Terms of Reference
Humanitarian evidence systems mapping in East Africa

1. The following Terms of Reference sets out the requirements for a DFID funded research mapping project of the humanitarian sector in East Africa.

Background

2. Evidence has an increasingly active role to play in DFID’s efforts to improve responses to humanitarian crises at a regional and country level. In 2012, DFID launched a Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Strategy which set the framework for a significant step change in DFID’s support and investment in this area.

3. However, very little is known about the in-country or regional research and evidence landscape in which the humanitarian programmes of DFID, and others, operate in. For example, who are the commissioners and producers of research and evidence in the humanitarian sector? How does research and evidence enter policy and practitioner decision-making spaces and forums? Who are the brokers and facilitators of research and evidence in the humanitarian sector? How do humanitarian policy-makers and practitioners interpret and use research and evidence in decision-making?

4. The wider literature on research uptake indicates that there are a number of broad factors that determine the consideration and use of evidence by decision-makers:
   - To what extent the research itself is relevant, credible and meets the needs of users;
   - The extent to which policy-makers and practitioners are willing and able to use research;
   - The degree of linkages between research and the policy and practice communities; and,
   - The context in which research use takes place.

5. There is some evidence and strong inference that these factors are relevant for the humanitarian sector. A study of humanitarian evaluation utilisation, for example, draws similar conclusions, emphasising the importance of evaluation relevance, quality, and credibility; the need for collaboration between evaluators and users; the role of champions and importance of leadership; the impact of organisational structures and processes; and professional and personal networks. However, there are

---

no known studies that look at humanitarian research/evidence systems grounded in particular country contexts or regions.

6. In response to this, the DFID Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme (HIEP) is seeking a research organisation to conduct a humanitarian mapping and political economy study of research and evidence systems in East Africa, where this is a high concentration of humanitarian activity.

7. The mapping exercise will be an important step in allowing DFID, and other research actors, to identify the institutions and research groups that are commissioning, conducting and brokering humanitarian research activities, as well as how decision-makers interpret and use evidence. This mapping will inform DFID’s understanding of the humanitarian research and evidence landscape in East Africa and identify potential opportunities for DFID to support the strengthening of research capacity in the region.

8. The findings from this study will have relevance for a wider set of humanitarian and research actors, so will be published externally as global public goods.

9. This study should draw learning from other similar research mapping studies commissioned by DFID and others in different sectors and geographies:
   - Studies on the demand for and supply of evaluations in selected Sub-Saharan African countries (2013)\(^4\). This research focused on understanding the demand and supply factors in evaluation and evaluative research in Ethiopia, Ghana, Malawi, Rwanda and Zambia.
   - Social Science in India: A Mapping Report\(^5\) (2011), which reviews the institutional landscape of social science research in India. The report covers the research agendas of research groups or institutions and main sources and distribution of funds. A further study commissioned by Research Councils UK (RCUK), specifically provides an overview of the landscape of research and funding in the arts and humanities in India\(^6\).
   - Mapping of Research Capacity in Afghanistan report\(^7\) (2011) was commissioned to map research capacity and identify gaps in research and analysis in Afghanistan that would be valuable to Afghan and international development partners.
   - Mapping of Public Policy Relevant Research in Pakistan\(^8\) (2013) focused on describing and analysing the policy relevant research landscape in Pakistan. This project also included an analysis of the political economy of research in Pakistan\(^9\).

\(^4\) [http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Project/61225/Default.aspx](http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Project/61225/Default.aspx)
\(^5\) [http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Output/190220/Default.aspx](http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Output/190220/Default.aspx)
\(^6\) [http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/international/Offices/OfficeinIndia/landscape/Pages/Arts.aspx](http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/international/Offices/OfficeinIndia/landscape/Pages/Arts.aspx)
\(^7\) [http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Output/190699/Default.aspx](http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Output/190699/Default.aspx)
\(^8\) [http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Output/193916/Default.aspx](http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Output/193916/Default.aspx)
\(^9\) [http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Output/193915/Default.aspx](http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Output/193915/Default.aspx)
- Mapping of the social sciences sectors in Kenya, Ghana and South Africa, which are currently underway.\(^{10,11}\)

**Objective**

10. The objectives of this research project are to carry out:
- A mapping exercise that describes and analyses the humanitarian research and evaluation landscape in East Africa;
- An analysis of the political economy of commissioning, undertaking and uptake of humanitarian research and evaluation in East Africa; and
- Recommendations on the opportunities to support the strengthening of regional or national research and evaluation capacity on both the user and producer-side.

11. In relation to the first objective, Annex B sets out the starters of a framework which could be applied to an East Africa context.

12. It should be noted that a number of the DFID commissioned mapping studies summarised at para 9 included compiling comprehensive databases of research organisations active within particular sectors or geographies. This is not an objective of this research study. The focus is instead on understanding who the main actors are and how they are networked/linked within a research and evidence system.

**Scope**

13. This study will focus on humanitarian research and evaluation in East Africa, both as a regional entity but also with a focus in up to three specific countries within the region. For the country specific focus, Kenya, Ethiopia, and Uganda are considered to be good options for inclusion. However, the research team should propose up to three countries with a rationale for the selection.

14. Prospective research teams will also need to propose boundaries for the study in terms of different disciplines and issues that can be categorised as within the humanitarian sector. This is likely to include disciplines which span the natural and social sciences, as well as different ‘types’ of research and evaluation (e.g. operational, experimental, observational etc).

**Mapping**

15. This component of the study should take the framework attached at Annex B as a starting point. The mapping should involve the identification of the key institutions and research groups that are commissioning and carrying out humanitarian research, as well as those who act as evidence brokers and disseminators. The mapping should also reflect on the forums and spaces at a regional and national-level were humanitarian research and


evidence contributes to decision-making. Specifically, the exercise will cover:

- A review and synthesis of existing research mapping exercises and analysis undertaken in East Africa.
- Key East Africa institutions or research groups undertaking research or evaluation in the humanitarian sector (local, regionally or globally). To note that research/evaluation could be undertaken by a range of different types of actors (e.g. universities, think tanks, INGOs, Red Cross and Red Crescent national societies).
- Key institutions or research groups undertaking research or evaluation in the humanitarian sector in the focus countries in East Africa.
- The main areas of focus and strategic priorities (if any) of these institutions or research groups (including geographical focus);
- The main sources and distribution of funds for research and evaluation in the humanitarian sector, including the main research funding bodies/councils, and external sources such as international donors.
- The regional/national networks, forums, and institutions in which humanitarian research and evidence is discussed and brokered with humanitarian decision-makers, be they regional/national governments, operational agencies or international donors.
- Any organisation national, regional or international that are working to support research capacity of humanitarian organisations in East Africa (on both the supply/production and demand/usage sides).

16. Where possible, in addition to providing an overview of networks, the mapping exercise should quantify the relationships between organisations in terms of collaboration, funding and other relevant dimensions.

17. As noted above in para 12, the objective is not compile a comprehensive list of all the research organisations which touch on research areas which can be defined as humanitarian, but rather to map the key organisations and groups which form key components of a humanitarian research and evidence system.

Political Economy Analysis

18. For starters, this component of the study will involve a synthesis of the existing published and grey literature on the political economy of research in the humanitarian sector globally. This literature is expected to be extremely limited.

19. Based on this synthesis and discussions with key stakeholders in East Africa, both at a regional and national-level, primary research is anticipated to fill priority gaps in the existing understanding. Exact research questions will depend on the initial synthesis and identified priority gaps, but currently the following political economy questions are anticipated to be:

- How does humanitarian research and evaluation get funded and commissioned in East Africa and within the focus countries?
• What are the main enablers and barriers to conducting humanitarian research and evaluation in East Africa and the focus countries, including social, political, cultural and economic factors that affect where, why and how research is carried out both within and by humanitarian organisations?

• What are the main enablers and barriers for getting research into humanitarian policy-making and practice in East Africa and the focus countries? Again, what are the social, political, cultural and economic factors that affect where, why and how research is used in decision-making, both within and by humanitarian organisations?

• What partnerships exist between Northern research and evaluation institutions and East African institutions? How were these partnerships formed?

20. In terms of the overall study, the research team’s time and effort is expected to be weighted toward the political economy component. But, recognising that the mapping exercise will be an important pre-requisite to addressing the political economy questions.

21. The final report should also include recommendations on the opportunities for supporting research and evaluation capacity within the humanitarian sector in East Africa. This should consider capacity strengthening at an individual, organisational and systems-level.

Methodology

22. Proposals should include details of the methodology for both components of the project.

23. The study is expected to involve both desk-based review and primary research, which will likely include key informant interviews drawing from a wide and balanced range of sources and evidence. Tenders should propose how interviewees are selected and the content of interviews recorded and analysed.

Political economy analysis

24. Political economy is understood by DFID as; “the interaction of political and economic processes in a society: the distribution of power and wealth between different groups and individuals, and the processes that create, sustain and transform these relationships over time”.

25. Political economy analysis can include the following:
• The interests and incentives facing different groups in society (and particular political elites) and how these generate specific outcomes that may encourage or hinder research/evaluation and its use in decision-making;
• The role that formal institutions (e.g. regulation) and informal social, political and cultural norms play in shaping human interaction, and political and economic competition in the research/evaluation sector; and
• The impact of values and ideas, including political ideologies, religion and cultural beliefs on the commissioning, conducting and dissemination of research/evaluation.

26. The research team should consult the DFID paper on political economy analysis for more detail\textsuperscript{12}. It is expected that the study will also be informed by an awareness of gender and social exclusion.

Reports and outputs

27. The Supplier will be responsible for the delivery of the project, and will be required to deliver outputs against pre-agreed milestones. Tenders should outline a clear workplan to produce the following outputs:
• Inception report (within 2 months), including:
  i. refinements/amendments to the project scope and final questions;
  ii. full methodology (mapped against the research questions);
  iii. initial synthesis of the literature on the political economy of research;
  iv. risk management strategy; and
  v. communication plan for the study.
• Short monthly written progress reports, detailing project progress, spend, and raising any changing risks or issues;
• Mid-point presentation (within 7 months), presentation of initial findings from desk-based review and field research to DFID;
• Final research report (within 12 months), responding fully to the project objectives and questions across both components set out in these Terms of Reference and refined during the inception phase.

28. The final report should be no more than 30 pages long, with up to 3-pages for the executive summary. The report will be in the form of a narrative description, with supporting diagrams and tables.

29. Prospective Suppliers should be aware of DFID’s Open and Enhanced Access policy that requires that all DFID funded research should be irrevocable and freely accessible online to any user worldwide\textsuperscript{13}.

30. Personal opinions of the author or unsubstantiated claims made by organisations themselves will not be accepted.

Management arrangements

\textsuperscript{12} http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/PO58.pdf
\textsuperscript{13} https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dfid-research-open-and-enhanced-access-policy
31. The Supplier will design and manage this research study, including drawing together the findings for reporting and undertaking dissemination activities.

32. DFID will manage the contract with the successful supplier through a lead official (based in Nairobi), supported by a Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will be responsible for approving the project outputs, commenting on draft reports and arranging independent quality assurance of the project outputs. The Steering Committee will contain, but is not limited to, the following members:
   - DFID lead official: Nicola Murray (Research and Evidence Division)
   - DFID representatives: Head of the Humanitarian Profession; and Evidence into Action Team; and
   - External representative(s).

33. The research team will be involved in up to three meetings (inception, mid-point, and final report stages) and make up to two presentations (inception and final report stages) to the Steering Committee. Meetings will take place across Nairobi and London, but can involve teleconferencing or videoconferencing in other locations.

**Project team**

34. Tenders from suitably qualified organisations or consortia are equally welcome. We welcome organisations or consortia led by or including institutions from low or middle income countries, in particular those in East Africa.

35. The research team will design, co-ordinate and draw together the project findings in the final report. They will also quality assure the outputs and validate the data collection before submission to DFID.

36. Bidders are encouraged to briefly outline how they will ensure independence in their work in their proposals and manage any potential conflicts of interest.

**Skills and qualifications**

37. The **essential** competencies and experience that the contractor will need to deliver the work are:
   - Strong qualitative and quantitative research skills;
   - A good understanding of research capacity and research uptake;
   - Familiarity with the wider humanitarian research landscape and the research to policy context in East Africa; and
   - Experience of undertaking political economy analysis of research
   - Strong analysis, report writing and communication skills.

**Recipients**

38. The direct recipient for this research study is the DFID HIEP, who will lead on the management of this contract. Additionally, the report will be relevant
for a wider variety of stakeholders who will also benefit from the findings, including DFID humanitarian advisors, regional and national governments, other bilateral and multilateral donors, and humanitarian operational agencies.

39. The results of the study may also be a valuable public good for others involved in commissioning, undertaking or using humanitarian research in East Africa.

Risks management
40. The Supplier will be expected to set out their understanding of the most important anticipated risks, with an explanation of their mitigating strategies for them in a full risk matrix.

Budget
41. We anticipate agreeing a budget for this project in the range of £60,000 to £100,000 (including VAT). Value for money, in respect of both the overall package of work proposed and the rates for project team members’ time and other costs, will be a key criterion in the tender assessment.

Duty of Care
42. The geographical scope of this research study is East Africa with a focus in up to three countries. Prospective Suppliers will need to propose up to three countries for greater focus based on where they considered there to be most opportunity for this study to generate learning and evidence, as well as opportunities for supporting the research and evaluation capacity strengthening of the humanitarian sector.

43. The Supplier is responsible for the safety and well-being of their Personnel (as defined in Section 2 of the Contract) and Third Parties affected by their activities under this contract, including appropriate security arrangements. They will also be responsible for the provision of suitable security arrangements for their domestic and business property.

44. 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 risks involved in delivery of the Contract (such as working in dangerous, fragile and hostile environments). The Supplier must ensure their Personnel receive the required level of safety training prior to deployment.

45. Prospective Suppliers must develop their Tender on the basis of being fully responsible for Duty of Care. The exact geographical scope beyond the East Africa regional dimension for this research study will be determined by the research team. As an illustration, attached at Annex A is an initial DFID/HMG risk assessment matrix for operating in Kenya (one of the potential focus countries). Suppliers should illustrate in Tender responses how they will respond to the Duty of Care requirements in line with this level of risk. Suppliers must confirm, within the countries they specify, in their tender that they:
• Fully accept responsibility for security and Duty of Care
• Understand the potential risks and have the knowledge and experience to develop an effective risk plan.
• Have the capability to manage their Duty of Care responsibilities throughout the life of the contract

46. If a Supplier is unwilling or unable to accept responsibility for security and Duty of Care as detailed above, your Tender will be viewed as non-compliant and excluded from further evaluation.

47. Acceptance of responsibility must be supported with evidence of capacity and DFID reserves the right to clarify any aspect of this evidence. In providing evidence, Supplier should answer the following questions in their Tender responses:

• How 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)?

• 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?

• 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 ongoing training is provided where necessary?

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

• 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 ongoing basis?

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

**Dissemination**
48. The supplier should include in their tender a proposal for communication and dissemination of study findings. This will be developed further and finalised during the inception phase. This communication plan should take into account local realities, ensuring finding are taken up as widely as possible drawing on existing humanitarian forums and networks.

**Timetable**
49. The project is expected to begin in September 2014 and finish by Aug/Sept 2015. Tenders should set out a specific timetable within this framework.

**Figure 1: Project timetable (dates subject to change)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITT invite</td>
<td>30th June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT bids submitted</td>
<td>11th August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender evaluation panel</td>
<td>18th August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred tenderer selected</td>
<td>August/September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project setup</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report delivered</td>
<td>November/December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-point presentation</td>
<td>April/May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report delivered</td>
<td>August/September 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX A: Example DFID Duty of Care  
DFID Overall Country Risk Assessment matrix - Location: Kenya

Date of assessment & assessing official: 19 June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Risk Score</th>
<th>Risk Score</th>
<th>Risk Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya (excluding areas listed separately)</td>
<td>Mombasa island and within 5km of the coast from Mtwapa creek in the north down to and including Tiwi in the south (this area does not include Diani or Moi international airport)</td>
<td>Mandera, Daadab and Garissa plus anywhere else within 60km of the Somali border (including areas North of Pate Island on the coast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL RATING</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCO travel advice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</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>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil unrest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence/crime</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk rating of research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No activity expected in these</td>
<td>No activity expected in these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 For these areas specific travel advice should be sought. See latest FCO travel advice for Kenya
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>study/project</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>areas</td>
<td>Very Low risk</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Med risk</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>Very High risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIGNIFICANTLY GREATER THAN NORMAL RISK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX B – Humanitarian research/evidence system

DECISION-MAKERS

Humanitarian policy-makers
(International, regional, national)
- International UN
- Regional intergovt
- National governments
- Bilateral donors

Humanitarian practitioners
(International, regional and national; & HQ, regional and field-based)
- UN agencies/UN cluster leads
- International NGO
- ICRC/IFRC and national societies
- National & local NGOs
- Bilateral donors
- National governments

Funders
WHAT WORKS
(International and national?)
- Bilateral donors
- Multilateral donors
- UN agencies
- International NGOs
- Foundations (e.g. Rockefeller, Qatar)
- Others?

CONTEXT/NEED

Acquire & translate

Focus & transmit

Incentives/funding $

Receive & respond

Researchers/Evaluation
MISSION-ORIENTATED
(International and national)
- In-house employees
- Consultants/Consultancies
- Stand-alone research centres
- Universities
- Foundations
- Think Tanks
- Others?

DISCOVERY-DRIVEN

Relevant to

Evidence

Questions

Link & exchange

capacity

incentives

Best practice, guidance, needs assessment, early warning

Synthesis, simplify & apply

Personal experience
Anecdote
Interests
Values
Assumptions

Organise & comms

Issues & priorities

Receive & act

Particularise & popularise

Brokers
STORIES
- In-house communications
- Mainstream and specialist media
- Professional networks (e.g. ALNAP)
- Professional publications (e.g. IRIN)
- Coordination networks (e.g. FSNWG)
- Think Tanks (e.g. ODI HPN)
- Conferences
- Academic books and journals
- Others?
- FACTS

Appraise & screen

Adapted from CHSRF (2000)