

Section 3

Terms of Reference

Global Evaluation Monitoring Framework Agreement (GEMFA)

Introduction

1. The FCDO seeks to establish a new Global Evaluation Monitoring Framework Agreement (GEMFA) to ensure the provision of efficient and effective expert services for the design and implementation of monitoring and/or monitoring evaluation and learning (MEL) of programmes delivered by FCDO and other Government Departments. Membership will be awarded to the framework under the following four lots.

- a. **Lot 1 - Monitoring High Value Lot (>£600k) with mini-competition**
- b. **Lot 2 - Monitoring Low Value Lot (< £600k) with round robin**
- c. **Lot 3 - Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) High Value Lot (>£600k) with mini-competition**
- d. **Lot 4 - Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Low Value Lot (< £600k) with round robin**

Each lot will have a maximum of **ten** (10) lead framework participants managing a consortium of subcontractors.

Lead framework participants on any high value lots (Lots 1 & 3) **will not** be permitted to participate on any of the low value lots as either a lead supplier or a subcontractor. Lead framework participants on the low value lots (Lots 2 & 4) **will be** permitted to act as a subcontractor on the high value lots.

2. The Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO) leads the UK Government's effort to promote sustainable development and end poverty. The FCDO pursues British national interests and projects the UK as a force for good in the world. It promotes the interests of British citizens, safeguards the UK's security, defends our values, reduces poverty and tackles global challenges together with international partners.
3. The FCDO is interested in attracting a range of framework participants who can provide monitoring and/or monitoring, evaluation and learning expertise across a range of geographical regions and thematic areas for development and diplomacy work.
4. The current Global Evaluation Framework Agreement (GEFA) has awarded 66 contracts to the value of £90 million from September 2016 – May 2021. The current expiry date of GEFA is 31st December 2022. The current Independent Monitoring and Process Evaluation Regional Framework Agreement (IMPERFA) has awarded 7 contracts to the value of £9 million from April 2019 – May 2021. The current expiry date of IMPERFA is 14th April 2022.

5. It is intended that the GEMFA will become the FCDO's primary route to undertake its evaluations and/or monitoring assignments during the period of its operations through framework participants.

Background

6. The Foreign Secretary highlighted the importance of monitoring and evaluation in his recent speech at the launch of the FCDO, where he stated that "I want to focus on making sure that, when we are taking a decision, we monitor, evaluate and feedback the outcomes...so that we constantly evaluate the value and impact that we have"¹. Monitoring and evaluation are needed for the purpose of accountability, to demonstrate the effectiveness and impact of programme spend to taxpayers, partners and other stakeholders. However, the purpose also goes beyond accountability to ensure learning from investments – identifying what works, course correction on interventions and informing future policy and investment decisions.
7. Evaluation and monitoring enable the FCDO to learn about what works to tackle poverty and promote growth at country and international level. The FCDO is strongly committed to providing Value for Money through the development of a robust evidence base on development effectiveness and impact; understanding what development interventions work, for whom and in what circumstances, as well as which do not and why; learning and improving from its own experience and that of others. Further, the FCDO remains committed to driving the quality and maximising the utility and learning from its evaluation and monitoring portfolio.
8. The FCDO recognises that whilst evaluation is an important tool for learning and accountability, it is not always the most effective or efficient way to generate evidence and ensure evidence is used. Evaluation is not mandatory in the FCDO, but it is a requirement of all programmes and decisions to be based on evidence. Spending units must therefore think critically about when to conduct evaluation based on the strategic value, evidence gaps and resources available, and when to use other tools for generating evidence, such as monitoring assignments.
9. Evaluations and/or monitoring must meet international and cross-government standards on quality and rigour.² They must align to any forthcoming evaluation policies and strategies of FCDO (currently under development).
10. Monitoring and evaluation operates at three levels. At the programme level, MEL works to maximise the efficiency, impact and value for money of the programme, informing future programme designs and generating evidence on what works and what doesn't. At the portfolio level, MEL supports informed decisions about resources and strategic direction, improving the results, coherence and value for money of a group of related programmes. The third level of strategic MEL enables

¹ Foreign Secretary, 2 September 2020, at the launch of the FCDO.

² See HMG Magenta Book <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-magenta-book>; OECD Evaluation Criteria <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/>

cross-portfolio evidence generation to demonstrate impacts and make decisions about high-level strategy and policy.

Requirement

11. The FCDO evaluation system continues to commission a significant number of evaluations and/or monitoring assignments. As a result, the FCDO will need to have access to a range of framework participants who are able to provide high quality and internationally recognised evaluation and/or monitoring knowledge and skills to design and/or undertake evaluation and/or monitoring assignments across the organisation's policy areas and programmes in a range of geographical locations. This includes expertise in specialist areas such as measuring influence; monitoring, evaluating and learning within adaptive programmes and third-party monitoring.

Recipient

12. The recipients of the services will be FCDO and OGD for ODA and non-ODA development and diplomacy work.

The other Government Departments include:

- Home Office
- Department of Health and Social Care
- Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
- Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs
- Department for Culture Media and Sports
- Department of International Trade
- Office for National Statistics
- Ministry of Defence
- HM Revenue and Customs
- HM Treasury
- Department for Education
- Department for Work and Pensions
- Department for Transport
- Scottish Government
- Welsh Government

This list of departments is not exhaustive and will change through the life of the framework.

Scope of Work

13. The monitoring lots (Lots 1 and 2) will cover all independent and third-party monitoring assignments. The monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) lots (Lots 3 and 4) will cover all evaluation assignments as well as assignments that include both monitoring and evaluation, including the procurement of MEL units which act as a learning partner throughout the lifespan of the programme. These MEL lots will cover all types of evaluations, including impact evaluations, process evaluations and value for money evaluation. They will also cover any additional

learning assignments such as portfolio evaluations, synthesis work, reviews, evaluability assessments or results verification exercises.

14. This framework has time, geographic, thematic and intervention dimensions to its work.

- a. The framework is anticipated to be operational from February 2023 – January 2025, with extension options of 2 X 12 months. The framework will be reviewed each year to ensure it remains fit for purpose.
- b. Across all the lots, the Framework Agreement has global coverage (including the UK), and evaluations / monitoring will be undertaken in a wide range of different geographic locations and contexts, although the majority is likely to be ODA-eligible countries including fragile and conflict affected states (FCAS). In particular, the Foreign Secretary has emphasised a continuing focus on the Indo-Pacific region and Sub-Saharan African.³
- c. The Framework Agreement will cover requirements for monitoring and/or evaluation across a range of themes. This includes the seven core themes the Foreign Secretary recently set out for UK's ODA spend covering⁴:

Climate change and biodiversity: a greener and cleaner path to growth in developing countries

COVID and global health security: combat COVID-19 and support healthier and more resilient populations in developing countries

Girls' education: a global commitment to get 40 million girls into education and 20 million more girls reading by the age of 10

Science, research, technology: deliver cutting edge technology and research-led solutions in health, education, resilience, low carbon technologies, agriculture and economic development, conflict, and poverty

Open societies and conflict resolution: strengthen democratic institutions, human rights, free media, and effective governance

Humanitarian preparedness and response: Lead stronger collective international response to crises and famine

Trade and economic development: build trading and investment partners of the future

The Framework Agreement will be used in response to evaluation and/ or monitoring requests from across FCDO's portfolio on project, programmes or policy⁵ as well as from other government departments.

Scope of Work – Monitoring (For Lot 1 and Lot 2)

15. The FCDO uses OECD DAC definition of monitoring as “A continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.”

³Foreign Secretary in a statement to the House of Commons, 26 Nov 2020

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/changes-to-the-uks-aid-budget-in-the-spending-review>

⁵ Spending Departments likely to access the GEMFA include, but are not restricted to the FCDO's bilateral, multilateral, private sector, civil society, policy and research departments.

16. Monitoring is used to track progress of a programme's delivery and enable detailed oversight of projects, providing verification of the quantity, quality and progress toward project results. Independent monitoring may include assessing the accuracy and quality of implementing partners' monitoring systems, observing programme implementation, expert visits to programme sites, obtaining beneficiary feedback or verification of results achieved to enable the FCDO to release payments under payment by results programmes. Monitoring can also support learning through identifying ways to improve the programme's delivery and inform the design of new programmes.
17. Monitoring data is often administrative and quantitative, and typically covers all aspects of a programme's operation, for example, information about the programme beneficiaries, data on programme inputs, processes, outcomes and outcomes.
18. There are different types of monitoring.⁶ Results monitoring tests if the programme is on track against intended milestones and targets and whether it is creating unintended consequences. Monitoring of inputs and activities is used to understand how interventions are implemented. Monitoring of situation or context examines the programme's operating environment including risks, assumptions and political/institutional factors that may influence the programme's progress. Compliance monitoring may cover tracking financial information or assessing compliance with local and national laws and other standards.
19. There is an increasing emphasis and demand for monitoring using real-time data. This refers to high frequency data that is presented as it is acquired, or with a short time delay, fast enough to be used in decision-making. High frequency data can be used as a tool in monitoring and learning systems, enabling an up-to-date and/or large-scale picture of what is happening. Third-Party Monitoring (TPM) or independent monitoring describes the practice of contracting third parties to collect and verify monitoring data, as opposed to the implementing partner or donor collecting and verifying the data. It is often used in insecure contexts to monitor the activities of partner organizations in places where FCDO staff face access restrictions.
20. These framework lots will cover the full range of monitoring types and approaches. Framework participants will be required to demonstrate experience in undertaking a variety of monitoring assignments, including third party monitoring in a range of settings, and the use of real-time data in monitoring. Framework participants will need to demonstrate expertise in monitoring across all elements of a programme's operation, drawing on multiple data sources, and ensuring that this supports both accountability and learning aims.

Scope of Work – Monitoring and Evaluation (Lots 3 and 4)

⁶ Magenta Book: Central Government Guidance on Evaluation (March 2020).
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/879437/Magenta_Book_supplementary_guide._Handling_Complexity_in_policy_evaluation.pdf

21. The monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) lots will cover all evaluation assignments, as well as assignments that include both monitoring and evaluation, including the procurement of MEL units which act as a learning partner throughout the lifespan of the programme.
22. The purpose of evaluation in the FCDO is to contribute to improving the impact and value for money of the FCDO's development spending and support the effective delivery of the FCDO's Strategic Objectives. The FCDO needs to produce high quality, independent, relevant evaluations that enable development interventions to be responsive to the poorest people and contribute to their wellbeing. Evaluation seeks to generate evidence and knowledge that is policy and programme relevant and informs effective decision making.
23. There are typically two main purposes for carrying out an evaluation: learning and accountability. Learning focuses on identifying what works for course correction or adaptations within a programme, informing future policy and investment decisions, and filling evidence gaps across the sector. Accountability refers to providing evidence of the effectiveness and impact of UK aid to the UK taxpayer and partners, stakeholders and governments in the countries where ODA is delivered.
24. The FCDO is a member of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Network on Development and uses the OECD definition of evaluation: "The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors. Evaluation also refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of an activity, policy or program. An assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of a planned, on-going, or completed development intervention."
25. The FCDO aligns to the OECD DAC criteria, principles and quality standards for evaluating development assistance. Evaluation questions should include these criteria, as far as they are relevant to the evidence gaps and intended use. The OECD criteria are as follows:
 - **Relevance:** is the intervention doing the right things?
 - **Coherence:** how well does the intervention fit?
 - **Effectiveness:** is the intervention achieving its objectives?
 - **Efficiency:** how well are resources being used?
 - **Impact:** what difference does the intervention make?
 - **Sustainability:** will the benefits last?

26. The Magenta Book: Central Government Guidance on Evaluation (March 2020)⁷ sets out three main **types of evaluations** but highlights that a comprehensive evaluation will typically consist of all three:
- a. **Process Evaluation:** analysis of the implementation of the intervention to understand whether the design is working well and why. Process evaluations typically use both quantitative and qualitative data, covering perceptions or subjective issues as well as objective or factual details.
 - b. **Impact evaluation:** assessment of what changes have occurred due to the programme, the scale of the changes and the extent to which changes can be causally attributed to the programme. Impact evaluations are typically conducted through theory-based, experimental or quasi-experimental approaches.
 - c. **Value for money evaluation:** a comparison of the costs and benefits of the programme to better understand whether the programme is a good use of resources.
27. There are a variety of evaluation methods.⁸ Research methods commonly used across process and impact evaluations consist of both quantitative and qualitative approaches, including interviews and focus groups, case studies, surveys, output monitoring and observational studies. Theory-based impact evaluation approaches include realist evaluation, contribution analysis, process tracing, Bayesian updating, contribution tracing, qualitative comparative analysis, outcome harvesting and most significant change approaches. Experimental and quasi-experimental evaluation methods include randomised control trials, interrupted time series analysis and difference-in-difference, regression discontinuity design, propensity score matching, synthetic control methods, instrumental variable or natural experiments and timing of events. Common value for money evaluation methods includes social cost effectiveness analysis and social cost-benefit analysis.
28. Quantitative impact evaluations typically require specialised experience and strong econometric skills. The expertise needed includes forming an appropriate counterfactual group, conducting power calculations and valid sampling, assessing internal and external validity, and managing spill over effects and attrition. Statistical approaches to impact evaluations may require skills in statistical modelling, longitudinal data techniques and other econometric approaches.
29. Evaluations use a variety of data sources, including secondary survey and administrative data, monitoring data, big data (including social media data) and primary data collected for the evaluation through quantitative or qualitative methods.

⁷Magenta Book: Central Government Guidance on Evaluation (March 2020).

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/879437/Magenta_Book_supplementary_guide._Handling_Complexity_in_policy_evaluation.pdf

⁸See Magenta book annex

30. This framework lot will cover the full range of evaluation types and will require framework participants to demonstrate experience and skills across the range of evaluation approaches. Framework participants will need to show expertise across the range of evaluation methods, including quantitative, qualitative, theory-based, experimental and cost-benefit approaches, and exhibit experience in drawing upon a variety of data sources.

Additionally, these lots could also cover other approaches:

- Synthesis methods, to combine findings from a range of studies, such as meta-analysis; systematic reviews or realist synthesis.
- Portfolio evaluations and monitoring, which do not assess individual programmes but collate and analyse data and learning across several related programmes.
- Reviews, which assess of the performance of an intervention in a more operational manner and tend to be less comprehensive and/or in-depth than evaluations.
- Data and results verifications, which could cover an assessment and assurance of the methods and sources used to obtain results.

31. Framework participants will be required to demonstrate expertise across the range of evaluation and monitoring approaches, as well as experience in conducting other types of learning assignments such as those highlighted above.

Method

32. It is envisaged that GEMFA will comprise a variety of framework participants ranging from consortium arrangements with significant breadth, and other specialist, more niche suppliers. In exceptional circumstances, following the award of the Framework Agreement, new sub-contractors may be allowed to join with FCDO approval, existing consortia, for a particular call down only where the existing consortia cannot meet the requirements of the call down. Consortia should be constructed specifically for the bid under the management of a lead framework participant who is awarded on the Framework. Exclusivity agreements that prevent suppliers from working with different suppliers are not acceptable as stated in the Priorities and Expectations of Suppliers letter issued by the Secretary of State.⁹

33. Bids will be assessed based on framework participant's expertise and ability to deliver the scope of work. Membership will be awarded to the framework under the following lots. Framework participants on the high value lots will not be permitted to act as either a lead or a sub-contractor on the low value lots.

Lot 1 Monitoring High Value Lot (>£600k) with mini competition

Lot 2 Monitoring Low Value Lot (< £600k) with round robin

⁹https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/214287/stat-priorities-expectations-suppliers.pdf

Lot 3 Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning High Value Lot (>£600k) with mini competition

Lot 4 Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Low Value Lot (< £600k) with round robin

34. There will be a maximum of ten (10) suppliers on each of the four lots. This will be determined by awarding to the first ten bids with the highest combined technical and commercial scoring.

Expertise

35. Each framework participant will need to demonstrate the following for each lot:
- a. Delivered monitoring, evaluation and/or learning to a high quality.
 - b. Managed a consortium (if applicable) to deliver that type monitoring, evaluation and/or learning.
 - c. Experience in designing and implementing high quality methods, analysis and synthesis in the delivery of that type of evaluation/monitoring and have improved its application.
 - d. Appropriate internal quality control mechanisms in relation to that type of evaluation/monitoring
 - e. Relevant codes of conduct for evaluations/monitoring (including on beneficiary feedback)
 - f. Good practice in working with marginalised groups
 - g. Good practice in undertaking evaluation or monitoring from a gender perspective – with reference to the International Development (Gender Equality) Act 2014.
 - h. Procedures and processes in place to ensure high ethical standards in their design, implementation and dissemination of evaluations and or monitoring.
 - i. Communication of and stakeholder engagement with evaluation and monitoring findings to a wide range of audiences using appropriate tools and formats.

Coverage

36. Each framework participant will need to demonstrate the following:
- a. Framework participants must demonstrate their understanding of the context in different environments. For example, if they are to work in fragile states participants will have to demonstrate their understanding of the effects of the security situation on the monitoring and/or evaluation process. It is important to be able to be innovative in the application of high-quality approaches to overcome the operational challenges of undertaking evaluation in these environments and other challenging circumstances.
 - b. Framework participants will need to demonstrate that they have or can engage appropriate local expertise from the countries in which they work.
 - c. Framework participants must demonstrate that they can competently deliver evaluations in a range of themes.

- d. Framework participants must demonstrate that they can conduct monitoring and/or evaluations of projects and/or policies and/or programmes according to the lots they are bidding for.
- e. Framework participants should also demonstrate their ability to manage multiple pieces of work concurrently, and how they will mitigate any risks associated with this.

Quality

37. Across each lot, framework participants must be able to demonstrate clear processes and control mechanisms to ensure the highest quality of evaluation and/or monitoring at all stages of the assignment cycle that address the purpose of that evaluation/or monitoring assignment and the stakeholder needs. This covers both the design of the work, the implementation of the research methods and data collection, and the analysis and presentation of the findings.
38. Evaluations and/or monitoring are expected to comply with DAC principles and quality standards. In addition, they must adhere to the following principles:
- a. Useful for learning and improvement, with clear reference to a “use and influence” plan, and with all outputs accessible to the intended audience.
 - b. Transparent and appropriate approach and methodology, which is aligned with the evaluation questions and is reliable and replicable. Issues of limitations or biases must be made explicit and addressed in the analysis. Evidence should be clearly and sufficiently triangulated and cross-referenced into the findings. Conclusions should provide reasoned judgements based on the evidence presented.
 - c. The evaluation/monitoring team should reflect the right expertise and balance of thematic/regional/methodological skills.
 - d. The assignment should be delivered in partnership, with meaningful engagement with local teams and stakeholders, ensuring a two-way process for knowledge-sharing and capacity development.
39. Final payment will be dependent on evaluation products being rated as satisfactory (and above) by FCDO.

Ethics

40. The FCDO expects that all evaluation, monitoring and any other related forms of data collection and analysis conducted on FCDO funded projects must comply with and be guided by the ethical principles and standards set out in the Ethical Guidance for Research, Evaluation and Monitoring. All evaluation and monitoring assignments should also comply with the safeguarding in research standards.
41. Framework participants should consider whether external ethics approval is needed for the evaluation and/or monitoring assignment. Alignment with the FCDO’s ethical principles and standards will normally be assured by submission of relevant protocols for review by the evaluator’s Institutional Review Board

(IRB)/Research Ethics Committee (REC) and the relevant regulatory authority in the country where the research is completed. For many evaluations, this will not be required, however, the FCDO expects that the planning of data collection and analysis will reflect active consideration of the ethics principles and standards throughout the evaluation cycle. During the evaluation and/or monitoring assignment, the framework participant must inform the FCDO immediately of any ethics issues arising and shall investigate and document all breaches of the ethics principles and standards or potential cases of a breach.

Inclusion

42. The FCDO aims to ensure that “no one is left behind”, and therefore expects both programming and evidence gathering to have a gender, age and inclusion lens. MEL systems should be able to show not only whether FCDO’s interventions are working, but also who they are reaching, and any unintended consequences on groups. Inclusion encompasses meaningful engagement of all programme participants throughout the evaluation and monitoring life cycle, including those with limited visibility and those that are hard to reach, such as girls and those with disabilities.
43. The UK is bound by various policy and legislative commitments on gender equality, including the UK’s International Development (Gender Equality) Act 2014, which makes consideration of gender equality a legal requirement before the provision of any UK development and humanitarian spend.
44. The FCDO expects that issues of gender equality and inclusion are considered throughout the monitoring and evaluation cycle. MEL frameworks and indicators should go beyond counting numbers to capturing the quality of results for different groups, and data collection methods should enable all groups to express their experiences and views. Where possible, all data should be disaggregated by sex, disability, age, geography and other relevant dimensions, and the analysis should highlight any differences and trends for these groups¹⁰.

Stakeholder engagement

45. Framework participants will be required to actively identify and engage stakeholders and key influencers throughout the evaluation and/or monitoring process, including in the planning and management of the assignment and in the emerging findings. This is to ensure that the learning is relevant to their needs. Approaches for monitoring and/or evaluations should be clearly linked to the intended use of the assignment, and the timeframes should similarly take the intended use into account. Framework participants will need to demonstrate an understanding of how to make the evaluation both useful and influential for the FCDO and its partners.

¹⁰ See <https://www.data4sdgs.org/inclusivedatacharter>

46. Stakeholders should be considered beyond the immediate programme stakeholders, to wider stakeholders that may benefit from the learning generated, such as other donors, local and national government and civil society partners. This should include local citizens and beneficiaries (see below), where appropriate and relevant.
47. The FCDO expects that framework participants actively use a “Use and Influence Plan” as a guide for stakeholder engagement, considering how to broaden engagement beyond those directly involved to include other actors in the wider context who may have an interest in the evaluation or monitoring findings. The Use and Influence Plan should include details of end users, how they will be reached and ways to influence them. It should also consider timings and options for communicating evaluation findings in accessible formats that will appeal to potential audiences. This could cover issues of language, data visualisation and the report structure. It should also set out strategies for managing sensitive issues, alongside maintaining transparency and the FCDO’s commitment to publish evaluation reports.

Beneficiary engagement

48. Beneficiary engagement is about upholding dignity and agency of the people that the FCDO aims to support through its interventions. It is also about the right of beneficiaries to have a say over decisions that affect their lives. Beneficiary engagement is a process of thoughtfully finding ways to help beneficiaries have more agency in a meaningful and safe manner. The FCDO’s approach to beneficiary engagement is based on four principles:

Do no harm – beneficiary engagement should be designed with care to ensure that beneficiaries are not harmed through their engagement, that they feel safe to share their views and that the information they provide is kept safe.

Engage early – beneficiary engagement should be planned at the outset of the evaluation to ensure that their input is meaningful, and the resources required are available. It can also help to mitigate the risk of harm.

Leave no one behind - beneficiary engagement should reach every beneficiary, including those beneficiaries who are the most marginalised, such as disabled people, the elderly, women and girls or others facing discrimination. They can be the hardest beneficiaries to identify, reach and engage.

Close the loop – ensure that beneficiary engagement is respectful by acting upon feedback gathered and updating beneficiaries on what action is taken.

49. The FCDO expects that framework participants will give due consideration to engaging with beneficiaries throughout the evaluation and/or monitoring cycle, according to what is practical and relevant to the intervention being evaluated. Framework participants should consider at what stages beneficiary engagement can go beyond one-way extractive processes based on gathering data from

beneficiaries and include two-way engagement with beneficiaries and interactive engagement between beneficiaries and evaluators. This should, at all times, consider the best combination of methods for gathering reliable data from beneficiaries (for example, avoiding elite capture and bias, ensuring diverse views, robust sampling protocols etc) and sourcing evidence from other sources. At a minimum, evaluation framework participants should state what their approach to beneficiary engagement will be for the evaluation, demonstrating that they have considered what is the most appropriate way to engage with beneficiaries during key stages to the evaluation cycle: evaluation design; evidence gathering; validation and analysis; dissemination and communication.

Maintaining Expertise and Standards

50. Framework participants will be required to share knowledge and experience on undertaking evaluations and/or monitoring with, for example, each other, development partners and key stakeholders (from governments to small NGOs) to help further develop the professional practice of evaluation.

- a. Framework participants are members/ or willing to be members of a professional evaluation association whose members are bound by ethical standards and/or codes of practice.
- b. Framework participants have demonstrated competence to share knowledge and experience on development evaluations for a range of stakeholders.
- c. Framework participants have knowledge and undertake leadership on emerging good practice in evaluation or monitoring.
- d. Framework participants should engage constructively with quality assurance on their evaluations (It should be noted that activities identified as an evaluation will go through the FCDO's evaluation quality assurance process regardless of its budget).
- e. Framework participants will have established quality assurance arrangements that support the quality, independence, credibility, utility, integrity and ethics of their evaluation processes. Framework participants will need to consistently demonstrate adherence to international evaluation standards (e.g., OECD-DAC Evaluation Standards); knowledge and leadership in current and emerging good practice in evaluation.
- f. In addition, Framework participants will need to demonstrate strengths in:
 - General administration, management and timeliness
 - Financial management
 - Flexibility to respond to changing needs and demands
 - Relationship management- including maintaining a consistent and constructive relationship with FCDO officials
 - Managing ethics in evaluation and monitoring of international development programmes and projects

UK Aid Branding

51. Should be in line with clause 34 of the Framework Agreement Terms and conditions.

Management, Reporting and Review

52. The FCDO's Commercial Department (CD), will be responsible for ensuring the smooth running of call-offs of Lots 1-4. The Evaluation Unit will work with CD to support monitoring, management, performance and ongoing use of the framework.
53. The Key Performance Indicators as detailed in Appendix D will be used to assess the management at framework level. Framework participants will be required to complete Appendix D on a six-monthly basis at a scheduled dates to be confirmed at inception of the Framework Agreement.
54. Framework participants are required to report to FCDO on a quarterly basis management information regarding framework usage and will include but not limited to department, value, geography and area of evaluation. FCDO will provide a template at the implementation stage of the Framework Agreement which the framework participant will be required to complete and uploaded to the FCDO procurement portal on a quarterly basis.
55. In addition, framework participants will be required to attend an annual management meeting, either in person or by video conference, at a time as requested by FCDO and at the framework participants own cost. The likely agenda for these meetings will be:
 - Framework Usage
 - Bidding behaviour of framework participants
 - Lessons learned/Best practice
 - Updates regarding FCDO Supplier Management
 - Potential pipeline
56. Framework participants must make available appropriate management, quality control (technical reviewers, editors, proof-readers, etc) replacement of expertise, secretariat and any other support staff necessary to undertake a monitoring or evaluation activity throughout the lifetime of the framework. The framework participant will assign a Lead contact to each evaluation and/or monitoring call down assignment they are commissioned to undertake. The Lead contact will have overall responsibility for the evaluation and formal contacts with the contracting authority.
57. Framework participants will be required to report on the progress of each call down contract assignment to the programme team commissioning the work. The reporting requirements will be set out in any call down contract awarded.
58. Framework participants' performance will be reviewed against their delivery (which will include but may not be limited to on-time, on-scope, on budget, to quality standards).

Transparency

59. The FCDO has transformed its approach to transparency, reshaping our own working practices and pressuring others across the world to do the same. The FCDO 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.
60. Clause 28 of the Framework terms and conditions set out the requirements in relation to transparency.

Supply Chain Mapping

61. The FCDO is expected to report to central government on the levels of contracted work being allocated to SME and other sub-contracted organisations. It is now a requirement to provide details regarding the levels of direct and indirect departmental SME spend with major suppliers to the cross-government SME Small Business Policy team working on this initiative. The FCDO is also interested in gathering details of the organisations working within the supply chains of directly contracted suppliers. As part of the contractual compliance checking process, suppliers will be required to submit returns providing these details, as a minimum on an annual basis.

Conflict of Interest

62. The lead supplier that provides the FCDO's Evaluation Quality Assurance and Learning Service (EQUALS) and any successor cannot be contracted as a lead in the FCDO's Global Evaluation Monitoring Framework Agreement (GEMFA). The lead supplier that provides the FCDO's Evaluation Quality Assurance and Learning Service (EQUALS) **can** be contracted as a subcontractor in the FCDO's Global Evaluation Monitoring Framework Agreement (GEMFA) where strong evidence is provided that there is no conflict of interest and is agreed by FCDO.

Timeframe & Budget

63. The Framework Agreement will be let for an initial period of two years with a budget of £100 million and options to extend for a further two 12-month periods with the provision of an additional maximum £50 million. The GEMFA will be reviewed on each anniversary of the execution date to ensure that it is meeting the evolving needs of the FCDO's work in evaluation and monitoring.
64. For the avoidance of doubt, the framework participant's provision of services related to a Framework Agreement shall be on a non-exclusive basis. The FCDO reserves the right to contract with or employ directly third-party contractors, or employees to provide similar services at any time.

Procurement and Contractual Requirements

65. Although it is not possible to determine in advance the precise scope of each requirement the FCDO will endeavour to provide reasonable notice periods for all upcoming work, and detailed Terms of Reference produced for each requirement.
66. It is envisaged that mini-competitions for Lot 1 and 3 will have a timescale of approximately 12 weeks from issue of invitation to tender to award of call-down contract. However, from time-to-time there may be a requirement for a “fast-track” mini-competition where there is an extremely urgent requirement.
67. Assignments in Lots 2 and 4 (the “low-value” lots of assignments under £600k) will be called off via a rotational round robin method. A round robin is defined as, “an arrangement of choosing all elements in a group equally in some rational order, usually from the top to the bottom of a list and then starting again at the top of the list and so on. A simple way to think of round robin is that it is about “taking turns””.
68. The rotation will start with the framework participant that is most economically advantageous and move in turn to all the framework participants awarded to the Lot.
69. Each framework participant who is awarded a place on Lots 2 and/or 4 will be awarded a call down in turn following the submission and acceptance of a concept note by FCDO or other Government departments. The content requirement and length of the Concept Note will be detailed in each call down requirement. Framework participants will be required to confirm acceptance of the Concept note within 2 working days. Failure to do so will result in the next framework participant on the rotation being contacted and the non-responding framework participant being placed at the bottom of the rotation. Where the requirement is on a small scale (i.e., one or two experts to be engaged on a short-term basis) we would expect the lead framework participant submit a Concept Note an example of which is detailed in Appendix B within a much-reduced timescale (to be determined but likely to be less than 2 weeks). The call down contract will not be formally awarded until the acceptance of the concept note. The FCDO reserves the right to move to the next framework participants in the rotation should the concept note not be acceptable by the FCDO or other Government Department programme team.
70. A framework participant on Lots 2 and/or 4 has the right to refuse a requirement; the requirement will then go to the next framework participant in the rotation. If a framework participant declines to provide a concept note, they will be placed at the bottom of the rotation and will not be awarded the next requirement. Where FCDO decline three concept notes in a row from the framework participant then the framework participants will be required to attend a performance review meeting with FCDO.
71. The exception to clause 70, is where the framework participants’ refusal of a call down requirement is based on having no capability in the region or thematic area cited in the call down requirement. The framework participant will remain in current top place if this reason is provided and can be cross checked with the capability

matrix as detailed in Appendix C, which all Suppliers will be required to complete at ITT stage.

72. FCDO reserve the right to undertake a mini competition on the low value Lots 2 and 4 where the call down requirement meets a definition of complexity of work. For the purposes of such a requirement, complexity is defined as a requirement with more than one thematic sector and more than one geography.
73. In the event all framework participants on the low value lots 2 and 4 decline to provide a concept note or that FCDO reject all available proposals from all framework participants on lots 2 & 4, FCDO then reserve the right to open the requirement to a competition between the framework participants on the high value lots 1 & 3.

Duty of Care

74. The framework participant is responsible for the safety and well-being of their Personnel (as defined in Section 2 of the Contract) and Third Parties affected by their activities under this contract, including appropriate security arrangements. They will also be responsible for the provision of suitable security arrangements for their domestic and business property.
75. The framework participants are responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security briefings for all 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 framework participant must ensure they (and their Personnel) are up to date with the latest position.
76. Call down requirements 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).
77. Call down requirements may require the framework participant 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 framework participants should be comfortable working in such an environment and should be capable of deploying to any areas required within the region to deliver the Contract (subject to travel clearance being granted).
78. The framework participant 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 dangerous, fragile and hostile environments etc.).

79. If you are unwilling or unable to accept responsibility for Security and Duty of Care as detailed above, the framework participant's ITT will be viewed as non-compliant and excluded from further evaluation.

Appendix A

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 in Appendix A and the standard clause 33 in section 2 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 the FCDO and any changes to the content of this schedule must be agreed formally with the FCDO under a Contract Variation.

Description	Details
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Parties acknowledge that Clause 33.2 and 33.4 (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 33.3 in respect of Personal Data necessary for the administration and / or fulfilment of this contract. 2) For the avoidance of doubt the Supplier shall provide anonymised data sets for the purposes of reporting on this project and so FCDO shall not be a Processor in respect of anonymised data as it does not constitute Personal Data.

Appendix B

Draft Concept Note

Only on approval of the concept note will FCDO award to the potential framework participant.

Expected Content of Supplier return (Example)

- Understanding of the ToR (Est 3 pages)
 - Context
 - Scope
 - Questions
- Approach and Methods (Est 4 pages)
- Work plan (Est 2 page)
- Personnel and days Narrative (Est 3 pages)

Completion of Commercial Proforma (based on contracted capped fee rates and any associated discounts)

Appendix C Supplier Capability Matrix

Lead framework participants should add a Y in all areas in which they or their consortium have capability at this time.

This is not scored and is for information in line with section 71.

FCDO reserve the right to request an update on an annual basis.

Thematic Area	Americas	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	South East Asia and Pacific	India and Indian Ocean	Middle East and North Africa	Africa (West and Southern)	Africa (East and Central)	Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iran	Global
Climate Change and Environment									
Governance									
Education									
Human Development and Health									
Humanitarian									
Infrastructure									
Livelihoods									
Social Development									
Research									
Diplomacy and influencing									
Conflict and security									
Agriculture									

Appendix D

Six Monthly Score Card

To be provided to FCDO at scheduled dates to be agreed after contract execution .

RAG STATUS SCORING KEY	
RED	Failed to meet KPI Standards
AMBER	Partially Meets KPI Standards
GREEN	Meets Standards

Measurement

Where the Framework Participant has a red status for an individual KPI , then Supplier to provide a resolution plan with in a 3 week period .

Where the Framework Participant has an amber status for an individual KPI , then this must be resolved by the next review. 2 amber in succession, then the Supplier to provide a resolution plan within a 3 week period .

FCDO reserve the right to remove a Supplier from the framework where there has been more than 4 resolution plan requests across all performance categories in a rolling 2 year period

Performance category	KPI Name	Indicators	Evidence of Performance against the Indicators	Supplier Assessment	FCDO Assessment	Agreed Score
PC1 - Flexibility and Ease of Doing Business (contract management)	1a Communications with Framework Team. Degree of effective communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication and information flow is clear, concise, accurate, well communicated, timely, well formatted, customised to audience, factual and with frequent follow up Initial Response to FCDO queries within 3 working days , resolution within 7 days period . Management Team members will arrange to have substitute contacts in any periods of absence Timely escalation of issues around risk identification /management of risk / programme monitoring issues 				
	1b Quality of Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timely upload /delivery of quarterly reports in agreed format. Quality reports that accurately detail Framework usage by department, detailing experts used, fee rates charged, geography and area of evaluation Supplier responds to changes in requests in a positive manner and within agreed timescales Annual report advising on bidding behaviour: Including reasons for non bid 				
PC2 - Delivery and Support	2a Management Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any Framework Management meeting takes place in line with agreed schedules, with any agenda points provided by the Supplier no less than 5 days in advance The supplier records minutes and actions and provides a copy to FCDO within a one week timeframe 				
PC3 - Financial Management	3a Value for Money: Degree to which the supply partner is able to maximise value for money	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VFM strategy developed and in use. VFM indicators (qualitative and quantitative) agreed, reviewed, tracked and reported in quarterly reports; Regular collation and reporting demonstration of innovation/approaches to improve value for money of the Framework call down. 				