Evaluation of Comic Relief / DfID funded Four Cities Initiative

Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

Comic Relief has been supporting work on urban slum development for many years through providing grants for individual projects under its standard grant-making cycles. In March 2012, DfID committed £10 million to Comic Relief’s work in Urban Slums - this was matched with £10 million of Comic Relief’s funding creating a total pot of £20 million. This funding presented Comic Relief with an opportunity to test a new, more proactive ‘city focused’ approach - with an underpinning assumption that *by funding a group of grantees in a particular city, and by encouraging stronger collaboration between grantees themselves (both within and across cities) and between grantees and key city stakeholders* the impact would be greater. The resulting “Four Cities Initiative” runs until November 2019.

Comic Relief implemented this ‘city focused’ approach through its existing grant management procedures, rather than developing an overarching programme structure. [[1]](#footnote-2) A total of 17 full grants as at April 2015 have now been awarded[[2]](#footnote-3) in Freetown, Cape Town, Kampala and Lusaka.[[3]](#footnote-4) The grants are broadly in line with Comic Relief’s Urban Slums strategy; the overarching framework for the initiative sets out the following outcomes which aim to broadly capture the work of the 17 grants:

* Intermediate Outcome 1[[4]](#footnote-5): Local government policies and processes are more responsive to the rights and needs of slum dwellers
* Intermediate Outcome 2: A more informed, collaborative and influential civil society is responding to priority slum issues
* Immediate Outcome 1[[5]](#footnote-6): Improved quality of and access to economic livelihoods for slum dwellers
* Immediate Outcome 2: Improved access to quality water and sanitation services
* Immediate Outcome 3: Improved access to quality health and education services for slum dwellers
* Immediate Outcome 4: Improved security of people in slum communities

Outcomes and indicators were initially developed as a result of a grantee-led process in each city and were then aggregated into an overarching framework. This framework forms the basis of annual reporting from Comic Relief to DfID. There is an ongoing aspiration to encourage collaboration at the city level and whilst there are some examples emerging, Comic Relief intends to facilitate some further learning and collaboration opportunities such as exchanges and learning workshops. The grants are now in full implementation phase and Comic Relief has already started to receive Year 1 reports (see Annex 2 for a timeline of the grantees’ projects within the Four Cities Initiative).

**Rationale for this evaluation**

The Four Cities Initiative represents a new approach for Comic Relief as a grant maker and manager, in terms of how it supports a group of grantees to strengthen the approaches and results of grantees’ projects, individually and collectively. This initiative therefore presents a unique opportunity for a targeted ***learning-focused*** **evaluation** forComic Relief, DfID and the grantees **to help understand whether/how collaboration influences (either positively or negatively) the effectiveness of grantees’ (collectively or individually) project approaches and interactions with other stakeholders for sustainable urban slum development and how grant makers can facilitate and support such collaboration between grantees.** The evaluation may also examine specific examples of successful collaboration within individual projects (e.g. between a grantee and slum dwellers or between a grantee and government agencies) where this can add value to understanding how such collaboration can be developed and supported. This evaluation intends to examine specific cases where collaboration has been successful/unsuccessful, rather than all 17 grants.

This evaluation is **not**, therefore, looking to contribute to the already extensive literature on what works and doesn’t work in urban slums development in terms of technical and programmatic focus, nor is it looking to assess the performance of individual projects or the initiative as a whole.[[6]](#footnote-7) Rather it is exploring how the specific aspect of collaboration can be supported and developed by grant makers and grantees to feed into and strengthen urban slum development.

This document sets out the broad scope of work for this evaluation as a basis for expressions of interest from interested parties.

1. THEORY OF CHANGE OF THE FOUR CITIES INITIATIVE

Comic Relief’s traditional approach to grant-making has been through a ‘reactive’ process of selecting projects (through a thorough assessment process) from proposals submitted to one of Comic Relief’s regular cycles of grant funding. This has provided a wide array (both geographically and technically) of different projects under Comic Relief’s International Grants Strategy. The Four Cities Initiative was designed to test a new approach to both Comic Relief’s grant-making and management and the way in which grantees implement projects for urban slum development (one of seven goal areas under the International Grants Strategy). This was based on the idea that “the whole is greater than the sum of its parts”. At the centre of the initiative is the assumption that collaboration between and across different stakeholders (communities, civil society organisations, city authorities, the private sector etc.) can strengthen the individual contributions of each and better support systemic, sustainable city level development and change that is responsive to the needs of the poor.

Responsiveness in this context implies the willingness, knowledge and capacity of different stakeholders to engage meaningfully with urban slum dwellers, understand and be able to respond appropriately and effectively to their needs at local and city-wide levels, and be accountable to them in their design, delivery and investment in urban services and development. An important aspect for DfID and Comic Relief is responsiveness of urban development to the *most* marginalised (whether that be from factors of gender, disability, ethnicity, income, age etc.) who may be excluded from existing local structures and mechanisms of representation due to power dynamics within communities and institutions.

To improve the effective collaboration of civil society organisations with city authorities and other stakeholders, the Four Cities Initiative seeks to increase the collaboration *between* grantees (both within each city and across the four cities, and across the various UK and local grantee partners). The assumption is that working together may create new opportunities and strengthen the capacity of grantees to engage with and influence other stakeholders, as well as enhancing their own capacity and quality/scale of delivery.

In order to provide a common basis for collaboration, Comic Relief took a proactive approach to making grants for this initiative. Four cities were selected to focus on[[7]](#footnote-8) and, after an initial in-country scoping process and introductory workshops with potential grantees and partners, organisations were invited to submit individual project applications within the broad parameters of the initiative (the scoping studies will be made available to successful applicants). These applications were then assessed in-country. This more engaged approach enabled Comic Relief to identify a more complementary portfolio of projects to fund than may have resulted from the traditional reactive grant-making approach, whilst retaining the ownership of grantees in identifying the specific issues, technical focus and approach of their projects.

The initiative seeks to develop a high trust model of collaboration, recognising that meaningful and effective collaboration between grantees must be owned and driven by the grantees themselves in ways that best suit their needs and in which they can clearly see the benefits. Comic Relief (with consultancy support from TripleLine[[8]](#footnote-9)) has sought to act as an initial catalyst for this collaboration through facilitating the grantees in the development of shared city monitoring, evaluation and learning frameworks and reviewing project start up forms and baseline studies against these frameworks. From this initial catalysing support the expectation is that grantees will develop the scope, scale, focus and types of collaboration in ways that are realistic, viable and meaningful for the work that they are doing and the context in which they are working.

This overall approach reflects the principles of the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, harmonisation, results and mutual accountability) in seeking to support locally-identified and locally-driven projects, and understanding how these can work together to identify complementarities, avoid duplication and strengthen their individual and collective voices and approaches to enhance the development outcomes of their work.

There is initial evidence that there is increased collaboration between grantees (a key example being a coordinated response of the Freetown grantees around the Ebola crisis), with pre-existing levels of relationships between grantees as well as the power dynamics between grantees and critical stakeholders at a city level shaping both the focus and depth of collaboration emerging. It should be recognised that for many of the grantees, Year 1 of their projects has been dominated with set up and a focus on implementation and it is only now that their attention is moving towards maximising on opportunities for collaboration.

1. SCOPE OF THE WORK

**Principles underpinning the evaluation**:

DfID and Comic Relief are keen to ensure that the evaluation:

* Results in learning that is useful not just for current grantees, DfID and Comic Relief but the sector more broadly;
* Builds on the priority learning areas of grantees and
* Solicits input at key points from grantees and key identified stakeholders.

**Evaluation objectives**

The objectives of the evaluation are to understand:

1. How Comic Relief, as a grant-maker, can best support effective collaboration between grantees working in urban slum development and, where/if applicable, more broadly;
2. What types of collaboration amongst urban practitioners (including government officials, NGO staff (international and local), researchers, private sector actors and community actors) have emerged (if any) as a result of the Four Cities Initiative (both across grantees and within individual projects); and
3. Whether this collaboration contributes to, or hinders, effective urban development that is responsive to urban slum dwellers (particularly the most marginalised) and if so, how and in what ways it has done this (both across grantees and within individual projects)

The evaluation will have a primary emphasis on learning rather than accountability. The evaluation will need to look at:

* multiple levels of collaboration (between grantees, between lead grantee organisations and partners, between individual or groups of grantees and slum dwellers, city authorities and other stakeholders)
* different degrees of collaboration (communication, cooperation, formal joint actions etc.)
* different focuses of collaboration (for advocacy, for information sharing, for joint technical approaches, for learning etc.)
* and different types/models of collaboration (informal or formal networks, coalitions, strategic partnerships etc.)

The evaluation will also need to take into account how collaboration is affected by the specific nature of urban slum development, including the economic and social insecurity of slum dwellers and the power relationships and political issues involved in the relationships between slum dwellers, civil society organisations and urban authorities.

**Proposed evaluation questions:**

Having considered a) the collaborative nature of this initiative, b) the outcomes captured in the framework and c) the project level work being funded, *and* having sought input from grantees and key stakeholders, the following evaluation questions are proposed:

1. How has the approach chosen by Comic Relief to catalyse and support the collaborative aspects of this initiative affected how collaboration has developed? (relevance and effectiveness)
2. How does the operating context within each city affect collaboration and the responsiveness of stakeholders and how does it help or hinder change? (relevance)
3. What successful collaborative approaches have emerged to support better understanding and responses to the diverse needs of slum dwellers (particularly the most marginalised)? What approaches worked less well and why? (efficiency)
4. To what extent is the collaborative approach taken by the initiative supporting improved responsiveness of city authorities and other key stakeholders to the needs of marginalised people within each of the 4 cities? (effectiveness)
5. What are the changes in the lives of slum dwellers as a result of the collaborative aspects of the initiative? (effectiveness and impact)

Indicative sub-questions for the evaluation are presented in Annex 1, and we would expect the evaluators to develop and refine these during the inception phase.

1. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

Given the learning focus of this evaluation and the resources available, a case-based approach will be used. At a broad level this will involve understanding the initial collaborative support and the emerging focuses and forms of collaboration within the initiative, identifying a select number of cases that will provide useful insights into this range of collaborative approaches and their effectiveness, establishing the types and methods of data required to explore and analyse these cases, and then following how these cases develop over the remaining period of the initiative.

This will be a multiphase evaluation with an *indicative* schedule as follows:

Figure : Indicative evaluation phases, schedule and outputs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Inception phase** | **Data collection and analysis phase 1** | **Data collection and analysis phase 2 and final reporting** |
| *3 months*Collaboration framework development | *6 months*Mapping of emerging collaboration, and identification of sample cases | *20 months*Data collection and analysis on sample of cases | *20 months* Further data collection and analysis on sample of cases |
| *Initial inception report* | *City workshops* *Final inception phase report* | *Interim report* *Cross-city workshop* | *Final evaluation report*  |

We expect bidders to present an indicative framework of types and levels of collaboration in their proposal and the criteria that would be used to evaluate collaboration (whether OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability or other criteria suggested by the bidder). This will be further developed and refined (based on a literature review and review of important documentation from the initiative) during the initial part of the inception phase and, once agreed, used to map the collaborative approaches under the initiative. The evaluation will need to analyse the particular operating and programmatic context in each city (the official structures and systems, the existing mechanisms of slum dweller participation and engagement, the portfolio of projects and grantees under the initiative in each city etc.) to feed into the final inception phase report that will cover each of the four cities. This report will detail the types of collaborative approaches emerging, the important contextual factors involved, a number of promising collaborative approaches to follow in each city from the typologies identified (in individual projects and across grantees) and how the evaluation will follow this sample during the rest of the evaluation period (what data will be collected and how, methodologies and analysis approaches etc.).

We expect bidders to present in their proposals, initial ideas on how they would approach the data collection and analysis of the selected cases. These will be refined and developed in consultation with the Steering Committee of the evaluation as part of the inception process and in light of the type of cases being selected. We welcome innovative and creative methodologies that will result in robust findings and useful learning from the cases being analysed. Where possible and appropriate, it would be expected that the evaluation will draw on existing data being collected by projects to avoid duplication of effort (e.g. scales of collaboration and influence on policy and practice were developed with grantees at the start of the initiative (see Annex 4), and are being used as part of project monitoring in some of the projects) and this will need to be assessed by the evaluation team during inception. This data will be supplemented and complemented by primary data collection from other sources undertaken by the evaluation team during the data collection and analysis phases of the evaluation.

The evaluation will gather data and undertake analysis during the projects’ implementation periods. Projects under the initiative have started at different times and so will be at different stages of implementation, and will have had different levels of engagement with the initial collaborative workshops in each city at the start of the initiative (see Annex 2). The evaluation will need to be able to take account of this in its approach and analysis (including using potential opportunities to examine issues of collaboration sustainability with projects that finish within the evaluation period), and bidders are expected to demonstrate how they might do this in their proposal.

Emerging interim findings from the first period of data collection and analysis will be presented in a workshop for grantees from across the four cities for discussion and learning, and the findings will be presented in an interim report.

A further period of data collection and analysis will then be carried out, resulting in a final evaluation report that will draw together the findings and learning on collaborative approaches for urban development that is responsive to the urban poor from across the four cities.

There should be a strong emphasis on participation, useability and learning for grantees as well as Comic Relief and other key stakeholders in this evaluation. It is expected that the evaluation team will use participatory methodologies to engage with each grantee in the initial stages of the evaluation and share emerging findings for discussion, validation and learning with grantees and key stakeholders at important points throughout the evaluation as indicated above.

Bidders are encouraged to reflect on this evaluation approach and suggest improvements and refinements in their proposal, as well as outlining proposed methodologies for taking the approach forward.

1. RISKS AND CHALLENGES OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation will require the development of ongoing relationships with grantees in identified cases. This leads to a number of risks:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Risk | Mitigation |
| Insufficient cases of substantive collaboration. | The risk of this is low as Comic Relief have already identified a number of promising areas for investigation evaluation. If collaboration is non-existent or collapses the evaluation needs to shift focus to understand how this happened and the effect on project implementation. |
| Insufficient buy-in from grantees in the process of evaluation | There is some risk if inappropriate cases are selected or that grantees do not see the relevance to their work. To mitigate this grantees have been consulted on this ToR. Further the reference group includes grantees. |
| Insufficient evidence to draw conclusions on effectiveness of the collaboration approach | Some collaboration is already evident in the programme. A case based approach enables a more limited focus in identified areas rather than trying to get a broader focus across the programme that would yield more shallow data. |
| Evaluators are unable to access the city environments to undertake the study | There is an ongoing risk that access to urban areas will be curtailed by natural or human related challenges. This will be managed with the reference group and steering committee. |

1. SAMPLING AND AVAILABLE DATA

As described above, the evaluation would be expected to begin with a broad overview of all projects under the initiative before narrowing down to follow a sample of collaboration cases within and across these in more detail. The sampling approach and criteria will therefore be developed during the inception period, with final selections made at the interim-reporting phase.

Existing data and documentation that the evaluation will be able to draw upon initially includes:

* Original scoping reports for each city and subsequent city overview documents prepared for DfID
* Individual project start up forms (showing project outcomes and indicators, many of which involve a specific outcome on learning and collaboration)
* Project baseline reports
* City frameworks (outcomes and indicators aggregated from across individual projects in each city) as well as the overarching framework and supporting documents
* City level workshop presentations and reports
* Annual project reports submitted by grantees to Comic Relief (including progress against each project outcome indicator and a specific collaboration section)
* Annual reports from Comic Relief to DfID
* End of contract reports from TripleLine to Comic Relief (detailing activities undertaken and learning points on encouraging collaboration and the grant-management approach)

As noted above, the evaluation team should also draw on the quantitative and qualitative data already being collected by projects’ own M&E systems (although it is important, as with the general approach taken throughout the evaluation, that this is approached in a manner that is sensitive to grantees’ capacities and avoids overburdening grantees). The quality of the data available is likely to be of variable quality. Review of the quality of data of potential cases will be included in the inception phase of the programme.

1. TARGET AUDIENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

The primary audiences for this evaluation will be Comic Relief, DfID and the initiative’s grantees, whilst other stakeholders involved in collaborations for responsive urban development (city authorities, slum communities, civil society organisations, private sector service providers etc.) and the broader urban development sector. Communication of the evaluation findings will be the responsibility of the Steering Committee and Reference Group (see below).

1. RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO CONTRACTORS

Comic Relief will provide support to the consultant evaluation team in contacting and liaising with grantees, particularly at the start of the evaluation and around any workshops to be held during the evaluation.

The consultant evaluation team is expected to supply and manage their own logistic requirements, including for in-country visits, and to be responsible for the organisation, logistics and delivery of all workshops and events carried out under the evaluation (which should be included in the budget submitted as part of the proposal). Multi-country evaluations can raise significant logistical and coordination challenges, and proposals will need to demonstrate that the evaluation team has sufficient management and coordination structures and processes to address these challenges.

1. DUTY OF CARE

The contracted evaluation team will be responsible for their own safety and well-being, including appropriate security arrangements. The contracted team will also be responsible for the provision of suitable security arrangements for their domestic and business property. The contracted team is responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security briefings for all of their Personnel working under this contract. Travel advice is available on the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) website and the contracted team must ensure that they are up to date with the latest position.

Bidders must develop their proposal on the basis of being fully responsible for Duty of Care in line with the details provided above. Bidders must confirm in the proposal that they have capability to manage their Duty of Care responsibilities throughout the life of the contract. Bidders should consider the following questions in this regard:

* Have you completed an initial assessment of potential risks that demonstrates your knowledge and understanding, and are you satisfied that you understand the risk management implications?
* 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 (if any), are appropriately trained (including specialist training where required) before they are deployed and will you ensure that on-going 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 one in place if you are awarded the contract)?
* Have you ensured or will you ensure that your staff (if any) are provided with and have access to suitable equipment and will you ensure that this is reviewed and provided on an on-going basis?
* Have you appropriate systems in place to manage an emergency / incident if one arises?
1. OUTPUTS

The successful bidder will be expected to produce:

* An **initial** **inception report** that presents the final evaluation questions and sub-questions, a detailed evaluation approach (including a framework of collaborative typologies and levels to be used in the mapping and sample selection) and an evaluation work plan and timeline.
* At least one grantee **workshop** in each city to verify and discuss emerging findings on the mapping of collaborative approaches and city contexts
* A final **inception phase report** that presents the collaborative approaches and contexts in each city, commonalities across cities, the selection of a sample of promising collaborative approaches to follow in detail, and the methodologies, work plans and tools to be used in these case studies
* At least one **workshop** bringing grantees (UK and local partners) together from across the four cities to discuss interim findings and learning
* An **interim** **report** presenting the interim findings from the case study sample of collaborative approaches
* **Progress reports** as agreed with the Steering Committee
* A **final evaluation report** pulling together findings, learning and recommendations on collaborative approaches from across the four cities (including city-specific annexes on the findings and recommendations of the case studies in each city)
* A 1 page highlights of the final report, a 3 page evaluation brief and a 20 page summary report. These abbreviated reports are targeting a broader policy audience who are not involved in the process of the evaluation. These reports will be written in plain English and in a format which is easily accessible to all stakeholders

Drafts of the inception, interim and final reports will be reviewed by the Steering Committee and the Reference Group, who will provide comments and feedback to the evaluation team before the final versions are prepared. Changes to the workshop schedule and the amount of involvement of the contractor in the workshops can be negotiated during the inception phase.

1. QUALITY STANDARDS

It is expected that the evaluation implementation and reporting will comply with the OECD-DAC quality standards for development evaluation.[[9]](#footnote-10)

Bidders are expected to outline an appropriate quality assurance process for the evaluation implementation and outputs, and the ethical guidelines they will follow in carrying out the evaluation.

The evaluation reports will also be submitted to the DfID quality assurance mechanism for review.

1. EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

The evaluation will be managed by a Steering Committee made up of DfID and Comic Relief representatives. The roles of the Steering Committee are:

* Prepare, review and sign off the Terms of Reference for the evaluation
* Lead the advertising, recruitment and selection process for an agency to do the evaluation and reach a joint decision
* Review and recommend approval of the inception report for the Evaluation and provide comments and recommendations for any improvements, if needed
* Review and recommend approval of any milestone reports and the final report for the Evaluation prepared by the commissioned agency and contribute comments and recommendations for any improvements if needed
* Review and recommend approval of the final report to ensure that it meets international quality standards and fulfils the methodology and approach agreed in the inception report
* Lead management response to the evaluation
* Prepare and oversee a communications plan for the results of the evaluation

An Evaluation Reference Group has also been established, consisting of key stakeholders working in urban slums contexts in sub-Saharan Africa and representing the grantees under the initiative. The Reference Group’s role is:

* Review and comment on the Terms of Reference for the evaluation
* Review the inception report for the Evaluation and provide comments and recommendations for any improvements, if needed
* Review any milestone reports and the final report for the Evaluation prepared by the commissioned agency and contribute comments and recommendations for any improvements if needed
* Review of the final report to ensure that it meets international quality standards and fulfils the methodology and approach agreed in the inception report
* Review management response to the evaluation
* Take an active role in the communication and dissemination plan for the findings of the evaluation and fostering adoption of lessons learnt

An institution or team of consultants, with support from the Steering Committee and input from the Reference Group, will be selected to carry out the evaluation according to these Terms of Reference.

1. TIMEFRAME

The consultancy is likely to start in July 2015 and finish by December 2019 at the latest. The indicative timeframes and milestone reports are set out in figure 1 above, but may be flexible according to approach. Bidders will be expected to outline a workplan and milestones for the evaluation in their proposal, and exact dates will be finalised as part of the inception phase.

1. TENDERING PROCESS

**Required qualifications and skills**

Contractors would need to have:

* Sound and proven experience and expertise in social research and evaluation concepts and methodologies
* Proven capacity to manage and carry out a multi-country evaluation exercise
* Sound and proven expertise in managing, aggregating and compiling large amounts of data
* Experience of working with local civil society organisations
* An understanding of grant making and grant management processes
* Proven experience and deep understanding of issues that face people living in urban slums and of current practice, policy and international debates in the urban development sector
* Proven expertise in writing in an accessible format
* Relevant country experience
* A mixture of international and national consultants

We also welcome joint bids where it is clear that each partner can bring a particular expertise that will enhance and maximise the outcome of the evaluation. Such joint bids will be expected to be clear on the roles, relationship and responsibilities between the different partners.

Successful bidders would be able to review Comic Relief’s scoping studies and contextual information upon which granting decisions were made.

## Tenders will need to include:

1. Basic information about the organisation(s) submitting the bid and their experience relevant to this evaluation
2. Any comments on the TOR
3. Detailed approach and methodology for the work
4. Timeline and workplan for the evaluation, including key milestones
5. CVs of key personnel and their proposed roles in the evaluation team
6. Levels of effort for each personnel member
7. Budget, setting out detailed personnel costs and operational project costs (including VAT where appropriate)
8. Payment schedule against milestones
9. 2 examples of previous similar work
10. Name and contact of two independent referees

Tenders will be scored against the following criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criteria | Weighting (%) |
| Organisational capacity and expertise of the institution | 10 |
| Team profile and experience | 30 |
| Proposed approach and methodology (relevance, rigour, practicality, emphasis on learning, participation and useability) | 35 |
| Samples of previous work (coherence, clarity, relevance) | 10 |
| Costings (appropriateness and value for money) | 15 |

## Contract value

The final budget for the consultancy is subject to negotiation with the successful contractor(s), and will be based on the approach agreed between the contractor and the Steering Committee. However, the total budget for the consultancy should be £150,000-175,000. This figure includes all related expenses (including international travel) and taxes.

To discuss this invitation further or to submit an Expression of Interest please contact Jake Grout-Smith (j.grout-smith@comicrelief.com) and copy in Jeff McConnell (J.McConnell@comicrelief.com). Expressions of Interest should be received by **5pm on Friday 10th July**. Shortlisted candidates will be invited to Comic Relief to discuss their proposal in greater detail with interviews tentatively planned for the week of 27th July 2015.

Annex 1: Indicative evaluation sub-questions

These sub-questions are indicative to help guide bidders on the specific areas that the evaluation is expected to cover. The evaluation questions and sub-questions will be finalised with the contracted evaluation team during the inception phase.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Main evaluation question | Indicative sub-questions |
| 1. How has the approach chosen by Comic Relief to catalyse and support the collaborative aspects of this initiative affected how collaboration has developed? (relevance and effectiveness)
 | Was the proactive approach to grant-making effective in providing a basis for collaboration and city-level influencing? |
| In what ways did Comic Relief’s grant-making and grant management processes support or hinder collaboration in the initiative and for each grantee? Has this differed between UK-led and locally-led projects? How? |
| Was Comic Relief and TripleLine’s support to collaboration amongst the grantees catalytic, too little or too much to develop sustainable and appropriate collaborative approaches between grantees? |
| Has the initiative improved grantees’ capacities for collaboration? |
| Did Comic Relief’s approach (including proactive grant-making, contracting consultancy support, carrying out MEL workshops etc.) represent value for money? |
| 1. How does the operating context within each city affect collaboration and the responsiveness of stakeholders and how does it help or hinder change? (relevance)
 | How have the official and community systems and structures (both formal and informal) influenced stakeholders’ willingness and capacities to collaborate, advocate for improvements and be responsive? How does this differ across sectors (WASH, housing etc.)? |
| How has the context influenced the focus of collaboration taken by the grantees in each of the Four Cities? Has this focus been targeted to the appropriated bottlenecks in responsive urban development? |
| What have been the factors that have supported and hindered collaboration between grantees (pre-existing relationships, common sectoral/geographical focus etc.)? |
| 1. What successful collaborative approaches have emerged to support better understanding and responses to the diverse needs of slum dwellers (particularly the most marginalised)? What approaches worked less well and why? (efficiency)
 | What successful forms of collaboration have emerged within projects and across projects (and across cities)? What opportunities have emerged from this collaboration? |
| Who have been involved in these approaches (UK or local grantees, other civil society organisations, slum dwellers, city authorities, private providers etc.) and how have these stakeholders been engaged? |
| How have the needs and voices of the most marginalised been engaged in these approaches? |
| How have different levels and types of collaboration combined to enhance the influence on key stakeholders and link bottom up with top down approaches to urban development? |
| Have these approaches facilitated moving from influencing specific slum areas to influencing a broader city focus? How? |
| What have been the costs and challenges for projects and grantees in developing this collaboration, and how have these been managed? |
| Are these approaches sustainable beyond the initiative? |
| 1. To what extent is the collaborative approach taken by the initiative supporting improved responsiveness of city authorities and other key stakeholders to the needs of marginalised people within each of the 4 cities? (effectiveness)
 | To what extent are city authorities and other key stakeholders responsive (in terms of knowledge, attitudes, practices, systems and structures, capacities etc.) to urban slum dwellers and how has this changed over the period of the Four Cities Initiative? |
| To what extent do these changes incorporate responsiveness to the most marginalised groups of urban slum dwellers? |
| What contributions have the collaborative approaches within the projects, and across the projects, made to these changes? |
| To what extent have these changes moved from influencing specific slum areas to influencing a broader city-level approach? |
| What have been the key barriers to influencing key stakeholders’ responsiveness? |
| Are these changes institutionalised and sustainable? |
| 1. What are the changes in the lives of slum dwellers as a result of the collaborative aspects of the initiative? (effectiveness and impact)
 | Has the initiative improved the ability and capacities of slum dwellers to organise themselves and advocate for changes to local authorities? |
| What changes have slum dwellers valued? What changes have been unwanted? Why? |
| What demands have the collaborative approaches made on slum dwellers? Have these been appropriate and proportionate to the changes achieved? Are these demands sustainable? |

Annex 2: Four Cities Initiative timeline



Annex 3: Project summaries under the Four Cities Initiative[[10]](#footnote-11)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grantees** | **Project summary** |
| **LUSAKA: Tiyende Pamodzi Partners** |
| **UK Organisation:**[Reall](http://reall.xyz/)( Real Equity for All – trading name of Homeless International) **Partner Organisations:** [People’s Process on Housing and Poverty in Zambia (PPHPZ)](http://www.peoplesprocess.org/), Zambia Homeless and Poor People’s Federation (ZHPPF), [Lusaka City Council](http://www.lcc.gov.zm/), and [University of Zambia](http://www.unza.zm/) (UNZA)  | **Project Title:** Community-led urban slum upgrading programme (CUSUP)**Project Summary:** This project will develop the information base needed for informal settlements to be recognised as an important part of Lusaka and establish a means for the rights of urban poor communities to be included in the planning and provision of public services. The initiative will be implemented on a tripartite basis by Peoples’ Process on Housing and Poverty Zambia (PPHPZ), Lusaka City Council (LCC) and University of Zambia (UNZA) working with organisations of people living in informal settlements. The expected results will include better data and knowledge about Lusaka’s informal settlements, a comprehensive bottom-up and citywide slum prevention strategy, an enhanced capacity for slum upgrading on the part of local authorities and communities, and an assessment of the feasibility of establishing a City Development Fund designed to finance slum upgrading. |
| **UK Organisation:** CARE UK International**Partner Organisation:** CARE Zambia | **Project Title:** Peri-Urban Community-driven models for equitable services (COMEQS) project**Project Summary:** Residents of informal settlements in Lusaka suffer from inadequate garbage disposal services. Littering, dumping and burning of waste results in disease, water pollution, contamination of land and hazardous blockage of drainage systems. The project will test new approaches to fee collection for garbage collection services in order to find ways to improve solid waste management systems and make them sustainable. Improved services are expected to lead to secure livelihoods for waste collectors, stronger collaboration between community-based organisations, better environmental conditions, an improved quality of life for residents, and options for replication in other urban settlement in Zambia. |
| **UK Organisation:** WSUP (Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor)**Partner Organisations: WSUP Zambia,** Kanyama and Chazanga Water Trusts; and Lusaka Water and Sewage Company (LWSC) | **Project Title:** Strengthened Sanitation Services in Peri Urban Areas**Project Summary:** Most people living in the peri urban areas of Lusaka use a latrine for sanitation, often a covered pit latrine shared with a number of households. Many of these latrines are full because they cannot easily be emptied or relocated. When annual flooding occurs pits overflow leading to highly unsanitary conditions and a high incidence of disease and illness. In response, Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP) and Lusaka Water and Sanitation Company (LWSC) have developed an innovative approach to faecal sludge management which addresses critical barriers in the sanitation chain – the capture, transport, treatment and potential re-use of waste from pit latrines in a safe and sustainable way. WSUP and LWSC have established a pilot pit emptying service, managed by Water Trusts (WTs). WTs are community- based structures, which operate water and sanitation services on behalf of LWSC. WSUP is working with WTs in the slum settlements of Kanyama and Chazanga to pilot this new approach to faecal sludge management whereby households are expected to pay to have their pits emptied and the waste safely transported and treated. The project will seek to scale up the outreach and efficiency of the service being provided, further develop and test the way in which the service can be delivered better, and establish a basis for larger scale replication across informal settlements in Lusaka and other cities. |
| **UK Organisation**: Y Care International**Partner Organisations:** YWCA and Woman & Law in Southern Africa (WLSA) | **Project Title:** Empowering young female slum dwellers to tackle gender based violence in Lusaka**Project Summary:** Up to 90% of women in Zambia experience intimate partner violence and a high proportion of those living in informal settlements in Lusaka. Many are unemployed, engage in transactional sex and regularly experience violence as a result. This project will create spaces where women can share their experiences, get counselling, and understand their rights. Working with social services, the police and others will strengthen women’s access to justice. Some women will also receive support to help them create small businesses. It will also work with younger men as part of an existing campaign encouraging them to reject violence against women and become positive role models themselves. |
| **KAMPALA: Kampala Slum Transformation Initiative (KASTI) Partners** |
| **UK Organisation:** WaterAid UK**Partner Organisations:** WaterAid Uganda, AEE, CIDI, and Environmental Alert  | **Project Title:** Improving equitable access for the urban poor to water and sanitation services in Kampala**Project Summary:** This project will work with residents of a number of slum areas in Kampala to dramatically improve access to water and sanitation services, as well as increase understanding of the critical importance of hygiene. Latrines and water catchment tanks will be constructed in 25 schools. Hygiene education campaigns in the schools and wider community will complement a parallel initiative to build community-access latrines in the slum. Government workers will receive training in delivering improved water and sanitation services and community groups will be strengthened to hold local authorities to account. As a result, slum-dwellers, and particularly children, will access safe water and sanitation, improving school attendance and bringing measurably improved health and living conditions. |
| **Lead Organisation:** LWF (Lutheran World Federation)**Partner Organisations:** ACTogether, National Slum Dwellers Association of Uganda (NSDFU) and Development Research & Training (DRT),  | **Project Title:** Kampala Tugende! (Let’s go!)**Project Summary:** While the new Kampala Capital City Authority is taking steps to develop a more structured approach to Uganda’s rapid urban growth, it has limited knowledge or detailed information on the 50 or more different slums in the city. At the same time, slum dwellers in Kampala continue to voice frustration at the lack of opportunities to engage with government and help shape the communities in which they live. This project will help Kampala’s slum dwellers to organise themselves so that they can meaningfully participate in urban governance and development. Access to small loans and training will build livelihood opportunities and encourage saving and active citizenship. Data collected by slum dwellers will enable effective planning for upgrading informal settlements in partnership with government, while loan funds for improvements to basic services such as water and sanitation will begin to have a transformative effect on the living conditions for slum dwellers across all of Kampala’s five districts. |
| **UK Organisation:** Plan UK International**Partner Organisations:** Plan Uganda and UYDEL | **Project Title:** Partnership for empowerment of vulnerable girls and women in urban slums of Kampala City**Project Summary:** Based on the learning from a successful and inspiring pilot project, this proposal will support girls and young women exploited in sex work to find less risky alternatives to make a living. Through rehabilitation and vocational training, the project will help a total of 900 sex workers develop the skills and confidence to find employment or start a business. Those who are mothers will receive extra support to take better care of their children. Access to integrated services will also improve sexual and reproductive health for around 25,000 particularly vulnerable slum dwellers. At the same time, initiatives will be taken to ensure both local communities and those in positions of authority understand the importance of protecting the rights of young women and girls forced into sex work – and that appropriate laws and systems are in place to ensure that protection. |
| **Local Organisations:** Shelter and Settlement Alternatives and UCA (Uganda Cooperative Alliance) | **Project Title:** Participatory Housing Approaches Towards Improved Informal Settlements**Project Summary:** The need for sustainable housing solutions in Kampala becomes more critical by the month and many organisations continue to respond in different ways. But coordination and collaboration among stakeholders is poor, and there are currently few opportunities for organisations to share information – or to develop collective responses to issues such as the need for eviction guidelines that protect the rights of slum dwellers and provide appropriate options for resettlement. This project will address these issues in two ways. First, it will help slum dwellers to establish housing cooperatives that will give them a stronger voice and improve access to land. Secondly, it will support development of an effective network for organisations working to improve the urban and slum environments, increasing access to key information and creating opportunities to participate in policy formation. |
| **CAPE TOWN: Khayalethu Partners** |
| **Local Organisations:** Violence Prevention Through Urban Upgrading (VPUU) | **Project Title:** Lasting Change IKAPA Through VPUU**Project Summary:** For twenty years South Africa has struggled with a legacy of totally inadequate housing for the majority of the population. In 2012 the City of Cape Town built 7,000 new houses, but has an official waiting list of 400,000 families. Many of these people live in informal settlements where hundreds queue for water and toilets, there is little work or education, the majority of people may have HIV/AIDS and violence is endemic. Over the last six years a new programme has been developed to place people at the heart of developing their own communities. It allows them to make decisions, while at the same time providing stimulus through education, sport, work and safety. The people themselves then retain control of services – providing work and ownership. Working with City officials, this will now be rolled out into three new communities with especially challenging histories of violence and deprivation. This will provide basic services of water and toilets alongside a higher degree of safety. It will also bring work, education, health and a real sense of ownership throughout these communities, leading both to long term gains and models which can be replicated elsewhere. |
| **Local Organisations:** Community Organisation Resource Centre (CORC) | **Project Title:** A People’s Community Finance Facility in Cape Town**Project Summary:** Roughly one million people live in slums and settlements to the south east of Cape Town. Their houses and shacks are built on sand dunes with regular flooding and frequent fires. In most areas water and toilets are few and far between. It is expensive to reach the city where work may be. Over the next few years a further million people are predicted to be living here. For many years the city authorities have built houses and improved conditions – but only a few have benefited. This project will engage large numbers of poor people in saving small amounts every day. This commitment will allow them to access larger sums for local projects and towards improving their basic conditions. A capital fund largely managed by community members will be created for this purpose. Through these activities a new sense of community ownership and trust will have developed and residents will be supported to plan how best to improve their neighbourhood. Once this is established, the city authorities, in recognition of their engagement, has agreed to fund basic settlement improvements, mainly water, toilets and electricity |
| **Local Organisations:** Isandla Institute | **Project Title:** Developing communities of practice on informal settlement upgrading**Project Summary:** Over the last twenty years, living conditions for the majority of South Africa’s poor have hardly improved – and for many have worsened. There remains a massive task to provide even the most basic of facilities. Comic Relief is supporting two other organisations in Cape Town who are working to place the urban poor at the centre of changing their own lives. This has huge potential, but real progress will only be made if these organisations and other key players – including the City of Cape Town, local businesses and the urban poor – work and learn together. For these initial schemes to be scaled up, lessons and experiences gained from Cape Town need to be carefully recorded, analysed and shared. This project aims to provide the skills and opportunities to enable the two organisations to work together and with others. It will provide guidance as to where to focus, where and how to collect information. It will support the analysis of this information and how to share it with others to best effect. It will also identify where the work can influence policy and practice to scale up impact and significantly change large numbers of lives. |
| **FREETOWN: Pull Slum Pan Pipul Partners** |
| **UK Organisation:** Y Care International**Partner Organisations:** YWCA, Centre of Dialogue on Human Settlement & Poverty Alleviation (CODOHSAPA), Federation of Urban & Rural Poor (FEDURP) | **Project Title:** Empowering young slum dwellers for the social and economic transformation of slum communities in Freetown**Project Summary:** This project builds on a previous YCI/YMCA project in Freetown which enabled slum dwellers to access clean water, to develop new livelihood options, to access savings and loan services and to influence government’s policy on slums. This follow on project will expand the work to another 6 slums in Freetown. There will be a focus on vocational training and enterprise development, life skills and literacy training, youth-led hygiene and health programmes, youth-led advocacy and community disaster preparedness and management planning. New water and toilet facilities will be installed and a small grants programme will be established for use by participating communities. YMCA will also support the further development of the Centre for Dialogue on Human Settlement and Poverty Alleviation (CODOHSAPA) and its work in carrying out community mapping and enumeration, establishing community savings and loan schemes and organising communities to take a lead role in their own development. |
| **UK Organisation:** BRAC**PartnerOrganisations:** BRAC SL | **Project Title:** Improving sexual and reproductive health and creating sustainable livelihoods for youth (15-24 years – with a focus on girls) in Freetown slums in Sierra Leone.**Project Summary:** The project aims to improve the quality of life of people living in 10 slums in Freetown. Activities will be implemented to improve the sexual and reproductive health of young people, particularly young women, and to support youth to develop sustainable livelihoods through training and access to micro-finance loans and loans for enterprise development. An emphasis will be placed on working collaboratively with local and national government as well as with other non-governmental agencies working in Freetown slums. As a result of the project sexual and reproductive health is expected to significantly improve, livelihoods opportunities will be created and household incomes will be increased.  |
| **UK Organisation:** Transform Africa**PartnerOrganisation:** YDM (Youth Development Movement) | **Project Title:** Freetown Urban Slums Transformation Initiative**Project Summary:** This follow-on project intends to support young people, petty traders (particularly women) and other disadvantaged people living in 8 slums in Freetown, three of which YDM has already worked in. The project will provide vocational training and apprenticeships, affordable micro-credit loans and improvement of literacy, business and money management skills. It will also improve access to basic services, including water and improved drainage and provide hygiene training. The capacity of local CBOs will be strengthened and support provided to improve their advocacy skills, enhancing their ability to hold government to account. As a result there will be a healthier environment and increased incomes, especially for women young people and other marginalised groups, leading to a better quality of life in the slums. In addition the project will promote advocacy relating to streamlining of land tenure systems and seek to influence planning and national housing policy. |
| **UK Organisation:** Restless Development International UK**Partner Organisations:** Restless Development SL FAWE, CODOHSAPA and  | **Project Title:** Empowering Young Women and Girls in Freetown's Urban Slums**Project Summary:** The pilot project will be implemented in the eight most populated slums in Freetown and is aimed at addressing the root causes of SGBV. As a result of the project girls, young women and their communities will have increased knowledge and awareness of their rights and the laws related to SGBV and Sexual and Reproductive Health (SRH). There will be improved support services for victims of SGBV, as well as increased savings and wider opportunities for improved livelihoods and local community organisations will be better able to influence policy on issues of SGBV and SRH. |
| **UK Organisation:** University College London, UCL**Partner Organisations:** Njala University  | **Project Title:** Sierra Leone Urban Research Centre (SLURC) – Due to start in September 2015 **Project Summary:** Freetown’s slums are amongst the most difficult places to survive – let alone thrive - on earth. Faced with enormous challenges in providing shelter and services of any kind, there are many projects which attempt to improve living conditions. But they do so with little co-ordination or useful information on exactly the scale and extent of the problems. Through a new organisation linked to the University, this project will train and support people to bring existing and new information together on Freetown’s slums with the aim of contributing to Freetown’s first urban development plan. This could significantly improve the quality and coordination of services in the slums, leading to slums dwellers being more secure, safe and better off. |

Annex 4: Policy and Collaboration Scales



1. It should be noted that Comic Relief is not an ‘implementer’ but a grant maker. As such Comic Relief set the broad parameters of the initiative and was proactive in seeking potential grantees whose work would fit within these parameters. The specific technical focus, approach and scale of the individual projects were defined by potential grantees’ project proposals rather than a detailed programme or project framework defined by Comic Relief. Creating an overall outcome framework for the 17 projects has therefore been a bottom-up process of working from what the individual projects are doing. The logframe therefore represents a collation of activities and outcomes of grantees who may be operating through a variety of theories of change. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. A small amount of the funding remains unallocated to date and may be used for extending some existing projects or awarding a small number of shorter term grants [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Each grant involves a number of different partners (a lead agency and a number of local partners). There is a mix of UK-based lead agencies and locally-based lead agencies in the overall portfolio of grants. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Intermediate outcomes = Medium term changes that come about as a result of ongoing work by grantees with Comic Relief funding [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Immediate outcomes = Short-term changes achieved as a result of Comic Relief funding [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. The effectiveness and results of individual projects under this initiative will be the subject of more ‘standard’ end of project evaluations as part of Comic Relief’s agreement with each of the 17 grantees. These 17 independent project evaluations will be commissioned and managed by the individual grantees and will have a primary emphasis on accountability of the grantees to Comic Relief. Comic Relief may commission a separate synthesis of these 17 individual project evaluations to draw together some of the common aspects. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. An initial desk based scoping took place which involved scoring 16 cities (in 16 separate countries) against agreed criteria including the policy and development environments, slum conditions, NGO capacity and levels of collaboration, contribution and achievements of other development bodies etc., with a view to recommending where a Comic Relief intervention may have the greatest impact. This resulted in a shortlist of 4 cities which were then considered in further detail during an in-country scoping with a final recommendation to conduct the initiative in each of these 4 cities. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. TripleLine were contracted by Comic Relief in the inception period of the initiative to provide support to the monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) systems of grantees and help to initiate and facilitate the city-level collaborative aspects of the initiative. This has involved TripleLine carrying out MEL capacity development assessments with grantees, reviewing critical documents such as grantee’s start up forms and baseline reviews, and playing a critical role in the development and updating of the city and overarching frameworks through facilitating the city workshops and updating these frameworks according to projects’ baseline reviews and start up forms. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. See <http://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/qualitystandards.pdf>, section 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Please note: whilst the majority of Comic Relief applications are contracted to a UK based ‘lead applicant’, a number of grants under this initiative have been made directly to a local partner. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)