Design and Implementation of Mid-Term Review and Final Evaluation for the *Institutions for Inclusive Development* (I4ID) Programme

Terms of Reference (ToR), September2016

DFID Tanzania

<u>Table of Contents</u>

<u>List of Annexes</u>

o **Annex 1** DFID Overall Project/Intervention - Summary Risk Assessment Matrix

1. Introduction

1.1. DFID Tanzania is seeking a supplier to design and then implement a mid-term review (MTR - early 2019) and a final evaluation (early 2021) for the main programme management contract under its *Institutions for Inclusive Development* (I4ID) programme.

1.2. Through its I4ID programme, the UK is contributing up to £14 million over 5 years (2016-2021) to strengthen democratic governance institutions in Tanzania so that they are more inclusive and accountable, and economic growth provides more benefits for poor people. The I4ID programme is designed as a flexible programme that will constantly adapt to the ever changing operating context and experience and understanding gained during implementation.

1.3. Any reference to the I4ID programme in this ToR refers to the DFID umbrella programme rather than individual components. Most of the I4ID programme is implemented through a single programme management contract, procurement for which will be finalised early in 2016. This contract is referred to in this ToR as the I4ID programme management contract. The supplier for the I4ID programme management contract is referred to in this ToR as the main I4ID partner. I4ID programme funding may also be allocated to a small number of additional initiatives outside the main I4ID programme management contract. Implementers for these components are referred to as other I4ID partners. Collectively the I4ID implementers are referred to as all I4ID partners.

2. Objective

2.1. The aim of the MTR and final evaluation will be three-fold:

   A. Strategic direction adjustments for the programme: an outside look at the direction of travel of the programme, flexible delivery and opportunity to adjust accordingly.
   B. Learning on flexible and adaptive programming: the chance to ensure we are capturing key lessons from the experience of implementing a programme designed to introduce new "ways of working"; and
   C. Better understanding of how change happens: a chance to capture what the programming is telling us about the overarching ToC (from output level upwards).

3. Recipient

3.1. Given the emphasis on learning from the I4ID experience, we expect the main users to be: a) Programme stakeholders in Tanzania, b) DFID Tanzania (particularly the team responsible for the I4ID programme), c) stakeholders working in the political governance sphere in Tanzania, and d) the development community globally working on flexible and adaptive programmes.

4. Budget

4.1. Indicative maximum budget is £400,000 (inclusive of applicable taxes). This indicative budget is based on the current funding levels for the main I4ID contract of between £10m and £13.5m and the current three programme components.

4.2. It is expected that a revised budget and payment plan will be developed and agreed as part of the approval of the MTR and Evaluation design.

4.3.   It is recognised in both the I4ID Business Case and in the main I4ID programme ToRs that there is a possibility of scale up or scale down, either of individual components or of the programme as a whole, in response to injection of additional funding from other donors, assessment of programme performance and/or shifts in programme context. Further proportional budget increase (up to a maximum of 50%) or decreases and/or MTR/Evaluation design revisions may therefore be required during the life of the contract.

5. Scope

5.1.   **Part 1 – Design:** To be completed by April 2017. The supplier will begin by working with DFID and the main I4ID partner to establish a core set of "evaluation questions" linked to the I4ID programme management contract's Theory of Change (ToC) and the I4ID programme's overarching ToC. Once these are agreed (and approved by DFID), the supplier will use them as the foundations for designing a MTR and final evaluation, including a stakeholder engagement and dissemination strategy. A participatory approach to design is expected throughout the design phase, with particular emphasis on close working with the main I4ID implementer.

5.2.   The Design Phase Report should outline in detail the approach to be used for both MTR and evaluation processes, including the review/evaluation methodology, workplans (including timelines), team and governance structures (with Terms of Reference for key personnel), and budgets. The evaluation design will need to be cognisant of, and appropriate for the flexible and adaptive nature of the I4ID programme.

5.3.   As part of this design process, the evaluator will agree with the I4ID programme management contract service provider and DFID which information will be gathered over the life of the project to inform the MTR and final evaluation.

5.4.   We expect the evaluation supplier to be engaged with the main I4ID programme from inception phase onwards in order to ensure that the approach to the final evaluation reflects a clear understanding of the nature of the programme, that required information is gathered throughout the life of the programme, and that review and evaluation findings can be fed back to into programming decisions.

5.5.   **Part 2 – Mid-Term Review (MTR):** To be completed by **April 2019**. The supplier will carry out an MTR in line with the agreed approach. It is expected that the MTR will be significantly "lighter-touch" than the final evaluation, and also that it will include a focus on information needed to inform decisions about programming ahead of national elections anticipated for late 2020.It will also agree any revisions to the approach for final evaluation with DFID and the I4ID programme management contract service provider.

5.6.   **Part 3 – Final Evaluation:** To be completed by **June 2021**. The supplier will carry out a final evaluation in line with the agreed approach.

6. Evaluation Parameters:

6.1.   The MTR and final evaluation will focus primarily on the I4ID programme management contract, with some attention paid to broader issues linked to the overarching I4ID programme. They are intended to complement and expand on internal monitoring and

evaluation work carried out by the main I4ID partner.[1] We do not anticipate any focus at activity-to-output level.

6.2.   Indicative parameters include:

A. Strategic Direction Adjustments
- <u>Are we tracking effectively?</u> A look at the main I4ID partner's monitoring, evaluation and learning approaches with recommendations for adjustments.
- <u>Is it worth the cost?</u> An outsider's assessment of the main I4ID partner's work against agreed value for money principles and metrics.
- <u>An eye on the future:</u> A review of evidence linked to the potential longer-term impact, sustainability and potential to scale up for work under the I4ID programme management contract.

B. Learning on flexible and adaptive programming
- <u>Are the new "ways of working" actually working?</u> A look at the main I4ID partner's efforts to implement specific ways of working. These include:
  - Flexible and adaptive programming and
  - Problem-Driven Iterative Adaptation (PDIA)
  - Payment by Results as an incentive for flexibility and ambition
  - Coalition-building for collective action/issue-based programming
  - Risk management
  - Consortium models, approach to partnerships and coalition building
  - Governance structures
- <u>What else can we learn?</u> A chance to identify and then respond to specific questions linked to the programming that would be of interest to the wider development community (e.g. what factors make efforts to resolve collective action problems more likely to succeed?), and to consider the implications of programme learning for wider DFID and other development programmers.
- <u>Is DFID paying attention to the right things and in the right way?</u> Advice to DFID on how we can improve our monitoring of the I4ID programme management contract, for example in terms of the frequency and selection of the information and analysis we receive from the main I4ID partner.

C. Better understanding of how change happens
- <u>Are we still sure we're doing the right things?</u> A close look at key assumptions inherent in DFID's overarching ToC for the I4ID programme (including output-to-outcome and outcome-to-impact levels) and assessment of any evidence that supports or refutes their credibility/validity. Adjustment of DFID's ToC for the programme in light of findings.

6.3.   **Data collection:** We expect the supplier to combine analysis of qualitative data (interviews, focus group discussions, etc.) with secondary analysis of data from programme and external sources. We do not anticipate stand-alone quantitative data

---

[1] Terms of Reference for the I4ID programme management contract specify that its monitoring and evaluation strategy should:

- incorporate both partners' performance and compliance, and the processes of change the programme seeks to generate;
- capture the contributions and achievements of individual initiatives and also the collective outputs and outcomes of the programme as a whole (intentional and unintentional); and
- facilitate reflection on the programme's approaches and make course corrections during implementation.

collection. The timing of the supplier's design period to overlap with main I4ID partners' inception period allows the supplier to agree proportionate data collection by the main I4ID partner for evaluative purposes.

6.4. **Gender and Ethics:** We expect the supplier to incorporate gender dimensions of the intervention into the evaluation. The evaluation will be expected to develop its ethics policy (including for dissemination and communications activities) in the Design Phase, and apply it during implementation.

7. Constraints and dependencies

7.1. The consultant is expected to work closely with the I4ID programme management contract service provider to ensure that there is a good fit between ongoing programme monitoring, evaluation and learning, and the external MTR and Evaluation processes.

8. Implementation requirements

Team structure:

8.1. The I4ID programme is designed to constantly adjust programming in response to its changing operating context, emerging opportunities and feedback on project performance. It also integrates a focus on political governance, and on tackling collective action problems through coalition building, both of which offer particular challenges from an evaluation perspective. The I4ID programme management contract is designed to reflect the same principles, priorities and practices.

8.2. We are therefore looking for an evaluation team that is excited about the opportunity to work with this type of programme, interested in the challenge of how to assess the effectiveness of the "ways of working" that the I4ID programme management contract incorporates, ready to explore a range of options for evaluation to secure a good fit with the programme and DFID's evaluation needs, and ultimately ready to build a close, open and collaborative working relationship with DFID and the main I4ID partner, and to a lesser extent with the other I4ID partners. We also expect that an appropriate team for this contract would include expertise in the governance sector and sufficient understanding of research approaches, as well as evaluation expertise. The supplier should also note DFID's commitment to working with national consultants where feasible, as well as to seeking gender balance across implementation teams.

8.3. We would expect the deliverables to be delivered in a way that demonstrates the quality characteristics listed above, with a strong focus on the evaluation adding value to stakeholders.

Transparency:

8.4. 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/. The supplier should also note DFID's Open and Enhanced Access Policy for the research that DFID funds.

9.   Timeframe and Deliverables

9.1.   Implementation of I4ID is expected to start in May 2016 so we anticipate a start date for this contract of no later than September 2016 and expected it to be completed by June 2021.

9.2.   Timing and Deliverables are as follows:

Phase	Deliverables	Main I4ID Partner Timeline
Phase 1 – Design to be completed by April 2017.	i) Set of "evaluation questions" ii) Design for MTR and Final Evaluation, including stakeholder dissemination and engagement strategy, and information collection plan agreed with I4ID programme management contract service provider. To be approved by DFID.	Inception Phase expected to begin in April/May 2016 and will last for 9 months.
Phase 2 – Mid-Term Review to be completed by April 2019.	iii) MTR Report including recommended revisions to the approach for the final evaluation. To be approved by DFID iv) Delivery of agreed stakeholder dissemination and engagement strategy	I4ID Implementation phase will begin 9 months later (anticipated for Dec 2016/Jan 2017). Pre-election break-point will be in June 2019.
Phase 3 – Final Evaluation to be completed by June 2021.	v) Final Evaluation Report. To be approved by DFID. vi) Delivery of agreed stakeholder dissemination and engagement strategy	I4ID Implementation phase concludes in April 2021.

10. Reporting

10.1.   The supplier will provide the following reports to DFID:
   • Design phase report
   • Mid-Term Review report and Evaluation design revision summary
   • Final Evaluation report
   • Financial reporting in line with proposed disbursement schedule.
10.2.   While the supplier is expected to recommend adjustments to the MTR and Evaluation designs as required and to provide advice and recommendations to both DFID and the main I4ID partner on the range of issues outlined under Section 6, final decisions on application of any recommendations will lie with DFID Tanzania.

11. DFID co-ordination

11.1. The consultant will report to the DFID Tanzania Governance Adviser and Programme Manager, and will liaise with the DFIDT Evaluation, Statistics and Results Adviser. The Governance Adviser will be responsible for oversight of all programmatic aspects of the consultancy on behalf of DFID. Contract administration and payments will be managed by the Programme Manager on behalf of DFID.

12. Evaluation risks

13.1. **Appropriateness of evaluation design:** Designing and implementing an evaluation of a programme with this flexible and adaptive nature will require an innovative and pragmatic approach to evaluation design, and explicit consideration of how to bring this flexibility into the evaluation design and delivery, while maintaining an appropriate level of analytical rigour.

13.2. **Avoiding duplication with main I4ID partner:** The supplier will need to focus on adding value over and above the main I4ID partners monitoring and evaluation strategy.

13.3. **Poor relationship with main I4ID partner:** The supplier will need to ensure that it sustains an effective working relationship and good channels of communication with the main I4ID partner.

14. Background

14.1. I4ID Business Case: http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati_documents/5137776.odt

14.2. See enclosed separately ToRs for programme implementer.

15. Other Requirements – Security and Duty of Care

15.1. The supplier must be self-supporting and responsible for his/her own activities and should not rely on DFID Tanzania transport, offices, facilities, logistical or administrative support. Suppliers must include all such costs in their bids. DFID Tanzania can provide letters to support visa applications on request.

16. Duty of Care

16.1. The Supplier 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.

16.2. DFID will share available information with the Supplier on security status and developments in-country where appropriate. The Supplier is responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security briefings for all of their Personnel working under this contract. 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.

16.3.   Tenderers must develop their Tender on the basis of being fully responsible for Duty of Care in line with the details provided above and the initial risk assessment matrix prepared by DFID (see Annex 1). They must confirm in their Tender that:
- They fully accept responsibility for Security and Duty of Care.
- They understand the potential risks and have the knowledge and experience to develop an effective risk plan.
- They have the capability to manage their Duty of Care responsibilities throughout the life of the contract.

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

16.5.   Acceptance of responsibility must be supported with evidence of Duty of Care capability and DFID reserves the right to clarify any aspect of this evidence provided in response to the tender requirements.

DUTY OF CARE OVERALL PROJECT/INTERVENTION SUMMARY RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX – DFID TANZANIA

Project/intervention title: Design and Implementation of Mid-Term Review and Final Evaluation for the *Institutions for Inclusive Development* (I4ID) Programme
Location: Tanzania (nationwide)
Date of assessment: August 2016
Assessing official:

Theme	DFID Risk score
Geographical Coverage	Whole of the country (including Dar)
OVERALL RATING	**3 Medium**
FCO travel advice	1
Host nation travel advice	Not available
Transportation	3
Security	3
Civil unrest	4
Violence/crime	4
Terrorism	3
War	1
Hurricane	1
Earthquake	3
Flood	2

Medical Services	3
Nature of Project / Intervention	2

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