Department for International Development

UKaid from the British people

Section 4 Appendix A

CALLDOWN CONTRACT

Framework Agreement with: IPE Global

Framework Agreement for: Global Evaluation Framework Agreement

Framework Agreement Purchase Order Number: 7448

Call-down Contract For: Impact Evaluation of the Development Capital Investment Intervention of the DFID India's Private Sector Infrastructure Portfolio

Contract Purchase Order Number: 8044

I refer to the following:

1. The above mentioned Framework Agreement dated 3 September 2016

2. Your Technical and Commercial proposal of September 2017

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

1. Commencement and Duration of the Services

1.1 The Supplier shall start the Services no later than 29 January 2018 ("the Start Date") and the Services shall be completed by 1 July 2021 ("the End Date") unless the Call-down Contract is terminated earlier in accordance with the Terms and Conditions of the Framework Agreement.

2. Recipient

2.1 DFID requires the Supplier to provide the Services to DFID India ("the Recipient").

3. Financial Limit

3.1 Payments under this Call-down Contract shall not, exceed **£420,300** ("the Financial Limit") and is exclusive of any government tax, if applicable as detailed in Annex B**.**

When Payments shall be made on a 'Milestone Payment Basis' the following Clause 28.1 shall be substituted for Clause 28.1 of the Framework Agreement.

28. Milestone Payment Basis

28.1 Where the applicable payment mechanism is "Milestone Payment", invoice(s) shall be submitted for the amount(s) indicated in Annex B and payments will be made on satisfactory performance of the services, at the payment points defined as per schedule of payments. At each payment point set criteria will be defined as part of the payments. Payment will be made if the criteria are met to the satisfaction of DFID.

When the relevant milestone is achieved in its final form by the Supplier or following completion of the Services, as the case may be, indicating both the amount or amounts due at the time and cumulatively. Payments pursuant to clause 28.1 are subject to the satisfaction of the Project Officer in relation to the performance by the Supplier of its obligations under the Call-down Contract and to verification by the Project Officer that all prior payments made to the Supplier under this Call-down Contract were properly due.

3.2 Expenses

Expenses, as detailed in Annex B, pro forma 3 are indicative and will not exceed the maximum costs detailed against each line of expense. For the clarification of doubt expenses will be paid on receipted actuals at each Milestone Payment.

3.3 Payment by results

Performance payments shall be linked to agreed timelines as detailed in Annex B and the quality of each deliverable produced by the supplier. The payment mechanism and penalties imposed on failure to deliver will follow the proposed payment method as detailed in section 2.3.1 Linking payments to timely delivery and 2.3.2 Linking payments to quality of outputs of IPE Global's Commercial Tender. For the clarification of doubt section 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 have been extracted from IPE Global's Commercial Tender and included in Section 4, Annex B, pro forma 5 of this contract.

4. DFID Officials

4.1 The Project Officer is:

[redacted]
DFID India
[redacted]

4.2 The Contract Officer is:

[redacted]
Procurement and Commercial Department
East Kilbride, G75 8EA
[redacted]

5. Key Personnel

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

[redacted] – Team Leader / Evaluation Expert

[redacted] – Evaluation Methods Expert

[redacted] – Private Sector Infrastructure Specialist [redacted] – Private Sector Infrastructure Specialist

[redacted] – Research Manager

[redacted] – Monitoring and Evaluation

[redacted] – Research Assistant

[redacted] – Political Economy Analysis

[redacted] – Quality Assurance

6. Reports

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

7. Duty of Care

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

I. The Supplier will be responsible for all security arrangements and Her Majesty's Government accepts no responsibility for the health, safety and security of individuals or property whilst travelling.

II. The Supplier will be responsible for taking out insurance in respect of death or personal injury, damage to or loss of property, and will indemnify and keep indemnified DFID in respect of:

II.1. Any loss, damage or claim, howsoever arising out of, or relating to negligence by the Supplier, the Supplier's Personnel, or by any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier, in connection with the performance of the Call-down Contract;

II.2. Any claim, howsoever arising, by the Supplier's Personnel or any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier, in connection with their performance under this Call-down Contract.

III. The Supplier will ensure that such insurance arrangements as are made in respect of the Supplier's Personnel, or any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier are reasonable and prudent in all circumstances, including in respect of death, injury or disablement, and emergency medical expenses.

IV. The costs of any insurance specifically taken out by the Supplier to support the performance of this Call-down Contract in relation to Duty of Care may be included as part of the management costs of the project, and must be separately identified in all financial reporting relating to the project.

V. Where DFID is providing any specific security arrangements for Suppliers in relation to the Call-down Contract, these will be detailed in the Terms of Reference.

8. Call-down Contract Signature

Department for International Development

UKaid from the British people

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

For and on behalf of
The Secretary of State for
International Development

Name:

Position:

Signature:

Date:

For and on behalf of

IPE Global

Name:

Position:

Signature:

Date:

Department for International Development

UKaid from the British people

Terms of Reference

PO 8044

Impact Evaluation of the development Capital Investment Intervention of the DFID India's Private Sector Infrastructure Portfolio

Contents

Background……………………………………………………………………………..2
Context…………………………………………………………………………………..2
Objectives, purpose and scope……………………………………………………….4
Target audiences……………………………………………………………………......5
Dissemination and communication…………………………………………………...5
Evaluation questions…………………………………………………………………...5
Evaluation design and methodology………………………………………………….6
Skills and qualifications……………………………………………………………..….8
Logistics and project management procedures……………………………………..9
Outputs and deliverables……………………………………………………………...9
Budget…………………………………………………………………………………..11
Timelines………………………………………………………………………………..11
Existing information and data sources……………………………………………….11
Evaluation Criteria……………………………………………………………………..12
Duty of care…………………………………………………………………………….14
Risk Management……………………………………………………………………...16
Annex 1……………………………………………………………………………......17
Annex 2…………………………………………………………………………………..25
Annex 3…………………………………………………………………………………..27

Title:	*An evaluation of the development capital investment intervention of the DFID India's private sector infrastructure portfolio*

1. Background

The Department of International Development (DFID) is a British Government Department and a part of the British High Commission in New Delhi. DFID India is responsible for the implementation and the administration of the UK's development co-operation programme to India in partnership with the Government of India.

These terms of reference (ToR) invite consultants to evaluate impact of **Capital Intervention through Debt and Equity** within DFID India's private sector infrastructure portfolio. Unlike traditional grant aid programmes this is new generation of development capital investment (DCI) programmes which have been approved by DFID India. The enhanced focus is on value for money (VfM) of DFID's intervention; particularly where new financial instruments are used which necessitates more rigorous independent evaluation of the interventions.

This evaluation will focus on the balance between commercial and developmental outcomes of DCI projects in infrastructure in DFID India. The study will assess both directly attributable impacts of the programme and will also look into indirect and induced impact of the interventions. This is the first major study of its kind to look at the impact of DCI intervention of the DFID India's private sector infrastructure portfolio.

Context

The shortage of infrastructure in the world's poorest countries is a major and growing obstacle to economic growth and the elimination of poverty. According to the Planning Commission of India, GDP growth is held back by 1.5% - 2% every year because of a bottleneck in infrastructure expansion. Consequently, 12th Five year Plan proposes to spend a little over $1 trillion on infrastructure and aims to increase the share of the private sector in infrastructure investment substantially from 37% in the Eleventh Plan to 48%. Finance requirements at the aggregate level remain the single most challenge for the infrastructure sector.

Though about 30% of all foreign direct investment into India is infrastructure-related but the global economic slowdown has reduced the overall size of all FDI from a high of $43.4 billion in 2008 to $33.9 billion in 2012. New sources of non-bank capital, both domestic and international, would greatly aid the ability to meet the ambitious 12th plan targets. Overall, even if India was to achieve its 12th plan target, per capita investment will remain inadequate. The challenge is to demonstrate the viability of infrastructure projects in India's low income states; identifying feasible projects in sectors with the greatest potential to directly or indirectly reduce poverty, e.g. transport; decentralised, clean energy; urban services; agricultural storage and logistics.

Infrastructure development needs long term finance, in the form of debt, equity and guarantees. Substantial equity financing is often preferred for projects with higher levels of perceived risk. A limited amount of equity for private sector infrastructure is available from multilateral organizations, such as the International Finance Corporation and the private sector window of the Asian Development Bank. Although these funds can provide only a small amount of capital, their participation in a project provides a substantial degree of comfort to other investors, particularly domestic banks. DFID's private sector infrastructure interventions therefore become valuable, particularly in India's low income states and in the investment size below $50 million where currently there is a gap in available private equity funds.

The volume of capital available through existing investors remains modest relative to the total requirement of $1 trillion but the range of global investors (such as pension funds, sovereign wealth funds etc.) they can tap is very large and the flow of equity internationally into India could increase substantially if bankable projects become available and the track record of implementation improves. Individual investor can reduce the risk by sharing the risk among a larger group of investors, which an equity fund structure allows.

The main poverty reducing benefits from this programme are expected through improvements in infrastructure services in high impact sub-sectors e.g. agricultural storage and logistics infrastructure, urban infrastructure, district and rural roads and through demonstration of successful projects. The focus will be particularly on relatively smaller projects in the low income states and these sub-sectors which account for substantially reduced flows of patient risk-capital or investors who can take a long-term view of the sector. Challenges to flow of such capital in low income states in India are-

1. Lack of investors' appetite to invest in risky regions due to availability of low hanging fruits in other matured states

2. Non- conducive business environment to attract private capital into infrastructure sectors

3. Lack of institutional capacity in project design and development.

To address the shortage of patient risk- capital in the infrastructure sectors, with a focus in the low- income states, DFID India has partnered with IDFC Bank and SBI Capital Markets Limited (SBI Caps) to provide debt and equity funds respectively to a range of infrastructure sectors in India's low- income states. IDFC Bank Limited has transitioned into a Bank now. SBI Caps is a subsidiary of the State Bank of India (SBI), the largest commercial bank in India.

The common **impact** of the Infrastructure Equity Fund and the Infrastructure Loan Fund Programmes is "increased investor interest in pro-poor infrastructure sectors in India's low-income states"

The **outcome** is "sustainable private sector supported pro-poor infrastructure projects delivered in the targeted sub-sectors in the low income states resulting in increased access to infrastructure services".

The Infrastructure Equity Fund Programme is an intervention using £36 million of DFID capital contribution to establish an equity fund of £48 million (including sponsor contribution) managed by the Fund Manager- SBICAP Ventures Ltd. (SVL) as the financial intermediary, and a £1.5 million technical assistance (TA) attached for improved systems of project appraisal, Environmental Social and Governance (ESG) assessment and monitoring through various partners selected from time to time.

The Infrastructure loan Fund Programme is an intervention using a £36 million returnable capital component (debt) via IDFC Bank Ltd. as a financial intermediary, and a £2 million technical assistance for improved systems of project appraisal, ESG assessment and monitoring through various partners selected through DFID procurement processes.

The programmes have the following three common **outputs**:

- Increased number of private sector infrastructure projects in targeted (agricultural infrastructure; renewable energy services; district and rural roads and urban services) sub-sectors etc. in the eight Low Income States (LIS)

- Build and strengthen development focus/ orientation of the project partner and portfolio companies.

- Generate policy relevant knowledge on private sector approaches to pro-poor infrastructure sub-sectors.

Headline results expected from the two programmes are: (See Annex 1 for Log frames)

- At least 12 private sector-led projects (to build e.g. roads, grain storage warehouses, waste management facilities or solar power plants and sectors as agreed with fund managers);

- At least £240m of private investment mobilised for pro-poor infrastructure services;

- 280,000 women and men to gain access to new/improved infrastructure services such as electricity, sewerage, and transport (roads, bridges);

- 1,500 long term jobs and 3,000 construction jobs generated;

- 3 studies to collect and share evidence about the development impacts of selected projects

2. Objectives, purpose and scope

The objective of DFID-India commissioning an independent evaluation of the returnable capital private sector infrastructure portfolio is to test the feasibility and effectiveness of debt and equity instruments in promoting pro-poor private investments in infrastructure in India's low- income states while achieving developmental (socio- economic) outcomes.

This study will also assess the pre-conditions (policy, regulation and institutional capacity) necessary for replicating these instruments in India and beyond. The purpose is to learn lesson from an innovative market led infrastructure financing mechanism in low income states and to ensure accountability in terms of optimising development outcomes.

The Theory of Change (ToC) for both the infrastructure debt and equity programmes is attached as Annex 2. The expected impact of both the interventions made under the portfolio is to *"enhance investor interest in pro-poor infrastructure sectors in India's low-income states".*

The scope of this study is to complete baseline data analysis by end of year 1 (2018) followed by mid-term evaluation in year 3 (2020).

The evaluation agency is expected to work closely with the partners, project developers and support systematic forecasting and monitoring of investment and beneficiary data from investments based on reporting by fund managers, investees and through direct and secondary information sources.

3. Target audiences

This evaluation is primarily to inform the impact of future programmes in DFID-India and DFID more widely on providing long- term finance through returnable capital instruments like debt and equity. It is expected that the findings of this evaluation will inform and be used to design and deliver future returnable capital programmes in DFID with focus on low- income economies.

The following will be the target audiences of this evaluation: DFID India, DFID global, the NIIF cross HMG team and a host of other agencies and partners including government departments in charge of implementing infrastructure programme, UK government / parliamentarians research networks, multilateral organisations engaged in infrastructure sector and other development agencies in India and globally. The findings will also have academic value as rigorous evidence of returnable capital as instruments to achieve development outcomes in the infrastructure sector.

4. Dissemination and communication

It is important that key findings, conclusions and recommendations from the evaluation are conveyed to the target audiences outlined above in a format that encourages them to engage and act on the information so that returnable capital instruments could be adequately analysed as instruments to finance long- term capital investments in infrastructure. The evaluators will be expected to develop a communication and dissemination strategy during the Inception Phase. As part of this work, the evaluators will be expected to identify other organisations that potentially have an interest in providing capital to the infrastructure sub- sectors in low- income states in future. The bid should include an outline of the dissemination and communication strategy.

5. Evaluation questions

The evaluation will, reflecting the five DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, aim to answer the following questions:

- **Outcome level**: Do DFID's Development Capital Investments influence investor interest? If yes, how? And if not, why not?

- **Development impact**: Has there been any impact in terms of access to services and infrastructure asset creation. What is the impact in terms of people, jobs and capital leveraged?
    - Allocation efficiency – in which sectors does investment lead to the greatest impact?

- **Institutional impact**: what is the impact on the developers/investees, the fund managers and their institutions, co-financers and the overall sector markets (e.g. risk of crowding out, do no harm)?

- **Instrument and incentives** e.g. profit, social impact, level of partnership: Does the choice of instrument – debt, structured or equity affect the impact?

- **Value for money**: What has been the overall value for money?

However, these are indicative questions. The bidders are expected to review and refine the theory of change and the set of evaluation questions during the inception phase in the light of the scope of the evaluation.

6. Evaluation design and methodology

The consultants are expected to develop an evaluation design that is rigorous and based on internationally recognised methods. The design proposed should show how the chosen methodology including sampling, data collection and analysis techniques will lead to a robust and credible set of conclusions and recommendations around the overall impact and validity of the DFID India development capital infrastructure financing model.

Bidders are free to propose the most appropriate design to allow generalisation from those investments selected for evaluation and identify key contextual factors expected to affect both effectiveness and sustainability and external validity. The design and methods will be judged on their utility under small to medium term scenarios and will be finalised during the evaluation process in agreement with DFID-India' evaluation team constituted for this evaluation.

The overall length of the bid proposal should not exceed more than 40 pages (excluding annex and CVs)

The consultants are expected to review and refine the theory of change in light of the expected outcomes and evidence to date and test the assumptions made and address any evidence gaps.

The evaluation is expected to adopt a design which includes the gathering of baseline, midline project data. The bidders should explain how best these two portfolios (debt and equity) be evaluated given the fact that both will support a number of projects in different states. The projects will be dissimilar in nature as they will be chosen from a host of sub-sectors and the implementation period of individual projects will also vary within the broad time-frame of the infra programme. In the light of the purpose, scope and objectives, the bidders should incorporate the rationale of their choice of projects and if all the projects are considered for evaluation, the bidders should explain what should be the rigour and scope with which the projects will be evaluated. In developing the evaluation design and methods, the bidders should also consider the following issues:

- Each of the partnerships (debt and equity) is expected to make 8-9 investments into various projects either directly or supporting infrastructure, across sectors viz. agri-infrastructure, urban, renewable energy, waste processing, waste to energy etc. The evaluation should capture impacts disaggregated by gender, poverty level, minority groups etc. wherever applicable.

- The investment decisions will be taken by an expert Investment Committee constituted by representation from DFID and other contributors to the fund for the Equity Partnership while there will be a Board of Advisors for strategic guidance of the fund. On the other hand, Investment decisions will be at the sole discretion of the partner under the Debt Partnership.

- The extent of opportunities to enhance evaluation and potentially to learn, through either the selection of portfolio companies or how portfolio companies select or deliver services to primary beneficiaries will need to be verified with the project implementers. It is expected that all investments will be identified by December 2018.

- Filling evidence gaps on the sustainability and effectiveness of the private equity and debt capital for infrastructure development in low- income states in identified sectors is one of the two main objectives for the evaluation. The design must therefore be methodologically rigorous and credible when judging both the **internal** and **external** validity of the results. Bidders will be expected to clearly set out the standards used for ensuring rigor/credibility. Assessing rigor/credibility will be a major focus of the future DFID quality assurance process.

- The expectation is that the detailed design will be completed and agreed by the end of the Inception Phase, with baseline data then collected and analysed by the end of year 1 (2018). A midterm evaluation, should then be scheduled for year 3 (2020), and will be used by DFID in its own midterm review of the overall private sector infrastructure returnable capital portfolio.

- The bidders are expected to comment on the methodology adopted for capturing the impact of individual projects. As investments for these projects will happen overtime and across various sectors and states, the methodology should be robust enough to comprehensively evaluate the programme accordingly.

- The evaluators will also be expected to set out how they will address the implications for establishing baselines and identifying control groups (if required) when target beneficiaries will be identified on an on-going basis till 2018; as individual investments are identified.

Note: A brief summary of the investment made till now is as under:-

Sr	Brief of the Investment/Loan	State/Head Quarters
1.	Wind Energy Project	AP
2.	Wind Energy Project	Rajasthan
3.	Waste to Energy Project	Odisha
4.	Milk Processing	Maharashtra
5	Non-Banking Financial Corporation	Low Income States
6	Wind Power Energy Project	Madhya Pradesh
7	Dairy project	Odisha
8	Cold Chain Logistics and Warehouses	West Bengal

Most of the above projects are already constructed/final stages of completion. The future investments/loan is also expected to be on similar lines.

7. Skills and qualifications

The evaluation team should have a sound understanding of evaluation designs and research methods. The team should understand the strengths and limitations of different designs and how to accurately interpret and present findings to both researchers and non-researchers. The team will require a broad set of skills to be able to effectively design a complex evaluation and prior experience of evaluating private sector programmes.

The team will also have a demonstrated ability to communicate complex studies and findings in an accessible way for non-technical readers, including presentation of data in visually appealing ways, highly structured and rigorous summaries of findings and robust and accessible syntheses of key lessons.

The evaluation team will need to have a mix of skills that covers:

- Strong understanding of various quantitative and qualitative evaluation methodologies, surveys, and econometric/statistical analysis
- Experience of undertaking large evaluation/impact assessments projects, using mixed methods approaches that meet recognised standards for credibility and rigor.
- Experience of working on evaluations of private sector approaches
- A good grounding in the literature of the ethnography in the target states;
- Strong analytical and report writing skills and task management
- Financial analysis, the private sector and economics;
- Poverty and vulnerability assessments;
- Political economy analysis;
- Presentation of reports, data visualisation, and synthesising findings; Research communications and uptake;

The evaluation supplier will need to be able to guarantee sufficient people to be able to implement and manage various studies simultaneously.

The evaluation supplier will need to comply with DFID's policies on fraud and anti-corruption, knowledge of latest UK Bribery Act and cooperate with any checks required from them for the duration of the evaluation e.g. annual audited statements, policies on management of funds, etc.

The evaluation provider will be expected to supply their own logistic requirements including office space and transport.

8. Logistics and project management procedures

The contractor will be selected by DFID India evaluation team with support from the Private Sector Team from a pre-qualified group. Economic Advisor, representatives of the Private Sector Team (DFID-India) will be the contact point for the study. An external sector expert may be appointed for this evaluation in consultation with the Evaluation Division, DFID. This external expert will be part of this pre-qualified group.

The evaluation suppliers will provide recommendations to Results Advisor and Task Team Leader of both the Infrastructure Projects. Sr. Private Sector Advisor, DFID- India will be the overall lead for ensuring quality of the deliverables. Bi-annual reports on the progress of the evaluation, any obstacles to delivery and updated financial forecasts will be required.

DFID India will sign off on the Inception Report and all other outputs specified in these ToR. All outputs will be subject to DFID quality assurance process, as will all final evaluation reports.

The evaluation suppliers will be independent, but required to work closely with IDFC and SBICAPs Venture Ltd. and DFID India throughout the life of the programme, including agreeing the evaluation design, hypotheses for testing, outcomes of concern, appropriate indicators and a dissemination strategy. Whilst the evaluation must generate internationally credible evidence, the research and associated findings must have local stakeholders' buy-in and acceptance to be useful for instigating reform and change. The programme will therefore create a reference group drawing from the partners, DFID programme team, DFID Evaluation Team and Investment Committee to facilitate this relationship.

9. Outputs and deliverables

The major deliverables include inception report and a pilot report for the methodologies for design, baseline and midline evaluation. The evaluation agency is also expected to submit a six monthly progress report to DFID. All the evaluation reports will undergo mandatory quality assurance (QA) processes. Usually, the quality assurance of each evaluation product requires 15 days. The evaluation expert should factor in the time requirement for QA while charting out the work-plan. All reports should be maximum 40 pages excluding annex.

9.1 An Inception Report (within 3 months of commissioning the evaluation)

The consultants will submit an inception report covering the followings:

- The finalised evaluation design and methods
- Elaboration of the ToC and discussion of implications for the evaluation design
- Review the evaluation questions and proposals for how they might be amended or their range expanded

- A communication and dissemination strategy, reflecting DFID's Open Access Policy, and specifying the target audiences
- A review of the main risks and challenges for the evaluation and how these will be managed
- Proposal on collection of baseline and midline data
- Assessment of the probable quality and credibility of the identified datasets and sources and implications for primary data collection
- Review and validation of the monitoring data and develop a monitoring plan with the partners to measure results and to maximise the extent that monitoring can be used for evaluation purposes
- Work plan

9.2 Pilot evaluation report

The supplier should be ready to proceed with the pilot within a week of Inception Report being agreed. Within a week of concluding the pilot of the methodology, the supplier is expected to produce an evaluation report (not longer than 5 pages) of the pilot and whether the design methodology as set out in the Inception Report needs to be adjusted.

9.3 A baseline evaluation report (on timeline as agreed in the Inception Report)

The evaluation agency will submit a report after the base-line work has been completed. The baseline-line report should state the findings of the survey, review of situation/context and analyse the results. It will include an executive summary, context, evaluation goals, purpose, objectives, scope, methodology and the process through which data and information have been collected and analysed. The report should include suitable graphs, charts; tables disaggregated and aggregated data for different relevant spatial and socio-economic categories based on the evaluation framework.

The supplier should submit the draft baseline-line report within two weeks of completing the primary data collection (quantitative and qualitative) and review of the relevant documents, policies and practices and secondary data sources. The final baseline report should be submitted within two week after incorporating comments from DFID and reference group. The supplier should submit the draft and final reports to DFID in both electronic and print format for comments.

9.4 A midterm evaluation report (Year 3 i.e. 2020):

The evaluation agency will submit a report after the mid-line work/survey has been completed in the third year after commissioning the evaluation. The mid-line report should state the findings of the survey and analyse the results as against the baseline. This will be a status report of the programme and illustrate findings with respect to the evaluation questions and indicators. The report should include an assessment of the likely effectiveness and sustainability of the programme and efficiency of the delivery approach, particularly effectiveness of the returnable capital instruments used for infrastructure financing with suggestions on how the programme approach might be adjusted to enhance its overall impact in terms of leveraging private investments. There should be a specific high level report using the mid-term findings and conclusions to disseminate to senior DFID and other stakeholders outlining the potential for replication of the social venture capital model. At this stage it may not be possible to identify impact however the mid-term evaluation will identify the trajectory of change and allow revisions to the evaluation design and methodology to be implemented in preparation for the final evaluation.

The supplier should submit the draft mid-line report within two weeks of completing the data collection and the final midline report within two week after incorporating comments from DFID and reference group. The supplier should submit the draft and final reports to DFID in both electronic and print formats for comments.

9.5 Regular six-monthly up-dates to DFID and the reference group**.** This should include progress on the evaluation plan and monitoring updates of investment and beneficiary data.

10. Budget

The proposed budget for the assignment is up to a maximum of £500,000, this value is inclusive of Indian taxes as applicable. Bidding agencies are expected to provide a detailed costing to meet the objectives of this assignment. Bid evaluation will be based on both technical and financial considerations. The final selection will be made having determined which proposal offers the best and most cost-effective way to meet the objectives of the study, based on the quality of evaluation and the competitiveness of the financial bid.

11. Timelines

The contract will be let for 3 years with the possibility of a no cost extension for up to a further one year. Where circumstances require further extension beyond the original contract duration/agreed extensions, DFID will consider doing so by means of the negotiated procedure.

Indicative start dates for the surveys are as follows:

Start of Baseline Survey- early 2018

Start of Midline survey- early 2020

12. Existing information and data sources

Apart from the primary data collected, the evaluator will have access to the following data sources:

- Financial Statements of the Fund (for the equity partnership) and the project developers
- MIS maintained by the Fund Manager, which will have financial and operational reporting from the portfolio investees.
- MIS of project developers
- ESG report of projects funded out of the 2 partnerships
- The business cases, log-frames and ToC of both the projects
- Periodic progress reports including mid- year and Annual Reviews of the projects, as and when they are available.
- Monitoring data in relation to all the above referred projects

13. Duty of Care

The supplier is responsible for making their own travel arrangements for fulfilling the requirements of the assignment. This is likely to include travel to programme activities in Africa and South Asia in order to deliver the contract (subject to travel clearance being granted). Only economy travel will be supported, and the supplier should make all reasonable effort to ensure value for money in all travel arrangements.

Duty of Care is a legal obligation and under DFID's policy on Duty of Care, the lead supplier is responsible for the Duty of Care of all supplier personnel (including employees, subcontractors and agents) including making the appropriate security arrangements to protect their safety and wellbeing. Suppliers must comply with the general responsibilities and duties under relevant health and safety law including appropriate risk assessments, adequate information, instruction, training and supervision, and appropriate emergency procedures. These responsibilities must be applied in the context of the specific requirements of the contract. Proposals should demonstrate how suppliers are capable of taking responsibility for duty of care within the contract. The Supplier is responsible for the safety and well-being of their Personnel and Third Parties affected by their activities under this Terms of Reference. They will also be responsible for the provision of suitable security arrangements for their domestic and business property.

DFID will share available information with the Supplier on security status and developments in-country where appropriate.

The Supplier is responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security briefings for all of their Personnel working under this Terms of Reference 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.

This Procurement will 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).

This Procurement will require the Supplier to operate in conflict-affected areas and parts of it are highly insecure. 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 areas required within the region in order to deliver the Contract (subject to travel clearance being granted).

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 dangerous, fragile and hostile environments etc.).

Bidders 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 developed by DFID (see Annex 3 of this ToR). Suppliers should be aware that an assessment of Duty of Care will be undertaken at the full tender stage and must confirm in their response that they have the capability to work in Innovative Ventures & Technologies for Development INVENT's partner countries as required. 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.
- Duty of Care for any field visits including all aspects of travel and accommodation will be fully assessed.

Acceptance of responsibility must be supported with evidence of capability (no more than 2 A4 pages) and DFID reserves the right to clarify any aspect of this evidence. In providing evidence Tenderers should consider the following questions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

For further details please see DFID's policy on Duty of Care: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/137565/DFID-duty-of-care-suppliers-note.pdf and latest DFID Duty of Care risk assessment matrix in Annex 3.

DFID will support by sharing available information with the supplier on security status and developments in-country as appropriate. Travel advice from the UK government is also available on our website (https://www.gov.uk/foreign-travel-advice).

The supplier will be responsible for managing all arrangements regarding setting up appointments associated with the assignment. DFID's global partnerships team in DFID India will provide reasonable support to the service provider with regard to supplying contact information and introductions to key stakeholders were necessary.

14. Risk Management

DFID's approach and format for characterising risk will be clearly communicated to the service provider. The service provider will be expected to identify the key risks they perceive in meeting the objectives of this TOR and proposed mitigation methods.

These may include but are not limited to:

- Lack of access to the data and information required for the evaluation is not expected to be a risk. The service provider will have access to partners and DFID programme information. Where specific data might be required, supplier will need to search and find them from public domain.

    - We do not expect internal programme risk to affect the delivery of the evaluation. Political risk has become lower since the programmes were approved. The new Indian government elected in June 2014 is pro-business.