

UK Aid Connect: Terms of Reference Building Open Societies

A. Introduction

The world has seen substantial success on poverty reduction. However, 1.2 billion people remain in extreme poverty. There is a growing recognition that global problems facing the poorest and most excluded people are complex and inter-connected and that no single development actor has all the answers.

Consortia¹ and collaboration can bring new and creative ideas, innovation, better results and opportunities through pooled ideas, skills and resources. UK Aid Connect is a specific mechanism to bring those qualities together in tailored coalitions to address key development challenges in priority thematic areas for DFID.

DFID is inviting proposals that answer the complex policy and practice problems of today and tomorrow. To do so and to specifically match the response to the problem will require consortia representing a broad range of organisations, such as think tanks, research institutions, foundations and philanthropic organisations, the private sector, large and small civil society organisations, social movements and organisations based in the Global South.

UK Aid Connect grants will be awarded to consortia for work in, or for the benefit of, people in countries ranked in the bottom 50 countries in the Human Development Index and/or those on DFID's fragile states list. DFID will award UK Aid Connect grants through a competitive process – the submission of a proposal by the consortium-lead.

A strong proposal will provide quality ideas that are directly relevant to the design of UK Aid Connect, answering the question of why this particular development problem is best answered by this particular coalition of actors. It will also articulate how these ideas will bring about lasting change in innovative ways. The power, innovation and ambition of those ideas is more critical to selection than very specific programme detail.

Fundamental to UK Aid Connect are the principles of innovation, learning and adaptation throughout the programme design and implementation. Prior to awarding grants, DFID reserves the right to request bidders to further develop ideas or approaches within proposals or within consortia. This may include, for example, strengthening integration or consistency of themes *across* UK Aid Connect programmes on important issues including closing civil society space, gender equality and women's rights or promoting the meaningful engagement of Southern-based civil society organisations. Following the awarding of grants, DFID policy teams will work closely alongside the consortia to further develop the programme design during a six to nine month co-creation phase – again this could include proposals to adapt programmes or constituencies, from all partners.

¹ See Annexe 1: Definition of Consortia

The consortium must nominate one lead organisation who will be the grant-holder to DFID and accountable to DFID for programme performance, risk and financial management. They will be responsible for the grant award arrangements with other consortium members and the overall governance of the consortium, including how the consortium manage and mitigate risk, financial management capacity and fiduciary risk. The consortium lead will be a registered non-governmental and not-for-profit organisation which supports the delivery of poverty reduction. All consortium members must be listed in the proposal.

These terms of reference outline the development challenge and the requirements for consortia wishing to respond to this opportunity.

B. The Development Challenge: Building Open Societies

Background – the problem

1. Countries and communities are more stable when different groups are included, and conversely, violent conflict is more likely in deeply divided societies where political, social and economic inequalities between different groups can be manipulated by elites.¹ There is also evidence of a link between openness and economic growth. In the long-term, open societies that give people a say over the decisions that affect them, help to address grievances and promote a stronger relationship between citizen and state have been more successful in promoting growth and stable development.²

2. Civil society provides a link between excluded groups and the state to communicate grievances and to transfer the benefits of economic growth through service delivery. Civil society is also recognised as a ‘means of implementation’ for the Global Goals³. Civil society organisations are often the best equipped actors to reach, empower, and give a voice to the voiceless. Repressing these groups undermines *Leave No One Behind* and achievement of the Global Goals⁴ and is affecting DFID’s commitment to implement the critical promise of the Global Goals to reach the poorest and most excluded people.

3. Across the globe, civic actors (particularly civil society, activists, and the media) are experiencing an unprecedented level of challenge to their ability to operate. These ‘shrinking space’ difficulties include combinations of legal restrictions and policy directives, for instance on foreign funding⁵, freedom of association, assembly and expression⁶ alongside informal targeting and closures, and increased violence and harassment.

4. The volume of restrictive legal and policy measures has grown in the past decade, most significantly in the past three years. Between 2008 and 2016 freedom of expression declined in 15 of 24 DFID priority countries⁷, and freedom of assembly reduced in 14.⁸ Groups are targeted most where they are seen to challenge power or social norms. Civil society actors that engage in politically-sensitive activities or human rights and democracy-related activities are particularly targeted. Legislation on non-governmental organisations is sometimes mirrored from one country to the next.⁹

5. Media freedom is also under fire. Global press freedom declined to its lowest point in 13 years in 2016 amid unparalleled threats to journalists and media outlets¹⁰. The World Press Freedom Index sees 2017 as a “tipping point” in the state of media freedom in many countries with media freedom under threat now more than ever¹¹. Political control through statutory regulation of both print and broadcast media is now the norm rather than the exception in many parts of Africa, coupled with decline in quality public journalism, governmental influence over significant media outlets and political party ownership of others.¹² The dramatic increases in attacks on media practitioners in the last few years¹³ mean journalists are increasingly under threat (for example, in 2013 and 2014, UNESCO’s Director-General publicly

condemned the killings of a total of 178 journalists and social media producers¹⁴).

6. While access to digital technology provides considerable development opportunities for poverty reduction, and the digital media sector is rapidly expanding, clampdowns on the legitimate use of new media are ever more prevalent. Methods of censorship and propaganda are becoming increasingly sophisticated¹⁵ with journalists facing ever greater persecution. Threats, violence and the entrenched impunity of perpetrators then fosters self-censorship, as journalists fall silent or flee into exile¹⁶.

7. These trends of closing civic spaces for media actors are exacerbated by media houses struggling to remain viable. Traditional business models which asserted the financial independence of private media are beginning to crumble in the face of fragmentation of the advertising market by social media and changing audience engagement. In the years up to 2014, across Africa there was insufficient advertising to support a more pluralistic media landscape¹⁷. Globally, changes to existing business models have led to an increased reliance on state funding, which has been closely associated with risks of overt dependence and governmental 'capture.'¹⁸

8. With the increase in 'fake news' and 'alternative facts' across social media, there is a dangerous shortage of the credible information citizens need to be meaningfully engaged in their communities. Political polarisation, extremism, violence have all been exacerbated by increasingly polarised and politically captured media.¹⁹

9. Evidence indicates that significant progress has been made in strengthening the "supply side" of transparency²⁰; to open up government information but delivering tangible change for people's lives needs an informed and empowered citizenry and media to use and debate information to hold governments to account. Women and minority voices continue to be stifled.

10. A wide-ranging evaluation of DFID's support to social accountability initiatives has found that service delivery is improved when local citizens are informed and learn about their rights and entitlements and have the opportunity to engage in dialogue with service providers²¹.

11. DFID is looking for a coherent consortium-led approach that will help to address the multiple and complex challenges of civil society organisations in a small group of countries and inform approaches that can be taken internationally.

12. We are looking for proposals which demonstrate a deep understanding of the context, and can be flexible and responsive to political and international levers that can be brought to bear. Proposals should address issues on a country-level. Proposals should be supported by research, focus on ongoing learning and engage with a better-informed and mobilised international community that is responsive to local needs.

13. We are keen for country level work to be complemented by learning and policy advice that can exert global influence. Consortia partners could consider opportunities to share learning, build networks and advocate for change through linkages to global fora such as the Commonwealth, OECD DAC Network on Governance and Open Government Partnership. Consortia partners may also consider strengthening and/or supporting media partners to link with regional and global initiatives which advocate for greater freedoms, provide protection and give a global voice.

14. What is important is that the consortium's approach for each country is rooted in the local context, is locally led, strategic and operates in ways which do not put actors at risk.

15. A consortium approach should be adaptive and iterative; able to stop what is not working, scale what is, move quickly to maximise opportunities, and learn from activities and from the changing political and contextual landscapes while being accountable to results.

C. What are the expected results?

16. We recognise that much has been done already to address these challenges through existing projects and programmes. UK Aid Connect is designed to take this further by focussing on new exciting and innovative approaches. This is not about more of the same, but radical new approaches with different actors and collaborations.

17. The specific results delivered by each consortium will in part be determined by the nature of the issues to be addressed in those particular policy and thematic areas. However we envisage the consortia will produce rigorous and influential practical evidence, knowledge and learning. The rigorous evidence and learning produced by the consortia will be used to implement and scale up these innovative solutions to deliver real change to poor people's lives in low and middle income countries².

D. Impact and Outcomes

18. The overall high-level **impact** identified for the UK Aid Connect Building Open Societies theme is for: free and open societies with civil society, including media organisations able to help people to hold government to account, make information meaningful for ordinary people and reflect and drive social and political change for the better.

Outcomes in identified countries:

19. Consortia are asked to propose approaches which will contribute to the achievement of *at least two* of following outcomes.

² See Annexe 2: List of Eligible Countries

- Civil society able to operate in a free environment without unduly restrictive legislative and regulatory burdens and without fear of state intimidation and violence.
- Civil society, including intermediaries have the ability, independence, and sustainable financing to produce informative outputs.
- Civil society works collaboratively together and with governments (where appropriate), locally and internationally to improve the translation and use of data and drive greater transparency and accountability.
- Civil society is characterised by openness, fairness, plurality and competitiveness; through which a diversity of voices and opinions are given a platform.

E. Outputs:

20. Approaches proposed may include activities which contribute to achieving one or more of the outputs listed below. However this is not an exhaustive list and Consortia are asked to propose activities and outputs which are appropriately rooted in the identified needs of particular contexts and consider carefully the political risk as set out above. *We are not looking for proposals which include media production or the development or expansion of broadcast/print/online content.*

21. Consortia are asked to clearly articulate the theoretical and evidence bases underpinning their proposed approach. Suggested outputs:

- Where appropriate, civil society and local and national governments work more closely together to build, trust, understanding and mutual respect;
- Legislative and regulatory reforms for a responsible and free civil society;
- Sustainable approaches to improve the skills of civil society workers, and improve the ability of intermediaries to hold governments and leaders to account;
- The establishment of coalitions which bring civil society to advocate for greater freedoms and drive greater transparency;
- International level policy and learning work supporting stronger regional and global bodies which can amplify local voices, advocate for change, and offer legal and other support and protections;

- Improved linkages and support for local actors and coalitions with international support and advocacy bodies;
- Improved financial sustainability of media institutions

F. Scope

22. Interventions approved through UK Aid Connect must be used to fund activities which aim to reduce poverty in the eligible countries. This could include:

- Action research
- Identifying innovative ideas
- Trialling new approaches and interventions
- Testing the viability of scaling up effective approaches
- Producing rigorous and influential evidence and learning
- Disseminating evidence and learning.

23. Potential consortia may suggest additional work streams that will help the programme fulfil its outcome.

G. The Requirements

24. Why a **consortia-led approach**: clear ideas and approaches demonstrating why this specific consortium is the most effective way to address this/these specific development challenge/s at this time and in the future. This must be supported by a clearly articulated Theory of Change.

25. **Capability and capacity**: the consortium must demonstrate the consortium's skills and capacity to deliver the impact and outcomes as set out in the Theory of Change.

26. **Structure and governance**: it will be the responsibility of the consortium-lead to establish a governance structure and arrangements that meets the need of the programme, including a clear risk strategy and a demonstration of financial management capacity and fiduciary risk.

27. **Quality of evidence, learning and adaptation**: the consortium must demonstrate their ability to produce rigorous and influential practical evidence, knowledge and learning to progress the programme at scale. It must set out clear mechanisms for systematically listening and responding to beneficiaries, and ensuring this feedback informs programme design and adaptation

28. **Innovation**: clearly demonstrates how the consortium will identify and trial innovative new approaches, and testing the viability of effectively delivering the new approach at scale.

29. **Value for money**: the consortium must demonstrate an understanding of the key cost drivers associated with the delivery of the programme.

H. Individual programme evaluations

30. There is an opportunity to learn from individual evaluations of innovative programmes delivered by consortium partners. The selection of programmes to evaluate will be dependent on any evidence gap identified by DFID or the consortium, an evaluability assessment of each individual programme, and the capacity of the consortium to support an evaluation and deliver learning accordingly.

31. The details and delivery of an evaluation will be discussed and negotiated during the inception/co-creation phase and if appropriate, additional funds will be made available against an agreed and costed evaluation strategy. Although suppliers will be contracted by the consortium, all sub-contracted evaluations will have access to DFID's contracted Evaluation Quality Assurance and Learning Service (EQUALS).

I. Timeframe

32. Proposals can be for up to 4 years duration, including the inception/co-creation phase.

J. Programme budget

33. There is not a pre-determined budget ceiling for the theme. DFID is aiming to award grants of circa £3 million a year. However, there may be exceptions to this which DFID will consult on during the planned market engagement discussions. We anticipate one consortium per theme; however, the final decision will be determined by the number and overall merit of the consortia proposals.

34. The detailed budget for each grant award will be finalised during the co-creation phase. For the purpose of the application, you will be required to submit a detailed budget for the co-creation phase, plus an indicative budget breakdown across each of the years, broken down to component level (the identified key cost drivers).

35. The indicative figures should include all costs associated with the establishment of the consortium, co-creation costs, management and programme costs.

K. Programme financing

36. Funding will be provided to partners quarterly in arrears, and on the basis of the final agreed programme budget. However, payment in advance can be provided if a partner can demonstrate that quarterly expenditure on DFID projects will use over 20% of its unrestricted reserves. If there are other reasons why payment in advance should be considered partners can make a request for this to the UK Aid Connect Programme Manager

L. Selection Process and timetable

37. See Annexes 3, 4 and 5 for the application process and timeline, proposal format and scoring methodology.

M. Due diligence

38. DFID undertakes due diligence assessments of all organisations funded. It will assess whether the consortium-lead has the necessary policies, processes, governance systems and resources including human resources with the right skills and experience to manage DFID funds, for the purpose they were awarded, and to deliver the programme successfully. This will include the proposed arrangements between the consortium-lead and its associated consortium members. This may include site office visits.

39. The UK Aid Connect grant will be conditional on the implementation of any recommendations arising from the due diligence assessment either before the grant starts or during the first months of the programme depending on the importance of the recommended action for assuring the necessary level of management capacity.

N. Inception/co-creation phase

40. There will be a funded co-creation (design) phase of up to 9 months, when the selected consortium will work closely with DFID to define the full programme, finalise the consortia as required, define the results framework, work plan and key deliverables, risk matrix and the detailed budget breakdown. DFID and the consortium may mutually agree to implement a shorter co-creation period. The final programme design will be subject to DFID approval.

O. Reporting, performance and financial requirements

41. The consortium lead will submit a quarterly narrative progress report covering progress against the agreed work plan, emerging evidence and learning and an updated assessment of programme risks; and a quarterly expenditure and forecasting report.

42. The consortium-lead will submit an annual report on progress against the targets/milestones set out in the results framework, which will be designed with DFID during the co-creation phase.

P. Upholding the International Development Act (Gender Equality) 2014

43. UK Aid Connect will uphold the UK International Development (Gender Equality) Act 2014 throughout its operations and is expected to give due consideration to gender equality throughout its activities in order to empower and protect women and girls and support gender equality. The consortium will be expected to monitor, evaluate and address the intended and unintended

impacts of interventions on women and girls where relevant. Potential consortia will be required to demonstrate how they will ensure gender equality throughout all activities. The details of this will be finalised during the inception phase.

Q. UK Aid Branding

44. A visibility statement forms part of the Accountable Grant Agreement. In this document you will describe how you will acknowledge UK funding both in country and when communicating about your work. This should be completed with reference to DFID's [UK aid branding guidance](#).

R. Transparency

45. The Partner will publish to the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standard on all its DFID funding within six months of the start of this Arrangement. DFID expects the Partner to publish to the IATI standard on all its non-DFID funding and for Downstream Partners to publish to the IATI standard on their funding. The intention of this commitment is to allow traceability throughout the delivery chain. For more details on IATI standards see: <http://www.aidtransparency.net/>

S. Ethics

46. Selected consortia will uphold the highest standards of ethics throughout its operations, including DFID's [ethics principles](#). Consortia should also have appropriate processes in place to safeguard ethics in all aspects of operations and to escalate and address any unforeseen ethical issues that may arise during the delivery of project activities. Potential consortia will be requested to submit their proposed ethics governance processes during inception.

T. DFID co-ordination

47. Each accountable grant agreement will be managed by the Programme Management Team comprising of the Policy/Thematic Lead Adviser, Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) and Deputy Programme Manager. This team will work closely with the Consortia-leads.

Annexe 1: Definition of Consortia

Consortia are models of collaboration bringing together multiple actors (individuals, institutions, or otherwise) who are independent from one another outside of the context of the collaboration, to address a common set of questions using a defined structure and governance model. The very nature of consortia makes them well suited to tackle complex development challenges. The creation, facilitation and nurturing of new and diverse consortia is key to the success of UK Aid Connect. Through our discussion and dialogue with more than 150 organisations, many benefits for consortia working were identified including improved learning, evidence and knowledge; better programme delivery; greater value for money, and more innovation.

The specific composition of each of the consortia will be determined by the specific development challenges to be addressed, and this must be demonstrated in proposals. However, diverse, multi-institutional coalitions working together will be required to tackle these complex issues. It is likely that consortia will include but will not be limited to traditional civil society organisations. There will be a need to ensure that many other types of organisations are included such as think tanks, research institutions, foundations and philanthropic organisations, the private sector, smaller civil society organisations, social movements and organisations based in low income countries.

Consortia organisations, including lead agencies, will not be limited to UK based organisations. There are a number of existing coalitions of organisations that have developed strong and coherent partnerships. These could provide valuable starting points for the development of effective consortia in response to specific policy and practice problems.

Brokering, promoting, supporting and maintaining effective consortia are complex and iterative processes that require considerable resources, knowledge and time and that present risks. Genuine collaborative consortia are not so easy to bring into existence or control. For all proposed partnerships, the roles of each partner and their contribution to delivery of the programme must be clearly defined. It must also be made clear how the consortia will learn and improve its' own operation. There must be clear mechanisms in place to enable beneficiaries to participate in the design, management, implementation and review of the work.

The consortium must nominate one lead organisation who will be accountable to DFID for the use of the funds and who will be responsible for the grant award arrangements with other consortium members. The consortium-lead will be responsible for the overall governance of the consortium, including how the consortium manage and mitigate risk, financial management capacity and fiduciary risk. The consortium-lead will be a registered non-governmental and not-for-profit organisation which supports the delivery of poverty reduction projects. All consortium members must be listed in the application. DFID reserves the right to comment on consortia composition, especially with regard to the fit to the defined policy problem and may, if deemed necessary, suggest changes to that composition.

Annexe 2: Eligible Countries

UK Aid Connect grants will be awarded to consortia for work in, or for the benefit of, people in countries ranked in the bottom 50 countries in the Human Development Index and/or those on DFID's fragile states list.

Afghanistan	Madagascar
Angola	Malawi
Azerbaijan	Mali
Bangladesh	Mauritania
Benin	Mozambique
Burkina Faso	Myanmar
Burundi	Nepal
Cambodia	Niger
Cameroon	Nigeria
Central African Republic	Pakistan
Chad	Papua New Guinea
Comoros	Rwanda
Congo (Democratic Republic)	Sao Tome and Principe
Côte d'Ivoire	Senegal
Djibouti	Sierra Leone
Egypt	Solomon Islands
Eritrea	Somalia
Ethiopia	South Sudan
Gambia	Sudan
Ghana	Swaziland
Guinea	Syrian Arab Republic
Guinea-Bissau	Tajikistan
Haiti	Tanzania
Iraq	Togo
Kenya	Turkmenistan
Kyrgyz Republic	Uganda
Lao People's Democratic Republic	Uzbekistan
Lebanon	Yemen
Lesotho	Zambia
Liberia	Zimbabwe
Libya	

Annexe 3: Application Process and Timeline

DFID will award grants through a one-stage competitive process – the submission of a proposal by the consortium lead. We do not expect consortia to submit proposals with a fully designed programme. A strong proposal will provide quality ideas that are directly relevant to the design of UK Aid Connect, answering the question of why this particular development problem is best answered by this particular coalition of actors. It will also articulate how these ideas will bring about lasting change in innovative ways. The power, innovation and ambition of those ideas is more critical to selection than very specific programme detail.

Following the award of a grant, DFID policy teams will work alongside the consortia to further develop the programme design during a six to nine month co-creation phase.

DFID will reserve the right to not fund one or more areas if the bids do not meet the required standard.

DFID will provide feedback on all applications. The following table summarises the actions you will need to take to apply for UK Aid Connect funding.

STAGE	TASK	TIMELINE
Proposal	<p>Complete and submit the following to UKAidConnect@dfid.gov.uk by the deadline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UK Aid Connect Proposal Form (including the Theory of Change) Budget Proposal template <p>Emailing your application: attachments larger than 6MB may need to be compressed or divided between separate emails.</p>	<p>Deadline for submission of proposals:</p> <p>23:59 20 October</p>
Assessment	Applications are assessed and scored.	Approximately 8 weeks
Due diligence/Grant arrangements	DFID will complete Due Diligence Assessments. Once the indicative budget for the project has been agreed and on satisfactory completion of the due diligence assessment, an Accountable Grant Agreement (AGA) will be issued.	1-3 months
Co-creation	<p>There will be a funded, intensive co-creation (design) phase when each consortium will work closely with DFID to clearly define the full programme, consortia membership if required, the outputs and indicators, work plan and key deliverables, risk matrix and the detailed budget breakdown.</p> <p>DFID and the consortia might mutually agree to implement a shorter co-creation period. The final programme design will be subject to DFID approval.</p>	6-9 months
Mobilisation	Full mobilisation of the programme.	Approximately 6-9 months from award of grant.

Annexe 4: Proposal Format

Using the template provided, the proposal must clearly set out the following:

Section 1 (maximum 15 pages)

- Brief project summary.
- Proposed impact and outcome for the intervention.
- Why a consortium-led approach is the best approach to delivering the outcome and **why, specifically this consortia**.
- The skills and capacity of the consortium to deliver the intervention. This incorporates a short statement on the capability and capacity of each consortium member, highlighting their added value.
- The governance arrangements for the consortium, including the approach to managing programme risk, financial management capacity and fiduciary risk.
- A demonstration of the consortium's capacity to produce rigorous and influential practical evidence, knowledge and learning to progress the programme at scale.
- A clear demonstration of how mechanisms for systematically listening and responding to beneficiaries will be implemented and used to inform programme design and adaptation.
- A clear statement on how the programme will give due consideration to gender equality throughout its activities in order to empower and protect women and girls and support gender equality.
- A clear statement on how the programme will deliver effectiveness, efficiency, economy and equity.

Section Two (maximum 3 pages)

- A theory of change. Submit this using your own preferred format.

Section Three

- Background and track record of the consortium members (max 2 pages per member).

Budget Proposal

- Using the template provide, submit an indicative budget breakdown which should include:
 - a. a breakdown of the budget for the co-creation phase;
 - b. a total budget, broken down across each of the proposed years, presented at the component level (the key identified cost drivers).

Annexe 5: Scoring Methodology and Evaluation Criteria

The Panel will apply the following scoring methodology to assess proposals:

6	Excellent, addresses the requirements of the ToR and where relevant demonstrates fine tuning, to match expectations, and is of a quality and level of detail and understanding that provides confidence in certainty of delivery and permits full contractual reliance (where applicable).
5	High degree of confidence that they can meet the requirements of the ToR (and where relevant strong evidence they have tailored their response to meet these). Demonstrates they have a thorough understanding of what is being asked for and that they can do what they say they will; translates well into contractual terms (where applicable).
4	An understanding of all issues relating to delivery of the ToR and tailoring the response to demonstrate that proposals are feasible so that there is a good level of confidence that they will deliver; can be transposed into contractual terms (where applicable).
3	Understands most of the issues relating to delivery of the ToR and addresses them appropriately with sufficient information, but only some relevant tailoring and so only some confidence that they will be able deliver in line with expectations.
2	Some misunderstandings of the issues relating to delivery of the ToR and a generally low level of quality information and detail. Poor appetite to tailor when asked and so fails to meet expectations in many ways and provides insufficient confidence.
1	ToR issues are scantily understood and flimsy on quality information, with minimal tailoring where relevant. Provides no confidence that the issues will be addressed and managed at all in line with expectations.
0	Complete failure to address the requirements of the ToR.

The above scoring methodology will be applied to each of the Criteria detailed on the table below. The Total Score for each Criteria will comprise of the score awarded (0 to 6) multiplied by the weighting allocated to each Criteria.

The Evaluation Criteria and Weightings that will be applied to proposal are detailed in the table below:

No.	Success Criteria	Weighting (%)	Score	Total Score
1.	Consortia approach: clear ideas and approaches demonstrating why this specific consortium is the most effective way to address this/these specific development challenge/s to bring about lasting change in an innovative way.	25	6	150
2.	Skills, capacity and governance: clearly demonstrate the collective consortium and individual	20	6	120

	<p>component skills and capacity to deliver the impact and outcomes as set out in the Theory of Change.</p> <p>Set out clear governance arrangements for the consortium, clear risk strategy and a clear demonstration of financial management capacity and fiduciary risk.</p>			
3.	<p>Quality of evidence, learning and adaptation: clearly demonstrates the collective consortium and individual component's ability to produce rigorous and influential practical evidence, knowledge and learning to progress the programme to sustainable scale.</p>	15	6	90
4.	<p>Quality of beneficiary engagement: sets out clear mechanisms for systematically listening and responding to beneficiaries, and ensuring this feedback informs programme design and adaptation</p>	5	6	30
5.	<p>Innovation: clearly demonstrates how the consortium will identify and trial innovative new approaches, and testing the viability of effectively delivering the new approach at scale.</p>	15	6	90
6.	<p>Gender equality: clearly demonstrates on how the programme will give due consideration to gender equality throughout its activities in order to empower and protect women and girls and support gender equality.</p>	5	6	30
7.	<p>Value for Money: demonstrates how the programme will demonstrate effectiveness, efficiency, economy and equity.</p>	15	6	90
Overall Total		100%		600

-
- ¹ Stewart (2010), Goldstone et al (2010), Call (2012).
- ² Acemoglu and Robinson (2012), World Development Report 2011, and such as Lant Pritchett
- ³ Goal 17.17 "Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships"
- ⁴ Moehler, D. (2013). Democracy, governance and randomized media assistance. BBC Media Action Working Paper 4. Bridging Theory and Practice Research Dissemination Series and Arsenault, A. and Powers, S. (2010). The impact of media development worldwide: a review of the literature for the Media Map project. Note that a feature of this trend has been the particular targeting of LGBTI groups (in Uganda "in the wake of an anti-LGBTI law's passage the rates of homophobic incidents, including violence, increased exponentially -- by somewhere between 750% and 1,900%"). ICNL *Global Trends* May 2016.
- ⁵ Darin Christensen, Jeremy Weinstein, "Defunding Dissent," *Journal of Democracy* 24, no. 2 (April 2013): 80.
- ⁶ International Center for Not-For-Profit Law review of changes to legislation globally.
- ⁷ Bangladesh, Burma, DRC, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Tajikistan, Uganda, Zambia. Bertelsmann Transformation Index 2008 - 2016.
- ⁸ Afghanistan up until recent legislation, Bangladesh, Burma, DRC, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Somalia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia. BTI 2008 – 2016.
- ⁹ Mendelson, S. Africa opening or closing? In Downie, R. (ed.) *Africa in the Wider World*. CSIS (2014). [here](#).
- ¹⁰ <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press/freedom-press-2017>
- ¹¹ [World Press Freedom Index](#)
- ¹² eg Extractive Industries transparency Initiative (EITI), International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) and Open Government Partnership (OGP)
- ¹³ There has been a marked increase in targeted arrests and deaths of journalists worldwide. The number of journalists detained globally in 2000 was 81. Between 2002 and 2009 the number increased and ranged from 122 to 139. By 2011 the number had reached 179 and has spiked since (232 in 2012, 211 in 2013, 221 in 2014 and 199 in 2015). In 2000 24 journalists were killed. In 2005 50 journalists were, compared to 71 in 2015. Committee to Protect Journalist Data.
- ¹⁴ UNESCO - Facts and Figures on the Safety of Journalists, 2013-2014 at http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/Events/IDEI_2014/IDEI2015_Facts-and-Figures-on-Safety-of-Journalists-2013.pdf
- ¹⁵ [Freedom in the World 2016, Freedom House](#)
- ¹⁶ <https://cpj.org/reports/2016/12/journalists-killed-murdered-syria-most-deadly-war.php>
- ¹⁷ <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/world-media-trends>
- ¹⁸ <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/world-media-trends>
- ¹⁹ <http://downloads.bbc.co.uk/mediaaction/pdf/governance-and-rights-approach-2016.pdf>
- ²⁰ eg Extractive Industries transparency Initiative (EITI), International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) and Open Government Partnership (OGP)
- ²¹ Itad, 2017, What Works for Social Accountability? Findings from DFID's Macro Evaluation; itad.com/knowledge-and-resources/macro-evaluations