and developments in-country where appropriate.

42. Duty of care risk matrix

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

Country	City	Overall Security	Violent Crime	Civil Disorder	Terrorism	Espionage
Afghanistan	Kabul (Capital)	5	4	4	5	-
Bangladesh	Dhaka (Capital)	3	3	3	4	-
Botswana	Gaborone (Capital)	3	3	3	2	-
Burkina Faso	Ouagadougou (Capital)	4	4	4	4	-
Burundi	Bujumbura (Capital)	4	4	4	4	-
Cambodia	Phnom Penh (Capital)	2	2	2	2	-
Cameroon	Yaoundé (Capital)	3	3	3	3	-

Central African Republic	Bangui (Capital)	4	5	5	3	-
Chad	N'Djamena (Capital)	4	4	4	4	-
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Kinshasa (Capital)	4	5	5	2	-
Cote d' Ivoire	Abidjan (Capital)	3	3	3	2	-
Djibouti	Djibouti City (Capital)	3	2	2	3	-
Equatorial Guinea	Malabo (Capital)	2	2	2	1	-
Eritrea	Asmara (Capital)	2	1	1	2	-
Ethiopia	Addis Ababa (Capital)	3	2	2	3	-
Gabon	Libreville (Capital)	2	2	2	1	-
Gambia	Banjul (Capital)	2	2	2	2	-
Ghana	Accra (Capital)	3	3	3	2	-
Iraq	Baghdad (Capital)	5	5	4	5	-
Jordan	Amman (Capital)	4	2	2	4	-

Kenya	Nairobi (Capital)	4	5	5	4	-
Kyrgyzstan	Bishkek (Capital)	2	2	2	2	-
Laos	Vientiane (Capital)	2	2	2	2	-
Lebanon	Beirut (Capital)	4	3	3	4	-
Lesotho	Maseru (Capital)	4	4	4	1	-
Liberia	Monrovia (Capital)	3	3	3	1	-
Libya	Tripoli (Capital)	4	3	3	4	-
Madagascar	Antananarivo (Capital)	3	3	3	2	-
Maldives	Malé (Capital)	2	2	2	1	-
Mauritius	Port Louis (Capital)	2	1	1	2	-
Mozambique	Maputo (Capital)	3	3	3	2	-
Namibia	Windhoek (Capital)	3	3	3	1	-
Nigeria	Abuja (Capital)	4	4	4	4	-

Pakistan	Islamabad (Capital)	5	4	3	5	Specific security concern
Rwanda	Kigali (Capital)	2	2	2	2	-
Senegal	Dakar (Capital)	3	2	2	3	-
Seychelles	Victoria (Capital)	3	3	3	2	-
Sierra Leone	Freetown (Capital)	3	3	3	2	-
South Africa	Cape Town (Capital)	4	4	4	2	-
South Sudan	Juba (Capital)	4	5	5	3	-
Sri Lanka	Colombo (Capital)	3	3	2	3	-
Sudan	Khartoum (Capital)	4	3	3	4	-
Swaziland	Lobamba (Capital)	2	2	2	1	-
Tajikistan	Dushanbe (Capital)	3	2	2	3	Specific security concern
Tanzania	Dar es Salaam (Capital)	4	4	4	3	-
Thailand	Bangkok (Capital)	3	3	3	3	-

Togo	Lomé (Capital)	4	4	4	1	-
Turkey	Ankara (Capital)	4	2	2	4	-
United Arab Emirates	Dubai (Capital)	3	1	1	3	-
Uganda	Kampala (Capital)	3	3	3	3	-
United States of America	Washington DC (Capital)	2	2	2	2	-
West Bank and Gaza	Jerusalem	4	3	3	4	Specific security concern
	Gaza City (Capital)	4	3	4	4	-
Yemen	Sana'a (Capital)	5	3	3	5	-
Zambia	Lusaka (Capital)	3	3	3	1	-
Zimbabwe	Harare (Capital)	3	3	3	1	-

TRANSPARENCY

43. DFID has transformed its approach to transparency, reshaping our own working practices and pressuring others across the world to do the same. DFID requires Suppliers 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.

It is a contractual requirement for all Suppliers to comply with this, and to ensure they have the appropriate tools to enable routine financial reporting, publishing of accurate data and providing evidence of this DFID – further IATI information is available from;

<http://www.aidtransparency.net/>

RESEARCH ETHICS

44. Researchers, evaluators and implementing agencies should adhere to clear, best practice ethical guidelines (e.g. confidentiality, disclosure, adequate and informed consent, explicitly ensuring ‘do no harm’), building on existing WHO resources and academic ethics protocols.

Specifying and ensuring compliance with ethical standards should form a part of research design, preparation of research teams, and delivery. All study team members and members of organisations involved in research delivery, should be carefully selected and receive specialised training and on-going support in research ethics.

Allied to ensuring best practice in research ethics, we expect the lead Supplier to ensure that clear ethical standards in research management are established, communicated, complied with, and monitored, including in relation to financial management and people management by all agents involved in research delivery and (particularly) all recipients of UK aid funds. The Supplier will be expected to develop a strategy for RPDC programme delivery.

Suppliers will be required to have written protocols for research/evaluation ethics and ethical clearance and to demonstrate adherence to WHO protocols and DFID research and ethical guidelines. During implementation, ethical review will be the responsibility of an appropriate Ethical Review Committee, established by the Supplier.

DFID BRANDING

45. The public has an expectation and a right to know what is funded with public money. It is expected that all research outputs will acknowledge DFID support in a way that is clear and explicit and which comply with DFID Branding Guidance. This will include ensuring that publications acknowledge DFID support.

If press releases on work which arises wholly or mainly from the project are planned this should be in collaboration with DFID Communications Department.

DIGITAL PRINCIPLES FOR PARTNERS AND SUPPLIERS

46. DFID expects all partners and suppliers who manage aid programmes with a digital element to adhere to the global [Principles for Digital Development](#). If any proposal contains a digital element this must be costed separately within the proformas and are subject to approval by DFID's digital team.

47. Environmental Considerations

- 47.1 The Supplier should ensure due consideration is given to the environmental impact of all work undertaken to deliver this component, both in terms of minimising any direct negative impact, and the extent to which research findings contribute to positive environmental management.
- 47.2 Specific attention to minimising operational impacts on the environment and global climate of those undertaking the research should include ensuring individuals travel by economy class, and reducing carbon footprint through for example, using recycled paper and minimising printing waste.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION

48. See attached SITFA business case and logframe.

Annex A Mid-term formative evaluation

The purpose of the formative mid-term evaluation would be to provide DFID and the implementing partners with evaluative information on implementation strategies and their actualisation, as well as on the performance management systems of the three supported initiatives, with a view to improving SITFA's performance and value. The focus will be on questions of program design, implementation and adaptive management, including the appropriateness of the programme's monitoring and evaluation systems.

Possible high level evaluation questions for the midterm evaluation are:

- a) How well are the programmes carried out to achieve implementation of the TFA by specific countries?
- b) What knowledge do the programmes have about ways to improve the value of their activities?
- c) How well does programme implementation identify, take into account and adjust to key and evolving contextual determinants of programme effectiveness, i.e. achievement of outcomes?
- d) Are there any preliminary indications of effects at impact level and, if so, how are these happening?
- e) How well do programmes meet value for money expectations, i.e. due regard for economy, efficiency and effectiveness?
- f) Do the measures reach those countries that are most likely to benefit from the proposed support (e.g. least developed countries)? How can targeting be improved?
- g) How well are programmes supporting trade facilitation reforms based on needs identified by governments and/or firms in developing countries?
- h) What is the complementarity of the three supported programmes and are there any overlaps?
- i) How do the programmes relate to other initiatives for trade facilitation covering the same countries?
- j) How well do programmes monitor, assess and report to DFID on their performance in implementing SITFA? What improvements should be made?
- k) Based on the first few years of implementation, how is the theory of change evolving and how is it used? To what extent is it meaningful, useful and valid for generating knowledge and assessing value? What adjustments are needed?
- l) To what extent and how well are gender, equity, sustainability and environmental perspectives integrated into the design, implementation and monitoring of SITFA?
- m) How can the management and accountability of the SITFA programmes be improved to add value?

The purpose of the final evaluation would be to assess the overall value of SITFA.

The methodological limitations to attributing net effect to programme activities does not mean that questions related to impact, understood as those significant effects, positive and negative, intended and unintended, on dimensions of trade, growth and poverty, cannot be meaningfully, usefully and validly addressed. The M&E unit is expected to develop and apply evaluation approaches and methodologies that provide reliable, valid, useful and meaningful information for management and policy decision making as well as generate useful knowledge on trade facilitation interventions.

In particular, General Elimination Methodology, or GEM approach, should be considered as the causal frame of reference for the assessment and final evaluation of SITFA's performance in terms of impact and overall value. Consistent with the GEM approach, Contribution Analysis, Realist Impact Evaluation, Multiple Case Study, Comparative Case Study, Longitudinal Mixed Methods Case Study are some of the methodologies that may apply.

Possible high level evaluation questions for the final evaluation are:

- n) What has been SITFA's contribution to changes in intended impacts and outcomes?
- o) How have changes in programme strategy and management affected the outcome trajectory and the overall value of SITFA?
- p) What have been the intended and unintended effects, positive and negative, of SITFA?
- q) How have key stakeholders, and in particular minority and vulnerable groups, been affected by the changes that SITFA has contributed to?
- r) How do advantages and disadvantages resulting from SITFA differ for women and men?
- s) What are the potential long-term impacts of the programme?
- t) How sustainable are gains made in trade facilitation?

Annex B

Potential monitoring questions

(a) Outcomes

- i. Is SITFA delivering against the DFID monitoring framework's agreed intended outcomes?
- ii. How is SITFA contributing to mainstreaming gender in trade facilitation project implementation and/or women's economic empowerment (provide both qualitative and quantitative evidence)?
- iii. Are firms, including micro, small and medium enterprises, both formal and informal in developing countries benefiting from SITFA? And how (reduced trade/business costs, waiting times at the border, less opportunities for or elimination of border corruption)?
- iv. Is SITFA indirectly benefiting other marginalised groups such as the unemployed, and youth?
- v. Are there any risks that SITFA projects could be negatively affecting communities that may lose due to trade facilitation reforms (e.g. formal and informal pre/post shipment inspection and customs brokers)? If so, how is SITFA addressing these negative effects?

(b) Value for Money (VFM)

Relevance

- Is SITFA supporting trade facilitation reforms based on needs identified by governments and/or firms in developing countries?
- How is the Theory of System Change being used and continuously updated?

Economy

- Are SITFA resources being used by the implementing entities economically?
- Is SITFA buying inputs of the appropriate quality at the right price (inputs are things such as staff, consultants, raw materials and capital that are used to produce outputs)?

Efficiency

- How well are implementers managing their activities to leverage change in specific and changing country contexts?

Effectiveness

- Is SITFA achieving its overall objective (are the outputs of implementers contributing to intended outcomes)?
- To what extent is SITFA achieving its objectives, compared to what was initially planned (DFID theory of change, monitoring framework, SITFA implementing entities' logframes or similar performance management tools)?

Counter Fraud/Corruption

- Are the SITFA implementing entities diligently managing any potential risks of fraud, corruption and mismanagement of funds by them or their sub-contracts and partners, particularly at the regional and country levels? How? Are political economy analyses used appropriately?

Equity

- Is the programme gender responsive?
What are the effects, intended and unintended, positive and negative, of SITFA activities o