

UK Aid Connect: Terms of Reference

Supporting Tolerance and Freedom of Religion or Belief

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 adaption 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.

The Development Challenge: Supporting tolerance and freedom of religion or belief

1. Most people in developing countries engage in some form of spiritual practice and believe that their faith is important and enables them to relate to the world. The Afrobarometer survey¹ in Africa found that 81% of those surveyed felt that religion was a “very important” factor in their lives. Gallup polls found that two-thirds of respondents in developing countries “give God high importance” or consider themselves to be “religious people”²³. Since 1950, the growth in the numbers of religious adherents in developing countries has been greater than the growth in population⁴.

2. Religion is often part of an individual’s or groups’ identity. This gives faith groups considerable legitimacy in the activities that they carry out. The World Bank’s ‘Voices of the Poor’ study⁵ (2000) found that “religious leaders and institutions” were often the most trusted institutions in developing countries. Faith groups can inspire confidence and trust and are often seen as more embedded in, and committed to, local communities. They are often the first group which people turn to in times of need and contribute to in times of plenty. Faith groups can make an important contribution to poverty reduction.

3. The development of effective and accountable states is important for poverty reduction. Faith groups can empower poor people so their voices are heard when decisions that affect their lives are taken. Faith groups can subject governments to critical scrutiny and bring distinct and valuable perspectives to policy formulation processes. Faith groups reach those who might otherwise be untouched and are the institutions that some people most trust in times of hardship. They run many schools and hospitals, and provide humanitarian relief in times of disaster. They have an acknowledged position in many societies. So, they are well positioned to speak out for, and speak with, the poor, as well as to provide for some who are not adequately catered for by mainstream relief agencies. In developing countries, members of faith communities have been at the forefront of public challenges to corrupt and abusive governments, toppling authoritarian regimes and promoting human rights, such as in South Africa⁶, in Latin America⁷ and the Philippines⁸.

4. Faith groups, as with many other civil society groups, bring with them strong hierarchies, which often reproduce power structures within society. Faith groups sometimes prefer to maintain the status-quo rather than increasing the voice of the poor and have even contributed to the emergence of authoritarian regimes such as in Latin America and Afghanistan. Elites within faiths can, at times, expropriate the name of the poor to gain certain benefits. While all faiths will have the poor as part of their membership, it is not always clear they place poverty eradication near the top of their agenda. As above reflects, faith groups can be both drivers of change and barriers to change.

5. Faith groups can bring a distinct contribution to reducing certain types of conflict⁹. They may have an authority and underlying desire to bring about peace that enables them to mediate. In fragile and failing states they may

retain a presence when government and other agencies no longer function. There are many examples of religious leaders and organisations playing prominent roles in processes to prevent and resolve violent conflict through conflict mediation, interfaith dialogue, intra-faith dialogue, norm setting and addressing structural conditions. While faith groups have a comparative advantage and long history in conflict resolution and the overwhelming majority of religious believers act peacefully, in accordance with universal principles, religion is nonetheless perceived to be a significant factor in many conflicts. Differences of faith exacerbate or cause conflict. The number and proportion of conflicts with a religious dimension is increasing. In 2013, 21 out of 35 (60%) armed conflicts around the world had “a religious element”. In 2001, the figure was 15 out of 34 (44%). There is a high degree of consensus that conflicts almost always have multiple causal factors and that religious identities are often manipulated to build a case for violence and increase legitimacy of combatants.

6. Formal religious leaders focus constantly and directly on moral issues and dilemmas, and this offers an important force which can be positively engaged on a wide range of topics such as corruption and governance. It may also provide healthy challenge to prevailing orthodoxies. Religion has a critical influence over beliefs, behaviours and social norms. However traditional interpretations of scriptures intertwined with traditional values, can lead to discrimination, stigma and fatalism¹⁰. In some places, staff employed by the providers of key services are overwhelmingly from one religion, which can mean that followers of minority religions, or those with no faith, are too frightened to access the services provided to others, opting instead to rely on their co-religionists for support.

7. Freedom of religion or belief is a fundamental freedom applying to all human beings, which is recognised by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 18:

“Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.”

8. Freedom of religion or belief includes the right to have a religion or a belief (and not to have one), and it includes the right to express this religion or belief either publicly or in private, including to publicly criticise one’s own or others’ religion or belief. The right to freedom of religion or belief can only be limited as prescribed by law and only when this is necessary to protect the public safety, order, health, morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

9. The right to freedom of religion or belief is included in the legally binding International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, monitored by the UN Human Rights Committee. The right to freedom of religion or belief is also enshrined in a number of regional human rights instruments including:

- European Convention on Human Rights (1966),
- African Charter for Human and People's Rights (1981),
- Arab Human Rights Charter (2004),
- ASEAN's Human Rights Declaration (2012).

10. Violations of the right to freedom of religion or belief are among the most common human rights violations, and people are discriminated and persecuted all over the world for having and expressing their belief (or non-belief). Persecution of religious minorities and atheists is acute and increasing in many countries. It is arguably greater now than at any time in the past 2000 years. The level and number of violations of freedom of religion or belief is increasing in all parts of the world, with the exception of the Americas¹¹¹². Countries with high levels of persecution of religious minorities and atheists include North Korea, Somalia, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Sudan, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Yemen, Eritrea, Libya, Nigeria, Maldives, Saudi Arabia and India¹³¹⁴.

11. The nature of persecution varies greatly from country to country. Persecution can derive from state authority which discriminates or which allows a climate of impunity for those who attack religious minorities and atheists and from extreme non-state actors which aggressively target religious minorities and atheists.

12. Many (more than 145) of the world's countries have laws ensuring the right to freedom of religion or belief; however, more than two-thirds of these protect only some religious groups and individuals. 46 countries have laws that entirely prohibit certain religious groups. Governments and authorities in 96 countries exercise violence or discrimination against individuals and groups based on their religion or belief, whether in the form of arbitrary detention, physical violence and torture, or destruction of religious property. More than 40 countries prohibit conversion from one religion to another – this is particularly widespread in the Middle East where converts risk prison, physical punishment and destruction of identity papers.

13. It is not only governments that violate the right to freedom of religion or belief. In more than 150 countries, there are examples of non-state intimidation, attacks, mob violence and destruction of property.

14. Religions can generate alternative versions of rights and obligations and do not always directly support modern human rights frameworks. However, freedom of religion in terms of personal belief is absolute, and should not be limited, even if some religious views give offence to others. Freedom of religion should only be limited where it impacts negatively and tangibly on the rights of others. Consideration of religion in terms of how it can hinder as well as support rights is relevant to the pursuit of human rights in development and can play a role in bridging the chasm between the theory and realisation of rights.

B. What are the expected results?

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. The work through UK Aid Connect will contribute to the following overall objective: a world where all women and men, girls and boys throughout all stages of their lives have equal opportunity to realise their rights, achieve their potential and live in dignity, free from extreme poverty, exclusion, stigma, discrimination and violence. Success will be getting to zero on extreme poverty and achieving development outcomes across all economic and social population groups.

18. The work through UK Aid Connect will include the following results:

- **Services:** equal access to opportunities and resources, regardless of religion or belief, including good nutrition, protection from disease, access to quality education, access to clean water and sanitation services, and active consideration of barriers to accessing services on the grounds of religion or belief.
- **Upholding rights:** duty bearers and those holding power to uphold the rights of all equally, regardless of their religion or belief, including religious minorities and those with no faith and to create genuine inclusion in politics, economics and society. Barriers to equal access to services on the grounds of religion are removed.
- **Legislation:** Removal of negative legislation on freedom of religion or belief and support for actively positive legislation for religious minorities and people with no faith.
- **Full participation in decision making processes** in households, communities and countries for all, regardless of their religion or belief, including religious minorities and those of no faith.
- **Progressive change in social and cultural norms:** including social norms within institutions, creating supportive environment for all to be treated equally, regardless of their religion or belief.

² See Annexe 2: List of Eligible Countries

D. Outcomes and Outputs

19. The planned discussion and dialogue with stakeholders will frame the expected outcomes and outputs of any consortium programme. However the work through UK Aid Connect could contribute to the following **outcomes**:

- **Political leadership:** key faith groups and leaders show political leadership and are pushing the agenda internationally;
- **Strong national and international faith networks** supporting collective action and supporting people to be active agents of change, support greater representation, social mobilisation and deeper accountability;
- **Inclusion:** freedom of religion or belief issues, and discrimination on account of religion taken up by mainstream development organisations and fully included in international development and human rights frameworks and programmes;
- **Capacity of development workers:** development workers have a better understanding of the local context and the way that the religion or belief of the service providers can impact their service delivery.

20. The work could be delivered through the following **outputs**:

- **Supporting stronger evidence base** (including robust methodologies), and tracking mechanisms to serve as a platform to address freedom of religion or belief violations and discrimination against individuals on the grounds of their religion or belief;
- **Civil society strengthening approaches** to support persecuted or marginalised religious minorities and those with no faith, including understanding better their needs and exploring culturally appropriate and context specific responses;
- **Effective approaches validated for faith groups and non-faith groups countering religious intolerance and discrimination**, hate speech, stereotyping, and violence against others on the grounds of their religion or belief;
- **Effective approaches validated for faith groups and non-faith groups to tackle the religious roots of extremism**, which adversely impacts development outcomes and the ability of all to realise their rights;
- **Effective approaches validated for faith groups and non-faith groups to counter gender inequality**, including religiously-based discrimination, harmful practices, and restrictions of women's participation, such as through tracking incidents of religious intolerance or persecution, and the government response, and having a mechanism of dialogue with the government to address this;
- **Constructive dialogue** between faith groups and other development actors. How to help faith groups to identify and discuss areas of difference in a constructive way without threatening wider collaborative work;
- **Effective approaches to validate how a school curriculum**

promotes or inhibits freedom of religion or belief such as by linking adherence to a certain faith with the concept of nationality and exploring how teaching can support tolerance and respect for the 'other';

E. Scope

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

- Influencing and supporting donors, multilaterals and national governments to commit to supporting tolerance and freedom of religion or belief.
- Designing activities and planning events to bring together existing actors, networks and mechanisms with new partners.
- Action research on tolerance and freedom of religion or belief.
- Trialling new approaches and interventions
- Producing rigorous and influential evidence and learning
- Disseminating evidence and learning.
- Improving and generating global data
- Providing technical support and resource to DFID.

22. Potential consortia may suggest additional work streams that will help the programme fulfil its outcome and outputs listed above.

F. The Requirements

23. **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.

24. **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.

25. **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.

26. **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

27. **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.

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

G. Individual programme evaluations

29. 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.

30. 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).

H. Timeframe

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

I. Programme budget

32. 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.

33. 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).

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

J. Programme financing

35. 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.

K. Selection process and timetable

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

L. Due Diligence

37. 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.

38. 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.

M. Inception/co-creation phase

39. 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.

N. Reporting, performance and financial requirements

40. 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.

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

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

42. 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

P. UK Aid Branding

43. 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 project. This should be completed with reference to DFID's [UK aid branding guidance](#).

Q. Transparency

44. 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/>

R. Ethics

45. 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.

S. DFID co-ordination

46. 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.</p> <p>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

References

- ¹ McCauley J and Gyimah-Boadi E, 2009 [Religious faith and democracy: evidence from the Afrobarometer surveys.](#)
- ² *Gallup Voice of the People 2005*
- ³ *Gallup International Millennium Survey 1999*
- ⁴ Marshall K et al, 2008:35 [Challenges of Change: Faith, Gender, and Development](#)
Berkley Centre for Religion, Peace and World Affairs
- ⁵ Narayan, Deepa with Raj Patel, Kai Schafft, Anne Rademacher and Sarah Koch-Schulte. 2000. *Voices of the Poor: Can Anyone Hear Us?* New York, N.Y.: Published for the World Bank, Oxford University Press.
- ⁶ de Gruchy, 1995 J. de Gruchy, *Christianity and democracy: A theology for a just world*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1995).
- ⁷ Medhurst, 1992 K. Medhurst, *Politics and religion in Latin America*. In: G. Moyser, Editor, *Politics and religion in the modern world*, Routledge, London (1992).
- ⁸ Moreno, 2007 A. Moreno, 'Engaged citizenship: The Catholic bishops' conference of the Philippines in the post-authoritarian Philippines. In: G. Clarke, M. Jennings and T. Shaw, Editors, *Development, civil society and faith-based organisations*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke (2007).
- ⁹ Haynes J, 2009 [Conflict, Conflict Resolution and Peace-Building: The Role of Religion in Mozambique, Nigeria and Cambodia](#) *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, 1743-9094, Volume 47, Issue 1, 2009, Pages 52 – 75
- ¹⁰ Zou J et al. 2009 [Religion and HIV in Tanzania: influence of religious beliefs on HIV stigma, disclosure, and treatment attitudes.](#) *BMC Public Health* 2009, 9:75
- ¹¹ Freedom House 2014,
- ¹² Pew Research Center 2014
- ¹³ Pew Research Center 2013
- ¹⁴ US Commission on International Religious Freedom (2014) Annual Report