Title: Building resilience and managing risk in fragile and conflict-affected states: A thematic evaluation of DFID’s multi-year approaches to humanitarian action in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Sudan and Pakistan.

1. Introduction

1. DFID is seeking the services of a Supplier with extensive experience in the evaluation of humanitarian programmes in fragile and conflict-affected states (FCAS) to undertake a thematic evaluation of four DFID humanitarian programmes in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, Sudan, and Pakistan. Findings from these four country evaluations will then be combined with those from a parallel evaluation on Somalia, which is being commissioned separately.

2. The purpose of the evaluation is to generate learning and evidence on whether and how a multi-year humanitarian funding approach has enabled DFID programmes: 1) to ensure timely and effective humanitarian response; 2) to build disaster resilience; and 3) achieve better value for money. The evaluation will provide evidence to contribute to the management of these programmes at country level, and to inform DFID’s humanitarian policy more broadly. The evaluation findings are also expected to contribute to the global evidence base on good humanitarian practice and on how to build resilience in the most fragile and conflict-affected states.

3. A number of high quality products are expected over the life time of the evaluation. These will include:
   a. Inception Report and Evaluation Framework, which will include: a more detailed multi-country theory of change including indicators in relation to building disaster resilience in FCAS; proposals for revisions of country programme logframes (if necessary); evaluability assessment/evaluation methodology report for each country; workplan across countries, and a cross-country evaluation uptake strategy.
   b. Formative evaluation report for each country (DRC, Ethiopia, Sudan and Pakistan), which includes preliminary findings timed to contribute to respective programme annual reviews and project
completion reports where possible. These formative reports will primarily be for the benefit of DFID country programmes to consider adapting programme implementation in response to preliminary evaluation findings.

c. **Summative evaluation report for DRC, Ethiopia, and Sudan**, which both provide high quality findings for DFID to inform programme management, as well as public goods informing the wider humanitarian community of lessons learned.

d. **Synthesis of the formative and summative evaluation country reports (including Somalia)** which brings together and evaluates the collective findings of the package of summative evaluation findings. This should include the findings from an evaluation of DFID Somalia’s humanitarian programme which is being commissioned in parallel. This report will inform both DFID and global policy debates.

e. **Other final stage outputs**, including briefing papers and factsheets, which translate the findings from the synthesis and country summative evaluations into products for easy use by humanitarian policy-makers and practitioners. The precise number will be agreed when the contract is signed. Topics/ themes will be agreed during the final phase of the evaluation.

4. This evaluation is expected to run from April 2014 until December 2017, with a 6 month inception phase. There will be a possible extension of up to 12 months to this contract subject to need, review recommendations and budget availability. In the event of an extension, this would need to be agreed with the Senior Responsible Officer for the evaluation.

2. **Background**

5. More than 1.5 billion people live in countries which suffer the effects of weak or repressive political systems and/or are affected by conflict. Humanitarian assistance remains an important means of reaching the most vulnerable populations in these countries. The UK is a major humanitarian donor, and has been at the forefront of innovation in humanitarian response, including the creation of major new financing instruments. The UK also has a strong interest in supporting development outcomes in the most fragile and conflict-affected situations, allocating a growing share of its financial and policy resource to this area.

6. A number of major reports have identified two key challenges facing humanitarian action in fragile and conflict-affected states.
   a. While existing humanitarian interventions are designed to meet life-saving needs, there is increasing interest in whether and how aid interventions might also help to build the resilience of individuals, households and communities to future stresses and shocks\(^1\).

b. How to ensure that if and when conditions deteriorate significantly, humanitarian efforts can be scaled up sufficiently in time to avoid major mortality\(^2\).

7. Common to both these challenges is the issue of timing.

8. Historically, humanitarian aid instruments were designed on the assumption that need was likely to be transitory and temporary. The timeframe for humanitarian project cycles has been 6-12 months, with budgetary processes for the international humanitarian system organised around this approach, with annualised consolidated appeals, for example. Yet, most humanitarian aid, 55% globally is spent in countries that have been experiencing severe humanitarian need for more than eight years largely in a context of conflict and fragility\(^3\). In other words, they are protracted crises. While long-term solutions are needed, it has often been difficult to attract long-time finance because political and security conditions limit the use of conventional development instruments. This has resulted in limited efforts to date to address the underlying chronic vulnerabilities of people and communities in FCAS contexts through building disaster resilience. Hence, the ‘gap’ between relief and development finance.

9. The second issue of timing relates to when to respond to spikes in need when environmental, political or other conditions deteriorate. A large literature attests to the human costs of late response in such circumstances. A repeated finding in this literature is that it can be very difficult to get timely decisions to scale up funding in the face of uncertainty as to whether a large crisis will really emerge, and then to translate release of funds into operations on the ground\(^5\).

10. In order to address these two challenges, DFID has been developing a new approach to the financing of its humanitarian work in protracted crises. This approach combines two elements.

11. The first, is to provide predictable funding for up to four years, enabling partners to invest in the capacity required to meet humanitarian need, and to find new ways of enabling communities to build resilience. For example, DFID Ethiopia is supporting a 3 year partnership with UNHCR.

---


\(^4\) For the previous 10 years the proportion of humanitarian assistance provides to long-term protracted crises was around 70% (see GHA (2012), Global Humanitarian Assistance: report 2012). The size of the Syria humanitarian response, however, has changed the proportions.

designed to meet support sustainable livelihoods, as well as immediate needs, in protracted refugee settings.

12. The second, is innovative pre-approved internal risk financing arrangements that allow the UK to fund early warning/action preparedness activities and rapid response in the event of a ‘spike’ in need. For example, DFID Sudan has a pre-approved contingency of £21million, to be used for response to new emergencies, such as intensification of conflict.

13. In addition, there is some evidence and strong inference that a multi-year approach will be more cost-effective than annual funding\(^6\). For example, multi-year staff contracts should not only save recruitment and training costs, but also improve the effectiveness and efficiency as a result of international staff having better “systems” knowledge and the ability to invest in training of national staff. It should also allow economy savings on forward contracts, facilities’ leasing and vehicle purchases\(^7\).

14. Underpinning the approach are three key hypotheses, and it is these that the evaluation is designed to test. These are that:

   a. By providing longer-term and predictable financing implementing partners will be able to respond more **effectively** to humanitarian need and to build resilience of extremely vulnerable communities in FCAS.

   b. That by securing pre-approved funding linked to specific triggers, the UK will be able to respond more quickly and effectively if and when conditions deteriorate.

   c. That multi-year financing will be more cost-effective and efficient than annualised humanitarian funding.

15. This evaluation will focus on four countries where DFID is using this multi-year approach to humanitarian funding: the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC); Ethiopia; North Sudan and Pakistan. Originally the DFID-Yemen humanitarian programme was included in the evaluation, but due to insecurity and limited access it has been replaced by the DFID-Pakistan humanitarian programme. A parallel evaluation of similar design is being commissioned for a multi-year business case in Somalia.

---

16. The multi-year programmes are all at different stages in the different countries. In some cases, implementing partners have been agreed for most if not all of the work (DRC and Ethiopia), while in others they have not yet been identified. DFID-Pakistan given its later inclusion in the thematic evaluation (November 2014) are still largely in a process of approvals and procurement. Given the later start, the DFID-Pakistan humanitarian programme will only have a formative evaluation (not an additional summative evaluation as in the case of the other three countries).

17. DFID partners will be expected to include monitoring and evaluation arrangements within their projects. The proposed work contained in these ToRs aims to be complementary to and benefit from partner M&E systems – not replace them, although a degree of consistency will be important. The evaluation work is expected to provide an objective assessment of both implementing partners performance and DFID programme management. Potential implementing partners include:
   a. Non-governmental organisations (possibly in consortia);
   b. United Nations Agencies and UN-led pooled funding arrangements (including WFP, UNHCR, UNICEF, as well as Common Humanitarian Funds).
   c. The Red Cross Movement.

18. Each country programme covered by this evaluation has a different set of implementing partners. Between them, these four country programmes are expected to disburse over £400 million under the business cases that are the subject of this evaluation. A summary of the four multi-year country programmes (including Somalia) is included at Annex 1.

Wider context for the evaluation: resilience in fragile and conflict-affected situations

19. This evaluation is of strategic significance. The issue of how best to support communities living in the most fragile and conflict-affected situations is one of the most compelling challenges in humanitarian and development policy. Its findings in relation to both financing instruments and programming interventions have the potential to impact DFID’s work at country level and globally, as well as wider international policy.

20. Evidence suggests that poverty, particularly extreme poverty, is increasingly concentrated in these settings. No fragile state has yet to reach any of the Millennium Development Goals. Evidence also

---

8 More detailed information on partners for each programme is available in Business Cases signposted in Section 14 Existing Sources of Information.
suggests that the effects of climate change and other natural hazards will be felt most sharply in these environments\(^{11}\). The following sections map out this contextual background in order to frame the evaluation questions.

**Defining disaster resilience**

21. DFID defines disaster resilience as:

\[\text{..the ability of countries, communities and households to manage change, by maintaining or transforming living standards in the face of shocks or stresses - such as earthquakes, drought or violent conflict – without compromising their long-term prospects. (DFID, 2012: 6)}\]

22. The operational framework for building resilience links together an analysis of context; types of disturbance (shocks and stresses); capacity to deal with disturbance; and anticipated reaction to disturbance – and a population’s subsequent trajectory (see figure 1). It is holistic, multi-sectoral – for example between disaster risk reduction, social protection and climate change adaptation – and requires a long-term approach to funding and programming. A key issue for analysis by country programmes in designing interventions is the level at which support is provided, and where data are collected over the duration of the programme – individuals, households, communities, or regions.

![DFID's approach to resilience](image)

23. The DFID 2011 Disaster Resilience approach paper included a commitment to generate evidence from the interventions which have

\(^{11}\) Harris K et al (2013) *When Disasters and Conflict Collide: improving the links between disaster resilience and conflict* Report to DFID.
successfully built disaster resilience in DFID programmes. This was further supported in the DFID strategy paper for promoting evidence-based approaches to resilience and humanitarian response.

24. The complexity of the concept of resilience, makes it difficult to measure whether, and how, and what different interventions actually look like and work in practice adding difficulty to the design of appropriate counterfactuals for evaluation. A priority, then, is to develop better metrics in order to track whether and how different interventions deliver resilience outcomes.

Resilience in FCAS

25. Building resilience in fragile and conflict-affected environments is both particularly important and particularly challenging, and the need for the best possible evidence is strong.

26. It is particularly important for two reasons. First, there is a strong overlap between those countries most vulnerable to natural hazards and those affected by conflict and fragility. Kellet and Sparks estimate that between 2005-2009, 50% of those affected by natural hazards lived in fragile and conflict-affected states. This phenomenon is not simply a geographical accident, but rather reflects the second important characteristic of these states: their poverty. That is a strong correlation between poverty and vulnerability to shocks and threats.

27. Poverty is heavily concentrated in FCAS (Kharas and Rogerson, 2012; World Bank, 2011). This poverty and vulnerability stems from multiple causes – political, economic and environmental - that interact with each other. In FCAS, these factors “stack up” to create extreme and often chronic vulnerability.

28. Collinson et al outline how violence interacts with other more ‘routine’ drivers of poverty to create high levels of vulnerability. This analysis at the micro-level of livelihoods starts to explain why poverty and vulnerability reach such extreme levels in some countries. The 2011 famine in the Horn of Africa was the most recent tragic case of environmental and political factors combining with fatal results.

---

12 DFID (2011), Defining disaster resilience: a DFID approach paper
13 DFID (2012), Promoting innovation and evidence-based approaches to building resilience and responding to humanitarian crises: a DFID strategy paper
14 Kellet J and D Sparks Disaster Risk Reduction: spending where it should count. Development Initiatives, Shepton Mallet: page 31
17 Harris et al (2013) op cit
29. Most analysis of how to manage disaster risk and build resilience is premised on the existence of a benign and functioning state\textsuperscript{19}. In FCAS, state institutions are at best unable to provide a framework for reducing risk and vulnerability. De Waal\textsuperscript{20} and Keen\textsuperscript{21} argue, in many contexts, the problem is not simply that governments and armed actors passively fail to avert disaster. Rather, they actively create crises (and by extension “dependency” on relief) as part of a strategy of war, profiteering, and/or to contain populations\textsuperscript{22}. In such contexts, efforts to build resilience are potentially highly political acts, going against the grain of the prevailing political economy.

30. A further key question in such environments, then, is how much space is there to enable populations to graduate from dependence on humanitarian aid to developing broader livelihoods opportunities to enable self-reliance. Bradbury\textsuperscript{23} documents how the promotion of ‘developmental relief’ had negative outcomes for Internal Displaced Persons (IDPs). In this case, aid agencies were encouraged to reduce rations (ostensibly to reduce dependency on aid), but this was done without first ensuring that these groups could access sustainable livelihoods. The result was to increase IDPs’ dependence on exploitative labour relations and a return to malnutrition levels above emergency thresholds.

31. In such contexts, a further key question is whether it is possible to build disaster resilience to multiple hazards, including extreme political shocks, conflict and natural threats. If so, to what degree, under what circumstances and at what level? When supporting the most vulnerable populations, what is the most appropriate timeframe to be thinking about communities (re-) establishing self-reliance? What are the necessary conditions to enable such a transformation? If resilience gains are unlikely to be significant in the short-term, to what degree is it necessary to plan to actually increase levels of support to enable both short term survival needs and medium term resilience objectives to be reconciled? To what extent does gender and other forms of social exclusion compound vulnerability and impact on resilience building activities? The evaluation team should keep these questions in view, and the extent to which answers can be gained from these particular programmes.

\textsuperscript{19} see for example, Government Office of Science, (2012), Reducing Risk of Future Disasters, see: www.bis.gov.uk/assets/foresight/docs/reducing-risk-management/12-1289-reducing-risks-of-future-disasters-report.pdf
\textsuperscript{22} For example, the ability of refugees to integrate into local economies is frequently constrained by limitations on the right to work or to move to seek employment.
32. A combination of conceptual and practical innovation offers new opportunities to reduce the risks facing populations living in these most difficult environments.

33. At a conceptual level, ‘resilience’ is proving a powerful organising principle around which different actors – national, international, public and private - are able to convene in order to define common problems and solutions. In contrast to the concept of ‘linking relief and development’, the resilience approach has the advantage of being driven by an analysis of risk and vulnerability as opposed to the compatibility of different aid instruments.

34. More practically, the increasing concentration of aid finance in FCAS, combined with the prospect of multi-year financing through humanitarian windows, provides a practical opportunity to shift programming decisions from the short- to the longer term.

35. Lacking, however, is knowledge as to capitalise on these opportunities at field level. There is currently a lack of evidence as to how best to support individuals, households and communities facing multiple risks, including environmental change, political violence and economic decline.

36. This evaluation will be designed to develop this conceptual background into a framework for systematic capture and analysis of experience of operationalising the concept of disaster resilience in the most fragile and conflict-affected settings. The purpose of the evaluation is to generate learning and evidence on whether and how a multi-year humanitarian funding approach has enabled DFID programmes to:
   a. build disaster resilience (effectiveness/impact);
   b. ensure timely and effective humanitarian response (effectiveness); and
   c. achieve better value for money (efficiency).

3. Purpose, Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

Rationale for the study

37. The purpose of this evaluation is to generate learning and evidence for DFID and the wider humanitarian community. It will both allow for course corrections within programmes, through contributions to annual reviews and for programme managers and advisers (formative component); and will build understanding on the most effective and efficient approaches for building resilience in FCAS (summative/synthesis components). Key outputs will be published, and should be of a high standard, meeting expected evaluation standards, including rigour and intellectual consistency.
38. Evaluation Criteria: this evaluation will use the core themes of the evaluation and programmes design(s) to focus on the following OECD DAC evaluation criteria: effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and impact:\(^{24}\):

- **Effectiveness**: the extent to which the planned results were achieved, or are expected to be achieved
- **Efficiency**: the measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time) are converted to results
- **Coherence**: the extent to which there is consistency between an initiative at the wider policy context (e.g. developmental, trade, military, humanitarian, human rights).
- **Impact**: the positive and negative, primary and secondary effects produced by an initiative, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended

39. The evaluation will be sequenced to produce a series of programme relevant outputs throughout the life of the relevant programmes for DFID country-offices, as well as evidence products for the wider humanitarian practitioner and policy-maker community. These are detailed further in the methodology section.

**Evaluation questions**

40. The design of the multi-year/pre-approved humanitarian funding approach has been driven by three key hypotheses (see para 16). These hypotheses, and their intellectual background, have been used to frame the three core evaluation questions.

41. These are presented below with provisional sub-questions framed according to DAC criteria. Following an evaluability assessment in each country, the evaluation team will use these provisional questions (potentially modified/ reduced in number), and the specific design of the relevant DFID programmes, to develop an Evaluation Framework. This will serve to inform an overarching Theory of Change, explicating how the multi-year approach to funding will enable more effective and efficient humanitarian response and build resilience in these challenging environments. Particular attention should be given to gender issues.

**Question 1**: Are vulnerable individuals, households and communities more resilient to shocks and stresses as a result of the work of DFID’ funded interventions? How do investments in resilience contribute to/compromise delivery of humanitarian outcomes?

**Efficiency** key questions might include:

- In what ways, if any does a disaster resilience approach contribute to improved operational efficiency on the part of DFID and its partners?

---

\(^{24}\) Refer OCED DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance, see: www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm
In what ways does a multi-year approach to funding contribute to improved operational and administrative efficiency?

- To what extent did multi-year funds enable more timely release of financing in a rapid onset emergency?

**Effectiveness** key questions might include:

- What factors enable or hinder efforts to build resilience of populations in FCAS, and to what degree?
- What are the trade-offs, if any, between achieving humanitarian outcomes (including reductions in mortality and improvement in nutritional outcomes to below emergency thresholds) and efforts to build resilience?
- How have partners responded to the increased emphasis by DFID on disaster resilience and to the availability of multi-year financing? To what degree have they demonstrated the ability to innovate in terms of programme content, and in terms of management (including financial management) of humanitarian work? Factors enable or constrain partners to absorb and implement multi-year humanitarian funding?
- How did beneficiary communities perceive any shift towards longer term engagement and efforts to build resilience?
- In what ways do humanitarian and resilience outcomes differ for men and boys/ women and girls?

**Coherence** key questions might include:

- To what extent have multi-year approaches delivered a coherent DFID humanitarian portfolio (including between bilateral, country level planning and multilateral, centrally funded initiatives)?
- To what extent have the resilience approach and multi-year planning promoted greater coherence within DFID country programmes as a whole (i.e. between humanitarian and development), and beyond DFID in-country (including between aid and other HMG engagement, for example the International Climate Fund and conflict pools)

**Impact** key questions might include:

- What outcomes can be attributed to these programmes in terms of building disaster resilience?
- To what extent has disaster resilience programming and multi-year financing enabled ‘graduation’, and for whom? (getting people out of humanitarian need and able to access development programmes)?

**Question 2: Has the availability of pre-approved DFID funding linked to specific triggers enabled DFID to respond more quickly and effectively when conditions deteriorate? [this component of the evaluation will only be applied where emergency funds have been triggered]**

**Effectiveness** key questions might include:

- Was the design of the trigger appropriate? Once thresholds were reached, was the release triggered in a timely way allowing rapid release of funds?
• Did the existence of pre-approved funding enable DFID to respond more quickly than other donors, and/or than was the case in its response to previous similar crises?
• How were these early funds used? To what degree were they used to meet urgent lifesaving needs, and to what effect? To what degree did they enable individuals, households and communities to preserve their livelihoods and so maintain greater resilience?
• To what extent did DFID pre-approved contingency funds enable more timely and appropriate response to the “spike” in need?

Coverage key questions might include:
• What proportion of early needs were covered by UK funds? To what extent did the availability of UK funds affect the humanitarian effort overall. Was the availability of UK resource important in mobilising others? Was it adequate to have an impact given the totality of resources that were available?
• How did estimates of need at the time of the trigger assessment compare to the need outturn?
• In what ways did this initial response enable additional resources to flow and so ensure adequate coverage?

Question 3: To what extent does DFID multi-year and pre-approved contingency funding provide better value for money than annual funding for DFID and partners?

Efficiency key questions might include:
• In what ways has the multi-year approach yielded efficiency gains for DFID and its partners in relation to their response to (a) protracted crises and (b) rapid onset crises?
• To what extent, if any, did multi-year and pre-approval of contingency funds contribute to increase administrative efficiency? How did this compare to the estimates and targets for efficiency gains at the start of the programme?
• To what extent, if any, did multi-year and pre-approval of contingency funds contribute to operational efficiency? How did this compare to the estimates and targets for efficiency gains at the start of the programme?
• Are efficiency gains most notable in terms of administration or in terms of programming (eg forward purchase of food aid) for multi-year and pre-approved funding models?
42. The Evaluation Team and DFID will review these proposed evaluation questions during the inception phase of the evaluation, and agree a final list of questions which will be asked across the four country programmes.

4. Recipients
43. The primary recipient for this evaluation is thematic evaluation is DFID, particularly in relation to the inception and formative stages. However, the results of the summative evaluation and evaluation synthesis are expected to contribute to the global evidence base on good humanitarian practice and on how to build resilience in the most fragile and conflict-affected states.

5. Requirements, Outputs and Timeframe
44. The evaluation should take a strategic approach based on each country context, aiming to identify how multi-year humanitarian financing is supporting the timely response to acute need and helping build disaster resilience. The evaluation should not seek to evaluate each component of each humanitarian business case, but to answer the core evaluation questions, based on a representative sample of projects. During the formative stage of each country evaluation, the evaluators will be expected to adopt a user-driven approach with DFID country offices to develop an evaluation strategy that will guide the work over the life-time of the study.

45. As a thematic evaluation, the Evaluation Team will use a common evaluation framework across all four countries (Sudan, DRC, Ethiopia, and Pakistan), and will then synthesise findings to identify common threads. This final synthesis stage should also attempt to incorporate the findings of the separately contracted Somalia humanitarian evaluation, which is asking similar questions.

46. As part of the common evaluation framework, it is expected that the core questions will be consistent across countries. Sub-questions may need to be tailored to country contexts to some degree. For example, depending on the focus of the country programme in building resilience of whom against what shocks and stress. However, a strong emphasis will be placed on ensuring that the questions asked and data collected can be synthesised to generate robust comparative findings.

47. The Evaluation Team will be expected to adopt a multi-disciplinary evaluation approach, drawing on mixed methods. They will be expected to undertaking high quality quantitative work that will give insights into issues such as cost effectiveness and coverage, as well as appropriate qualitative work to develop insights on how interventions have had an impact at a household and community level. Particularly important will be methods that ensure that the views of affected populations on the delivery and impact of interventions are fully represented. Where feasible, methods should seek to inform understanding of causality, as well as contribution. The team may consider using longitudinal studies and/or impact-orientated case studies. Bidders will be asked to map out the full range of approach
and methods for gathering and analysing data, to be finalised in the evaluability assessment to be undertaken during the inception phase.

**Evaluation ethics**

48. Given the highly challenging nature of this evaluation, and the potentially life threatening nature of the issues involved, it is essential that the evaluators and implementing agencies adhere to strict ethical guidelines.

49. Contracts will only be awarded to Suppliers where evaluation ethics and appropriate ethical clearance protocols are embedded in their institutions or where they are approved by independent Ethics Review Committees who are responsible for giving ethical clearance. Evaluation teams will also be required to demonstrate adherence to current WHO protocols and DFID research and ethical guidelines.25 Suppliers will have to demonstrate that they are alert to the particular ethical and security issues that arise from working in conflict affected environments, including protection of local communities, and the need for vigilant data handling and management.

**Evaluation outputs**

50. It is envisaged the work will commence as soon as possible. April 2014 is the start date for this contract. The successful supplier will then have a six month inception phase for finalising the design of the evaluation, which is expected to run until December 2017. There will be a possible extension of up to 12 months to this contract subject to need, review recommendations and budget availability. In the event of an extension, this would need to be agreed with the Senior Responsible Officer for the evaluation.

51. The evaluation is divided into four phases with the following outputs:

a. **Inception report: (0 - 6months)**, This will include:
   i. a cross-country theory of change in relation to how multi-year approaches contribute to building disaster resilience in FCAS and enable more rapid response to spikes in demand;
   ii. an evaluability assessment/evaluation methodology approach for each country (Pakistan evaluability assessment to be completed after the inception phase given it’s late inclusion into the evaluation);
   iii. a series of indicators to measure progress in building resilience in FCAS and recommendations on changes to programme logframes;
   iv. an updated work plan across countries and a cross-country; and
   v. An evaluation uptake strategy.

---

52. The production of these inception outputs will be informed by a series of workshops with key stakeholders. Country offices may use the theory of change to revise the logframes in their respective programmes.

   a. **Formative evaluation report for each country (between 7 -12 months),** which includes preliminary findings timed as far as possible to contribute to country programme annual reviews. These reports will be for the benefit of DFID country officers to facilitate any course correction based on preliminary findings. Note that the four DFID programmes under evaluation have different durations and started at different times.

   b. **Summative evaluation report for DRC, Sudan and Ethiopia (12 to 24-43 months.) [To note that each programme has a different end date],** assessment of medium-term outcomes and the trajectory towards longer-term impact. These evaluation reports will be public goods providing high quality findings for DFID and the wider humanitarian community. These should be timed as far as possible to coincide with respective programme project completion reports. A preliminary comparative analysis between the four case studies and the Somalia study will be undertaken.

   c. **Synthesis of the formative and summative evaluation country reports (including Somalia) (40-43 months).** This report will inform both DFID and global policy debates. Original qualitative and quantitative data should be made available for future analysis.

   d. **Publication and Dissemination (ongoing until 43 months):** The evaluation team should also translated evaluation reports and findings into humanitarian policy and practitioner relevant evidence products, as well as academic journal articles where feasible, throughout the evaluation but particularly at the final stage. A series of Thematic Briefings will be required, and the dissemination strategy may include at least one external event, and/or country briefings.

53. The inception, formative, summative and synthesis evaluation reports will all be published externally in line with DFID’s evaluation policy. It should be noted that the formative evaluation reports will act as interim evaluation reports for the final summative evaluation. Therefore the formative report will need to be presented as preliminary rather than conclusive, as the most salient evidence will emerge closer to the end of the evaluation programme. It is expected that DFID will publish its Management Response to the evaluation’s findings at both the summative and synthesis evaluation report stages.

54. In addition to the above outputs, the Evaluation Team will also be expected to produce quarterly and annual narrative reports on progress in a format stipulated by DFID. These reports will be submitted to the evaluation’s Management Group and Steering Committee. A template for the annual narrative report is included at Annex 4.
55. The evaluation will proceed to implementation only on acceptance of a quality assured and approved evaluation design by the Senior Responsible Officer/Management Group. The draft inception and evaluation design report, together with the final summative reports, will be **quality assured externally**, and the Evaluation Team will be required to respond accordingly to comments.

56. The evaluation team should work with the following stakeholders throughout the life-span of the project:
- DFID Humanitarian advisers, results advisers and other relevant colleagues at country level; CHASE evaluation and resilience advisers; Africa Regional Department.
- Key partners in each country including UN, NGO, Red Cross and other donors. The list of key non-DFID key partners will vary from country-to-country depending on the programme.

6. Skills and Qualifications

57. DFID is looking for a team with extensive knowledge and experience of conducting complex evaluations on humanitarian and development programmes, particularly in protracted crises and conflict-affected contexts. It is expected that the evaluation will be carried out by a multi-disciplinary team with good knowledge of the case study countries. The team is expected to include expertise in: economics, livelihoods, nutrition, health and applied social science.

58. The evaluation team should also have a sound understanding of evaluation design and methods, understand the strengths and limitations of different approaches and how to accurately interpret and present findings to both researchers and non-researchers.

59. The project team will need to have a mix of skills that covers:
- Design of monitoring and evaluation frameworks;
- Quantitative evaluation and research methods, including economic analysis
- Qualitative evaluation and research methods;
- Humanitarian aid and the humanitarian architecture;
- Undertaking research in fragile environments (such as Sudan, DRC, Pakistan and Ethiopia)
- Designing theories of change
- Credible track record in operating in insecure environments with appropriate concerns for duty of care considerations.
- Evaluation uptake and utilisation

60. The Team Leader will be responsible for overseeing the whole package of evaluations, and must be able to demonstrate the following expertise:
- Proven ability to design and deliver high quality complex evaluations on time and budget;
• Excellent knowledge of qualitative and quantitative methods, including in fragile and conflict-affected contexts;
• Exemplary written and oral communication skills;
• Strong inter-personal and negotiation skills, including the ability to manage poor performance;

7. Constraints and Dependencies
61. The timing for this evaluation will be complex, as the four DFID humanitarian resilience programmes are at different stages in their implementation and will be concluding at different times. Suppliers will need to plan carefully across country evaluations to ensure that findings can be drawn together at the appropriate milestones.

62. In addition, the Somalia humanitarian resilience programme is not part of the core evaluation, but will be brought in during the final synthesis stage. Suppliers will need to engage with the team of evaluators conducting this work at an early stage and be able to draw together findings at the appropriate time.

63. Other dependencies that Suppliers will need to consider in their work plan in relation to the delivery of findings include DFID programme Annual Reviews and Project Completion Reviews. These are moments during the DFID programme cycle where DFID Humanitarian Advisors are required to review programme performance against pre-agreed logical frameworks. This thematic evaluation, particularly in the inception and formative stages, should look to feed into these reviews where possible, but will not be expected to conduct them.
64. Suppliers in response to these Terms of Reference should also note whether there are any Conflicts of Interest with those who are implementing the DFID humanitarian programmes in the four countries. One of the core principles of DFID’s evaluation policy, is that all evaluations should be independent of programme implementation.

8. Implementation Requirements
65. Given the highly challenging nature of this evaluation, it is essential that the evaluators and implementing agencies adhere to strict ethical guidelines.

66. This requires approaches that go beyond usual research ethics of other areas of social research (e.g. confidentiality, problems of disclosure and the need to ensure adequate and informed consent). At a minimum, programmes should ‘do no harm’. Key points to be considered include:
   a. The safety of respondents and the evaluation team is paramount and should infuse all decisions and be monitored closely;
   b. Information gathering and documentation must be done in a manner that presents the least risk to respondents and the evaluation team, is methodologically sound, and builds on current experience and good practice;
   c. Protecting confidentiality of individuals is essential to ensuring safety of respondents and data quality;
   d. Anyone providing information about violence must give informed consent before participating in the study;
   e. Basic care and support for survivors must be available locally before commencing any activity that may involve individuals disclosing information about their experiences of violence. Links can be made with existing programmes or services. Study design should also include actions aimed at reducing any possible distress caused by the research;
   f. All evaluation team members should be carefully selected and receive specialised training and ongoing support;
   g. Additional safeguards must be put in place if children (i.e. under 18 years) are to be subject of information gathering;

67. Contracts will only be awarded to Suppliers where evaluation ethics and appropriate ethical clearance protocols are embedded in their institutions or where they are approved by independent Ethics Review Committees who are responsible for giving ethical clearance. Evaluation teams will also be required to demonstrate adherence to current WHO protocols and DFID research and ethical guidelines.26

9. DFID Co-ordination
68. The governance and management framework for this evaluation is laid out in Annex 2.

26 Refer to DFID, (2011), DFID ethics principles for research and evaluation, see: www.gov.uk/government/publications/dfid-ethics-principles-for-research-and-evaluation
The evaluation is being commissioned and funded by the Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme (HIEP), a joint initiative by DFID Research and Evidence Division, CHASE and Africa Regional Department, in collaboration with the country offices in the evaluation countries.

69. Overall responsibility for the study rests with the Head of the HIEP as the Senior Responsible Office and chair of the evaluation’s Management Group. Day to day contract management will be the responsibility of the DFID programme manager responsible for the contract based in the new DFID East Africa Regional Research Hub in Nairobi.

70. A Steering Committee will be formed, chaired by the Head of the HIEP and with representatives from the participating country offices, Africa Regional Department, CHASE and Evaluation Department. This Committee will be responsible for reviewing content and leading on the quality assurance of key evaluation outputs at key milestones.

10. Duty of Care and Security
71. A key criterion for selection of evaluation team will be its ability to manage large scale evaluations in insecure environments. The evaluation team will be responsible for their safety and well-being and of evaluation responders affected by their activities. The evaluation team is responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security protocols for all personnel working on the evaluation. They will also be responsible for the provision of suitable security arrangements for their domestic and business property.

72. Rigorous hostile environment training is required for all staff prior to deployment in conflict areas. This training should be the equivalent of the UK government’s Security Awareness in Fragile Environments (SAFE) training course.

73. Evaluation teams must develop their pre-qualification questionnaire (PQQ) response and Tender (if invited to 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’s developed by DFID (see Annex 3) 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.

74. If the evaluation team is unwilling or unable to accept responsibility for Security and Duty of Care as detailed above, the tender will be viewed as non-compliant and excluded from further evaluation.

75. 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. In providing evidence, interested contractors should respond in line with the Duty of Care Summary Assessment of Risk Matrix of the Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ).

76. DFID country offices will provide knowledge, guidance and assistance to the evaluation team regarding the likely risk, However, DFID will not provide direction on how to manage these risks. On commencing field work, DFID country offices will offer the evaluation team a security briefing based on the best available information. The Team Leader of the country studies should also act as the lead for the team on security issues. DFID will provide security updates to that person.

11. Risks

77. Risk of instability and conflict: By definition, there is a high degree of uncertainty regarding the operating environment in the countries of concern here. This means that the Evaluation Team will need to be prepared to plan for contingencies, including the possibility that one of the case studies may have to be dropped or substituted for another. For example, Yemen was originally included in the Terms of Reference and an evaluability assessment completed, but due to insecurity and limited access, the country evaluation has been replaced with Pakistan. The security situation will need to be continually reviewed and duty of care guidance considered.

78. Longevity of the evaluation: A further risk is with regard to continuity of personnel over the life time of the project, both in the evaluation team and within DFID. Ensuring continued availability of skills and commitment to the study over such a long period will be a challenge. Key to managing these risks will be:
   a. Effective management of data and institutional memory;
   b. Regular publication of high quality and relevant products, underpinned by a clear evaluation uptake strategy to reaffirm the value of the study and maintain buy-in at country level and globally;
   c. Good succession and contingency planning with regard to key members of the evaluation team;
   d. Effective handover by DFID staff in the event of staff rotation.

79. Link with the Somalia resilience evaluation: a separate team will be conducting the evaluation in Somalia but with findings being drawn together with those from this thematic evaluation during the final synthesis phase. Given the link, both evaluation teams will need to be in contact and coordinate from an early stage to ensure that the synthesis (as well as the timings) is feasible.

12. Break points

80. Due to the long duration and the nature of this work, the contract will have adequate provision for variation to adapt to changes that occur. DFID shall, as a condition of proceeding from one phase to the next, have the right to request changes to the contract, including the Services, the Terms
of Reference and the contract price to reflect lessons learned, or changes in circumstances, policies or objectives relating to or affecting the evaluation.

81. The key review points for the monitoring and evaluation of the contract are at the inception phase, mid-year and end-year reviews. Continuation following a review point will be subject to the satisfactory performance of the Supplier during the preceding period, and the continuing needs of the evaluation.

82. DFID may terminate this contract pursuant to DFID Terms and Conditions Clause 31 and/or Clause 32 of Section 2, if agreed performance is not reached.

83. The Supplier shall use reasonable endeavours to keep financial commitments limited to the duration of each phase to avoid unnecessary expense in the event of early variation or termination of this Contract.

13. Quality Standards/Performance Requirements
84. A Steering Committee composed of key DFID staff will be created to review the content and technical quality assure all the key outputs (inception phase reports, formative and summative evaluation reports, and the final evaluation synthesis) within the evaluation cycle.

85. DFID’s Evaluation Policy makes it mandatory for all evaluations funded by the department to be independently quality assured at the draft final report stage. This quality assurance process is centrally managed by DFID’s evaluation department, with the actual quality assurance being undertaken by a number of different groups. For this thematic evaluation, independent quality assurance managed by EvD is expected for the:
   - Inception report
   - Country Formative Evaluations;
   - Country Summative Evaluations;
   - Final Evaluation Synthesis.

86. A Global Advisory Group will also be established, which brings together a wider group of DFID stakeholders with external experts. It is expected that this group will meet three times during the evaluation cycle, during the inception phase, after the formative evaluation phase, and after the summative evaluation phase but before the final synthesis has been completed. The role of this group will be to provide wider external quality assurance and challenge.

87. It is expected that this external QA and Global Advisory Group feedback will feed into Steering Committee discussions (see Annex 2 for outline of governance structure).

88. The Evaluation Team will be expected to incorporate the feedback from the independent quality assurance and the Steering Committee into the final reports. The Head of the Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence
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Programme as SRO and chair of the evaluation’s Management Group will be responsible for the final sign-off of outputs, based on quality assurance feedback from various groups and the Evaluation Team’s response to comments and recommended changes.

14. Budget
89. This is a complex evaluation, requiring mixed quantitative and qualitative methods, in four fragile and conflict-affected countries. Evaluation teams should thus budget accordingly.

90. The contract for this evaluation will broadly follow a payment-by-results model, with payments linked to the delivery outputs to satisfactory level of quality.

91. The below schedule of outputs is expected to be linked to payment milestones. Output payments will be made once evaluation reports have passed QA by DFID’s Evaluation Departments external quality assurance service (green or amber rating) and the evaluation’s Steering Committee. The evaluation’s Management Group will coordinate QA feedback and relay it to the Evaluation Team. The Group will also make the final decision on signing-off reports and output payments.

92. Evaluation Team should also note that on completion of the inception phase the Management Group will also make the decision about whether the evaluation should progress to implementation phase. This will be reflected in a break clause in the evaluation contract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inception phase</strong></td>
<td>6 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inception report (including resilience theory of change, logframe recommendations, series of indicators for building resilience in FCAS, and revised work plan across countries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- evaluability assessment/evaluation methodology report for each country; cross-country evaluation communications strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation phase</strong></td>
<td>12 months (longer for Pakistan, to be determined after country evaluability assessment early in 2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative evaluation report for each country (Sudan, Ethiopia, DRC and Pakistan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative evaluation report for Sudan, Ethiopia and DRC</td>
<td>(between 24 and 50 months) DRC: programme finishes December 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Updated 24th November 2014

Sudan: programme finishes March 2016  
Ethiopia UNHCR: programme finishes December 2015  
Ethiopia WFP: programme finishes March 2016  
Ethiopia Humanitarian Response Fund: tbc (under development)

| Synthesis of the formative and summative evaluation country reports (including Somalia) and other synthesis evidence products for humanitarian practitioners and policy-makers | 54 months |

15. Evaluation Uptake

93. In order to realise strategic impact, it will be important that the evaluation team is able to communicate effectively its preliminary and final findings to key audiences. As part of the inception phase the Evaluation Team will be required to produce an evaluation uptake plan for the project, recognising the range of different audiences. This should include a comprehensive range of written outputs including peer-reviewed journal articles, thematic briefs and articles targeted at humanitarian practitioners and policy-makers within DFID and internationally.

94. A proactive approach will be expected from the Evaluation Team to create and take advantage of appropriate fora for discussion and dissemination of the evaluation’s findings during the whole evaluation work programme. This approach should ensure findings are fed into policy and programming.

95. In line with the UK Government’s Freedom of Information Act and the International Aid Transparency Initiative, all DFID-funded all of the key evaluation reports set out in these Terms of Reference will be made publically available. This should include publication and ensuring open access to underlying data sets where appropriate27.

96. Further guidance can be found in DFID’s Evaluation Policy and Research Uptake Guidance (see Section 16).

16. Existing information sources

DFID Humanitarian business case covered by the evaluation:

Included below and attached as separate documents are the business cases for the four DFID country humanitarian programmes which will be covered by this evaluation.

DFID DRC Multi-year Humanitarian business case  

DFID Sudan Multi-year Humanitarian business case – (business case not currently available)

DFID Ethiopia Multi-year World Food Programme Humanitarian business case  

DFID Ethiopia Multi-year UN High Commissioner for Refugees business case  

DFID Ethiopia Multi-year Humanitarian Response Fund business case – under development.

DFID Pakistan: Multi-year humanitarian programme in Pakistan 2014 – 2019 – (business case not currently available)

DFID Pakistan: Building Disaster Resilience in Pakistan 2014 – 2020 – (business case not currently available)

DFID Somalia Multi-year Humanitarian business case – attached as a separate document (Only in relation to the final evaluation synthesis)

**DFID Policy documents**

The below are key external documents which set out DFID’s overarching position in relation to resilience building from policy, programming and research perspectives. They are therefore important scene setters for this thematic evaluation. Also organisationally this thematic evaluation will sit within the programme of work to implement the DFID Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Strategy.


DFID, (2011), Saving lives, preventing suffering and building resilience: the UK Government’s Humanitarian Policy  

DFID (2011), Defining disaster resilience: a DFID approach paper

DFID (2012), Promoting innovation and evidence-based approaches to building resilience and responding to humanitarian crises: a DFID strategy paper

Independent Commission on Aid Impact (ICAI) report on DFID’s response to the Horn of Africa Crisis.

DFID internal guidance documents

The below are key DFID-wide policy and guidance documents in relation to conducting evaluation and research, as well as the Department’s approach to value for money.

DFID (2013), DFID Evaluation Policy 2013

DFID Ethical principles for research and evaluation

DFID VFM guidelines:

DFID (2013), Research Uptake: a guide for DFID-funded research programmes:

In addition, this thematic evaluation will look to feed into DFID humanitarian programme Annual Reviews (AR) and Project Competitions Review (PCR). Guidance on DFID ARs and PCRs is available below:

DFID (2011), How to Note: reviewing and scoring projects:

Other key documents

The below documents are other key research and consultancy reports commissioned by DFID on the topics of resilience in fragile and conflict-affected states, economics of early response and disaster resilience activities,
and the vfm implications of multi-year humanitarian finance. All have helped shape this evaluation Terms of Reference.


16. Other information

97. The DFID’s mission is to help eradicate poverty in the world’s poorest countries and this is underpinned by our set of values:

- Ambition and determination to eliminate poverty
- Ability to work effectively with others
- Desire to listen, learn and be creative
- Diversity and the need to balance work and private life
- Professionalism and knowledge

98. DFID wishes to work with Suppliers who embrace the above, and also demonstrate Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) by taking account of economic, social and environmental factors. These practices, whether operated locally, regionally or internationally, should also comply with International Labour Organisation (ILO) core standards on labour and social matters.
Annex 1 – Summary of DFID Humanitarian programmes covered by the Thematic Evaluation (see individual business cases for further detail)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRC</th>
<th>Ethiopia (three DFID programmes)</th>
<th>Sudan</th>
<th>Pakistan (two DFID programmes)</th>
<th>Somalia (synthesis only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Achieve results for vulnerable people</td>
<td>1. Support for refugees (UNHCR programme)</td>
<td>1. Building community resilience to shocks and stresses and strengthening early warning</td>
<td>1. Strengthening community and household resilience to emergencies and disasters (Resilience programme).</td>
<td>1. Respond to continued humanitarian need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reforming the humanitarian community</td>
<td>2. Address acute malnutrition (WFP programme)</td>
<td>2. Humanitarian assistance and protection to acute needs</td>
<td>2. Immediate relief and early recovery interventions to the most vulnerable (MYH programme)</td>
<td>2. Build resilience for the chronic case load of vulnerable people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>UNHCR: £15m (no contingency)</td>
<td>£135m (no contingency in-built)</td>
<td>£15m (no contingency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP:</td>
<td>£60m baseline (2013/14-2014/15)</td>
<td>£88m baseline £21m contingency over three years, capped at £7m per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR:</td>
<td>£15m (no contingency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP:</td>
<td>£60m baseline (2013/14-2014/15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Response Fund (HRF):</td>
<td>under development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYH programme:</td>
<td>Up to £100m (including up to £30m contingency) (2014-2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience programme:</td>
<td>up to £76.3m (2014-2020) (no contingency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of funding</td>
<td>Combination of annual appeals and multi-year funding</td>
<td>All Multi-year only</td>
<td>Combination of annual appeals and multi-year funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYH programme:</td>
<td>mainly multi-year, some annual to OCHA ERF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience:</td>
<td>multi-year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>July 2012 – March 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR:</td>
<td>August 2012 – December 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRF:</td>
<td>Tbc 2014/15 - 2016/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience:</td>
<td>2014 -2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYH programme:</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience:</td>
<td>multi-year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYH programme:</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience:</td>
<td>2014 -2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYH programme:</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience:</td>
<td>2014 -2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYH programme:</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience:</td>
<td>2014 -2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drivers of vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violent conflict, widespread severe malnutrition and disease epidemics</th>
<th>UNHCR programme: Conflict and fragility in Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan, Eritrea and Kenya</th>
<th>Conflict, natural disasters, market collapse, and political and ethnic tensions.</th>
<th>Multiple - see business case</th>
<th>Climate variation, insecurity (due to lack of governance and rule of law), limited urban/rural livelihood opportunities, and market instability.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WFP programme: natural shocks (drought, flood, disease); economic shocks (high inflation); conflict (especially in Somali Region) and climate change. HRF: tbc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resilience building of what to what

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities to chronic vulnerabilities. Focus on financial/economic resilience enhancing.</th>
<th>UNHCR: Refugees in Ethiopia to acute and chronic vulnerabilities. Focus on financial/economic and social/human resilience enhancing WFP: Individuals/households to acute vulnerability. HRF: tbc</th>
<th>Communities to chronic and acute vulnerabilities. Focus on longer-term financial/economic resilience enhancing.</th>
<th>Communities, households and individuals.</th>
<th>Households to chronic vulnerability. Focus on longer-term financial/economic resilience enhancing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential sectors funded</td>
<td>UNHCR (targeting refugees) Nutrition, sanitation and WASH, non-food items, education, and GBV. WFP Nutrition HRF: tbc</td>
<td>Nutrition, health, WASH, non-food items, shelter, protection, food security &amp; livelihood assistance.</td>
<td>Multiple – to be determined</td>
<td>Nutrition, health, shelter, WASH, and livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential implementing partners</td>
<td>Annual funding: Humanitarian Pooled Fund International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Medecins Sans Frontiers, and UN Humanitarian Air Service Multi-year funding: NGOs UN agencies</td>
<td>UNHCR WFP HRF: tbc</td>
<td>Annual funding: Common Humanitarian Fund ICRC Multi-year funding: International NGO WFP FAO</td>
<td>MYH programme: OCHA Emergency Response Fund; others to be identified. Resilience programme: to be identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2 – Evaluation Governance and Management Structure

1. Overview of the structure

**Management Group**
Chairied by the Head of the Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme (HIEP) (Senior Responsible Officer), East Africa Regional Hub Programme Manager; representatives from CHASE and ARD.

Overall oversight of the evaluation. Final decision-making and ultimate budgetary responsibility. *Meets regularly*

**Steering Committee**
Representatives from Country Offices, CHASE, ARD, and RED

Chairied by the Head of HIEP, with representatives from each Country Office, ARD, CHASE and RED

*Meets quarterly or as required.*

**Evaluation Management Team**
Manages implementation and delivery of the evaluation in DRC, Sudan, Ethiopia and the fourth country.

*Regular meetings with the Management Group (every 2 weeks in the inception phase). Formal written progress reports every 3 months & annual reports to the Management Group/Steering Committee.*

**Evaluations in DRC, Ethiopia, Sudan and the fourth country (input from Somalia evaluation)**
- Inception Report
- Formative Evaluation
- Summative Evaluation
- Synthesis (incl Somalia)

**Global Advisory Group**
DFID wider stakeholders and external experts.

Reviews and advises on key outputs during the evaluation.

*Meets 3 times during the evaluation*

**DRC Advisory Group**
E.g. Humanitarian advisor, results & evaluation advisors etc

*Meeting at key milestones*

**Sudan Advisory Group**

**Ethiopia Advisory Group**

**Pakistan Advisory Group**

**DFID Evaluation Department external Quality Assurance At key milestones**
2. Summary of governance, management and quality assurance arrangements

Resilience Thematic Evaluation Management Group

Aim:
- Overall oversight and budgetary responsibility for the evaluation.
- Advises and reviews actions and risks relating to programme planning and delivery, set against the agreed timetable.
- Final decision-making body of the evaluation. Gives final sign-off for key evaluation outputs (inception, formative, summative and synthesis reports).
- Agrees content of specific evaluation outputs, in consultation with the Steering Committee.
- Coordinates formal feedback from the Steering Committee, Global Advisory Group, and others as appropriate.
- Leads on the resolution of any disputes with the Evaluation Team.
- Responsible for coordinating the production of the Management Response to the evaluation’s findings.

Membership:
- Chaired by the Head of the Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme (HIEP) who is also the Senior Responsible Officer for the evaluation
- East Africa Research Hub Programme Manager (vice chair)
- Representatives from CHASE and ARD.

The Evaluation Team will not be a member of this group, but will be asked to attend meetings and present on the evaluation’s progress and planned activities.

Reporting:
- Meets as required, likely every 2 weeks during the inception phase (by teleconference)
- Date and time of meetings organised by the chair.
- Agenda to be set out by the chair before each meeting
- Chair to circulate action points with 4 working days of each meeting.

Suggested standing agenda items:
- Progress since previous meeting
- Highlighting where areas are off-track set against the agreed timeframe and delivery plan
- Plan for next actions set against the timeframe
- Any new or changing risks, and actions to manage risks
- Financial and budget report

Resilience Thematic Evaluation Steering Committee
Aim:
- Provides expert technical guidance and advice at key output milestones during the evaluation (inception, formative, summative, and synthesis stages). Comments on key reports and receive formal quality assurance reports.
- Ensures that the evaluation is closely aligned with the DFID humanitarian programmes under review.
- Promotes the uptake of the findings from the evaluation both within DFID and outside.

Membership:
- Chaired by the Head of the HIEP
- Humanitarian Advisor DFID Sudan
- Humanitarian Advisor DFID Ethiopia
- Humanitarian Advisor DFID DRC
- Humanitarian Advisor DFID Pakistan
- CHASE representatives
- ARD representatives

Present at meeting, but not as a member will also be the EARH Programme Manager.

Others expected to attend and be present as appropriate:
- Management Group members
- Evaluation Team

Reporting:
- Meets every quarter or at key output milestones (inception, formative, summative, and synthesis). Meetings by telephone conference or video conference with one physical meeting per year in Nairobi.
- Date and time of meetings organised by the EARH programme manager.
- Meeting agendas to be sent by the Chair before each meeting.
- Evaluation Team to prepare a written Progress Report according to an agreed template for Committee meetings.
- All key evaluation reports (inception, formative, summative, and synthesis) to be submitted to the Steering Committee
- Progress Reports and other reports sent 5 working days before each meeting
- Meetings managed and minuted by the EARH programme manager, action points to be circulate within one week.
- EARH programme manager will be responsible for coordinating and forwarding on all QA feedback to the Evaluation Team.

Global Advisory Group

Aim:
- Provides content and quality assurance at key output milestones during the evaluation
Membership:
- Members to be appointed by the Steering Committee
- Global Reference Group should ideally consist:
  - Chair - to be confirmed
  - DFID wider stakeholders, including analytical colleagues based in Country Offices and colleagues working on resilience programming more broadly.
  - External experts including academia, operational NGOs, UN agencies and others.

- Members of the Steering Committee and Evaluation Monitoring Group may be observers of this group. The Evaluation Team may also be present at these meetings.

*The exact membership of this group is still to be determined, but the idea is to bring together a combination of key institutional leads with individuals with extensive humanitarian research/evaluation and operational experience.*

Reporting
- Meetings will be linked to key output milestones in the evaluation. It is expected that the group will meet only three times during the evaluation – before the end of the inception phase, after the formative phase, and after the summative phase but before the final synthesis.
- Date and time of meetings will be determined by the evaluation workplan and will be organised by the Evaluation Team.
- Agenda to be set by the EARH in coordination with the Chair before each meeting.
- EARH to capture and circulate decisions/actions within five working days of the meeting. The Steering Committee and DFID Country Office Advisory Groups are to be sighted on the minutes from Global Advisory Group meetings.

Country Office Advisory Groups

*Country Offices involved in the evaluation may establish a County-level Advisory Groups to provide country specific assurance and also promote the uptake of the evaluation.*

Aim:
- Provides content and quality assurance of key evaluation outputs relevant to the Country Office.
- Role in promoting uptake of the findings of the evaluation and contributing to the evaluation’s Management Response.

Membership:
- Advisory Groups could be built into existing DFID country office humanitarian coordination groups, bring in others with a specific interest in the evaluation.
• Country Office Advisory Groups could include:
  o Lead DFID Humanitarian Advisor (Chair)
  o DFID evaluation, results, or stats advisors
  o DFID advisors from linked development programmes – e.g.
    social protection, livelihoods, and climate change adaptation
    o External stakeholders.
• The Evaluation Team may be present at these meetings as appropriate

Reporting
• Ad hoc meetings linked to key output milestones in the evaluation
  (inception, formative, summative, and synthesis stages).
• DFID Country Humanitarian Advisors to capture and share discussion
  points with the Management Group and Steering Committee.

DFID Evaluation Department external Quality Assurance

Aim:
• External quality assurance.
• All DFID funded final evaluation reports must be quality assured by the
  Evaluation Department’s external quality assurance service.

Reporting
• Terms of Reference for the evaluation pre-competition.
• Inception, Formative, Summative and Synthesis evaluation reports to
  be submitted to the EvD external evaluation quality assurance service.
• Feedback within 10 working days to the Evaluation Management
  Group. The EARH Programme Manager will be responsible for
  coordinating all external QA feedback.
Annex 3 – Duty of Care Risk Assessments for Ethiopia, DRC, Pakistan and Sudan for this Thematic Evaluation

Date of Assessments: Ethiopia, Sudan, and DRC August/September 2013; Pakistan November 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>DRC</th>
<th>Sudan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somali Region(^28)</td>
<td>Amhara Region</td>
<td>National (unspecified location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID overall rating</td>
<td>4 (high)</td>
<td>2 (low)</td>
<td>3 (medium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCO travel advice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host nation travel advice</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil unrest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{28}\) This risk assessment highlights risks for the Somali Region. However, zones in the northern part of the Region Fafan (Jijiga) and Siti (Shinile) are largely agreed to be less hazardous than the zones in the south and may carry a lower-than-4 risk rating if assessed in its own right.

\(^{29}\) These scores are based on an assessment done in September 2013. The security situation is dynamic and should be monitored closely. The DFID Sudan office would be able to provide any further information to any prospective suppliers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Project/Intervention</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence/crime</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated 24th November 2014
## DFID Overall Project/Intervention Summary Risk Assessment Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
<th>DFID Risk Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kyber-Pakhtunkhwa:</strong> Charsadda, Kohat, Bannu, the city of Peshawar and districts south of Peshawar</td>
<td>Tank, Lakki and Dera Ismail Khan, Swat, Buner and Lower Dir</td>
<td>Kalesh Valley, Bamoboret Valley, Arandu District to the south and west of Chitral</td>
<td>Federally Administered Tribal Areas, North and West Balochistan</td>
<td>Quetta</td>
<td>Sindh – Karachi Sindh Province; Nawabash and parts of Interior Sindh to the north of Nawabash</td>
<td>Punjab – Lahore – Islamabad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCO Travel Advice - Overall Rating</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Nation Travel Advice</td>
<td>Not Available (NA)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Unrest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence/crime</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Geographical scope of the DFID-Pakistan humanitarian programme has not yet been determined, but will be once partners have been identified through procurement processes in the first 6-12 months of the programme. Once geographic scope is identified, intervention risk levels and overall duty of care will be reviewed (November 2014).
Annex 4 – Annual Narrative Reporting Format

Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence programme: project Annual Review reporting template and guidance

(Adapted from the Department for International Development: Research and Evidence Division, PROGRAMME ANNUAL REPORT FORMAT, January 2013)

Research and Evidence Division (RED) has updated the format for annual reporting by research and evaluation projects. Our aim is to enable projects to report on their activities in a logical and proportionate manner. To that end, we have specified a tightly defined structure with page limits. There is, though, a section for further information. Please complete all sections, but avoid duplication (by referring, where appropriate, to material presented elsewhere).

SUMMARY OF HEADINGS FOR PROJECT ANNUAL REVIEW

TITLE PAGE

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

OVERVIEW OF THE YEAR
Progress and achievements
Challenges and disappointments
Context (update)

LOGFRAME OUTPUTS
Business case logframe outputs
Project logframe outputs

OUTPUTS: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
Highlight(s)
Other Outputs

UPTAKE / ENGAGEMENT WITH BENEFICIARIES

OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS

COSTS, VALUE FOR MONEY AND MANAGEMENT

WORK PLAN & TIMETABLE

RISK

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

COMMUNICATIONS AND PROMOTION

FURTHER INFORMATION
Theory of Change
Research methods
Challenges and lessons learnt
Other or supplementary information

ANNEXES
Logframe
Financial documents
Forward work plan
GUIDANCE NOTES

1. TITLE PAGE
As well as your project name, please state the period covered by the report, the date of the report (and version, if appropriate) and list the author(s), with an email address for the author with lead responsibility.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION
1 page

Please provide an introduction to your project, aimed at a reader within DfID who may not be familiar with it. Include: brief description of purpose and activities, lead & partner organisations, countries covered, start & end dates and total budget approved with spend to date (as of the reporting period end date).

This should also include which business case within the Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme (HIEP) the project is reporting against. The business cases are available on the DFID external website:

- Business Case 1: improved analysis of disaster risk and increased capacity to deliver humanitarian assistance (link)
- Business Case 2: greater use of evidence and innovation in humanitarian responses (link)
- Business Case 3: improving the evidence base for humanitarian practice (link)

Please speak to the HIEP Secretariat if you do not know which business case your project is reporting against.
3. OVERVIEW OF THE YEAR

1-3 pages

Progress and achievements
Please outline the progress of your activities this year and summarise your achievements.

Challenges and disappointments
Please summarise candidly the difficulties or setbacks you have faced.

Context (update)
Outline any key contextual changes, as well as noting major additions to the relevant literature or data. Is there any new evidence available that supports or challenges the project design or rationale?

4. LOGFRAME OUTPUTS

1-2 pages per output

This is the core section of the report.
Each project should have its own theory of change and logframe. However, these should be derived from the theories of change and logframes set out in the three HIEP business cases.

In section 1 you will have set out which business case this specific project comes under. Please start this section by setting out which high-level logframe outputs in the relevant business case this project is reporting against. Business case logframes can be found:

- Business Case 1 – logframe (link)
- Business Case 2 – logframe (link)
- Business Case 3 – logframe (link)
Please report carefully for each output in turn. This should be for both the business case logframe outputs and the project’s more specific logframe outputs, although the former is likely to be more high-level. Describe progress to date, and relate this to the progress expected (logframe indicators and milestones). Reflect on your strengths and challenges, as well as lessons learned. You may comment on future plans in relation to specific output(s), though use section 8 for reporting on your overall work plan.

This section should include reporting on how gender is being addressed in the project. This should include assessment on how gender issues are addressed in research (design, methods, outputs), any capacity building efforts, and research uptake strategies.

Please also ensure satisfactory coverage in this section of research capacity building (or, where appropriate, simply note that the project does not have a capacity building element).

NB. You must report on an agreed version of the logframe. You may, of course, suggest amendments for consideration and, if agreed, for use in future reports.

5. OUTPUTS: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Highlight(s)
up to 1 page

If you wish to highlight certain output(s) as especially salient please list these here, with brief explanation(s).

Other Outputs
up to 1 page
Please describe any outputs from this year which have not been captured in section 3 (logframe outputs).

6. UPTAKE / ENGAGEMENT WITH BENEFICIARIES
Up to 2 pages

Please report on progress with and your plans for research uptake and engagement with beneficiaries. Please comment on any monitoring or analysis of feedback or perceptions on the programme from beneficiaries.

7. OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS
Up to 2 pages

Please report briefly on occurrences of outcomes and impacts, including intended and unintended, positive and negative outcomes. You should consider the business case and project logframe’s ‘outcome’ and ‘impact’ (singular). But please do not limit your reporting to these, as we are interested in outcomes and impacts (plural) more broadly defined:

Outcomes are all the effects which may be linked causally to a programme’s outputs and work;

Impacts are the development-level effects which can be attributed to a programme through comparison with the counterfactual (that is, the absence of the programme); or for which there is reasonable evidence that the programme made a direct contribution.

Finish with a brief update on your plans to generate outcomes.

NB. We do not expect detailed annual reporting here, partly because we recognise that key outcomes & impacts may well occur towards the end or
after the completion of a programme. However, if at any time you would like to document outcomes and impacts more fully, please do contact us.

8. COSTS, VALUE FOR MONEY AND MANAGEMENT
1-3 pages

Please tell us how you are doing financially and explain variations from plans:
Is the project on-track against financial year budgets?
How did your forecasting of the project expenditure during the year compare against the actual expenditure claimed?
Have there been of any large (in excess of 5%) budget variations during the period?
Are future costs on or off track against the last full budget / forecasting profile?
Are there any changes in the cost structures (e.g. exchange rates)?
What percentage of your total programme budget for the year was funded by DfID?

Please also update on value for money (VfM):
What financial, procurement and programme management steps are in place to maintain and improve value for money throughout the programme?
Examples of what we are looking for here could include:
Decisions taken by the programme to ensure all spending decisions are guided by VfM principles;
Role of partner organisations in delivering VfM;
Monitoring of quality of and time taken to deliver outputs;
Qualitative assessment of developing capacity and performance amongst partner institutions;
How learning from the programme is fed back into future work to improve VfM.

Finally, please update here on organisational and management matters not covered above, including:
9. WORK PLAN & TIMETABLE
1-2 pages

Please comment on the extent to which you have implemented your work plan according to your timetable for the programme; and update on your plans for the year ahead. A more detailed forward work plan may be supplied as an Annex.

10. RISK
1-2 pages

Comment on the previously identified risks and whether the mitigations are satisfactorily addressing these. Describe any changes to these risks, as well as any new risks you have identified; how do you plan to address these?

Ensure you cover corruption and fraud risks here; identify what existing and/or additional controls are required to ensure funds are being used as intended.

What is your current assessment of the overall risk level for the programme (low, medium or high)?
If appropriate, summarise the impact on the climate/environment and any mitigating actions.

**11. MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

Up to 2 pages

If you are undertaking monitoring (beyond the logframe indicators) and/or evaluation, please update here on progress during this reporting period and your future plans.

**12. COMMUNICATIONS AND PROMOTION**

Up to 1 page

Please report on any communications/promotion activities associated with the project. This should cover both traditional and new media, as well as any evaluation from these activities (e.g. press notices, events, blog posts, twitter campaigns etc).

**13. FURTHER INFORMATION**

Use this section for any important information not provided above. All sub-sections are optional. Please do not re-iterate information. Wherever appropriate, simply enter ‘Nothing to add’.

**Theory of Change**

Please report on any work yet to be mentioned which you have undertaken in relation to a Theory of Change for your programme. You are not expected to do such work as part of preparing this report.

**Research methods**
**Challenges and lessons learnt**

You may wish to say more on how you are tackling challenges; and/or to describe issues or emerging challenges which you foresee and how you plan to mitigate these.

**Other or supplementary information**

If you have not found space for something of importance, please add this here. This final sub-section may also be used for sensitive material which you prefer not to include in the main sections of the report. Please identify clearly any material here or elsewhere which you wish us to treat as confidential. We shall do our best to honour this request but please note that we cannot guarantee that these elements of the report would not be released in any circumstance.

**14. ANNEXES**

**A. Logframe**

Attach the current version.

**B. Financial documents**

Please provide a financial report for the period and attach an up-to-date full programme budget by DFID financial year.

**C. Forward work plan**

Please insert your plan for the upcoming year.

**D. List of outputs (optional)**

We require you to upload information on every research output to R4D and that is where we look for information on your individual outputs. So we do not additionally require you to provide a list in the annual report, though you may do so here if you wish.