The SARH Systematic Review (SR) Programme for South Asia

Training Systematic Review (Systematic reviews by providing capacity building support): Request for Proposals

Issue date: 7th December, 2015

Last date of proposal submission: 18th January, 2016 (Monday) by 17:00 UK time

Attachments: Systematic review methodology brochure

Supported by

The SARH Systematic Review (SR) Programme for South Asia

Training Systematic Review: Request for Proposals

1. Background

The UK Department for International Development (DFID) promotes collection and use of high quality evidence to inform its policies and programmes. DFID's Research and Evidence Division (RED) leads commissioning and synthesis of research evidence. The South Asia Research Hub (SARH) works as part of RED to improve the outreach of its global research into country and regional programmes, and supports DFID country offices and their partners to be better users and commissioners of research.

The SARH Systematic Review (SR) Programme for South Asia

The South Asia Research Hub (SARH), DFID, has initiated a **Systematic Review (SR) Programme for South Asia**. The programme aims at providing DFID country offices, policymakers and development practitioners in South Asia with a robust assessment of the evidence base for their policies and programmes. The programme involves **commissioning research products, comprising of systematic reviews and evidence summaries**, in areas relevant to development priorities of South Asia to assess "what works" and "what does not" in development programming and policy making in the region. Further, **the programme aims to build capacity**, preferably of the South Asian institutions, for producing more systematic reviews and other rigorous evidence products in the region.

A particular emphasis of SARH (DFID) and the programme is on the quality and accuracy of the evidence produced, and contextualisation of results to the South Asia[1] (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Afghanistan and Myanmar in particular) to develop informed policy-making and programming in the region. This is an important step in strengthening the capacity for evidence-informed decision making.

The programme is established initially for two years.

Service provider to manage the programme

SARH (DFID) has selected a consortium of **PricewaterhouseCoopers Pvt. Ltd. (PwC), the Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Coordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre) and LIRNEasia** to implement the SARH SR programme in South Asia. The consortium (to be called the SR consortium hereafter) is **led by PwC** as the Lead Management Team (LMT) with **the EPPI-Centre** as the lead Quality Assurance Team (QAT); and **LIRNEasia** as the lead Capacity Building Team (CBT).

2. Systematic Reviews

"A systematic review is a high-level overview of primary research on a particular research question that tries to identify, select, synthesise and appraise all high-quality research evidence relevant to that question in order to answer it."

A L Cochrane; Effectiveness and Efficiency: Random Reflections on Health Services. London: Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust, 1972.

Systematic review teams seek all the research addressing a question, critically appraise its quality and synthesise the results. Systematic reviews are different from traditional literature reviews or expert commentaries in that they are pieces of research–transparent, rigorous and, in theory, replicable. They involve developing and publishing the protocol and carefully documenting the progress of the review in order to allow easy scrutiny of the methods.

For an overview of systematic review methodology, you may refer to the Systematic review methodology brochure attached to this RfP.

[1] For the purpose of this programme, the South Asian region (or South Asia) is understood as comprising of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Afghanistan and Myanmar.

Training Systematic Review: Systematic reviews under the programme will be categorised into "**Competitive Systematic Reviews**" (those which will be undertaken by teams having prior experience in conducting SRs) and **"Training Systematic Reviews**" (those which will be conducted by providing capacity building support to teams having basic technical skills required to conduct SRs). In essence, both competitive and training systematic reviews will adopt the same approach and methodology. However, the training systematic reviews are being commissioned for the purpose of capacity building in the South Asia region; hence teams conducting these reviews (to be called "**trainee teams"**) will be provided with residential and online training support to undertake systematic reviews. The training support will be provided without any charge to trainee teams.

This RfP is for inviting proposals for Training Systematic Reviews only.

3. Training Systematic Review Questions

The SR consortium, together with the SARH (DFID), has identified research questions for training systematic reviews under the programme. **Proposals are invited from interested organisations to undertake training systematic reviews for the questions provided below**.

Question no. 1 - Market-led rural development approaches: What is the effectiveness of market led development approaches in low and middle income countries? What are the factors which determine its success in subsistence and migration driven rural economies?

Question no. 2 - Natural Resource Revenue Management: What are the effects of various natural resource revenue management approaches adopted by countries rich in natural resources but experiencing fragile circumstances, including approaches for managing Natural Resource funds?

Question no. 3 - Urbanisation and insecurity: What is the impact of urbanisation on insecurity and urban violence? What is the impact of approaches for addressing insecurity or violence among urban population?

Please refer to **Appendix 4: Research briefing for systematic review questions** for details on each question.

There will be one award for each of these questions, but the SR consortium and SARH (DFID) may choose to fund fewer reviews if proposals of adequate quality are not received. Applicants interested to participate in more than one systematic review can do so by submitting separate proposals for each question

4. Methodology

Successful trainee teams are expected to conduct their review using approaches that will maximise both the rigour and relevance of their work to policy challenges in South Asia. They will be expected to choose their approach to suit the review question and the likely availability of primary studies[2]. They will discuss the options with the EPPI-Centre QA team before making a decision.

All systematic reviews will be conducted in two stages. The first stage will identify and describe the research available in terms of the focus, design and context of studies. The findings from this stage of the

[2] You may refer to these links for various systematic review approaches and study designs- http://www.systematicreviewsjournal.com/content/1/1/28

work will be presented to the review's Advisory Group (in the form of a presentation and working papers) for a discussion about the most useful and productive focus for the second stage. The second stage will involve studying the selected evidence in detail to answer the research question.

Trainee teams are expected to conduct their work in line with internationally recognised standards and procedures such as those advocated by:

- The PRISMA statement (http://www.prisma-statement.org/statement.htm) - for transparent and complete reporting of systematic reviews and meta-analysis
- AMSTAR (http://amstar.ca/index.php) - **A Measurement Tool to Assess Systematic Reviews**

They may choose to draw on resources and guidance elsewhere, such as:

- A checklist (http://www.3ieimpact.org/media/filer_public/2012/05/07/quality_appraisal_checklist_srdatabase.pdf) – used by DFID and 3ie for the quality appraisal of systematic reviews in the 3ie database.
- EPPI Centre (https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk) - part of the Social Science Research Unit at the UCL Institute of Education, focusing on systematic reviews in education, health and social policy;
- Campbell Collaboration (http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/) – Independent organisation producing systematic reviews on what works for education, health and social policy to build healthy and stable societies;
- Cochrane Collaboration (http://www.cochrane.org/) - Independent organisations producing systematic reviews for health interventions;
- International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie) (http://www.3ieimpact.org/)

Registering with the EPPI-Centre: Successful trainee teams will register their reviews with the EPPI-Centre. The Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre) is part of the Social Science Research Unit at the UCL Institute of Education. (https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/). It undertakes and supports policy-relevant systematic reviews of the evidence in a range of key areas of education, social policy, health, social welfare, and international development.

Quality assurance support: The EPPI-Centre is providing quality assurance for the programme and will provide support to trainee teams including: advice from the EPPI-Centre information specialist in preparing the search strategy; online systematic review training; arranging peer review of draft protocols and draft reports; and methodological support throughout the review process.

Access to information management software for systematic reviews, "EPPI-reviewer[3]", will be provided to trainee teams without any charge under the programme (for the purpose of systematic reviews & evidence summaries under the programme only).

[3] EPPI-Reviewer (see http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?alias=eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/er4) is a comprehensive online software tool, from the EPPI-Centre, that supports conducting all types of systematic reviews such as statistical meta-analysis, framework synthesis and thematic synthesis. This tool has the functionalities to manage a systematic review through every stage of operation from searching references, storing, coding, data extraction, study

Capacity building support to trainee teams: Trainee teams will be invited to attend two training programmes, organised by the SR consortium. These trainings will be provided to trainee teams **without any charge** and all expenses for attending these, including travel[4] and stay, will be funded from the programme. These training programmes will include residential as well as online training sessions. Online training sessions will be customised to the specific requirements of each trainee team.

The training programme will cover the following topics:

First training programme	Second training programme
▪ Principles and rationale of systematic review ▪ Use of logic models and other conceptual frameworks ▪ Searching and identifying literature ▪ Study designs and best available evidence ▪ Data extraction or coding and management ▪ Project management for systematic reviews	▪ Principles of synthesis ▪ Coding of studies to prepare for synthesis ▪ Assessment of risk of bias ▪ Effect size calculation ▪ Synthesis of the quantitative or qualitative studies ▪ Analysing contextual relevance to South Asia ▪ Drawing conclusions and developing implications from the findings

Further, the Capacity building team of the SR consortium (LIRNEasia) will support trainee teams in addressing comments of peer reviews and in improving the protocols and draft reports.

Please refer to Appendix 1 for details on capacity building and quality assurance support to be provided under the programme.

Formation of an advisory group: Trainee teams will be required to set up an advisory group for each review. Each advisory group should consist of at least three members. Out of these, one or two members will be from SARH and / or DFID country offices. A minimum of two members will be suggested by the trainee teams, of which at least one member should be a sector / domain expert. Teams will be required to set-up the advisory group at the start of the review. Trainee teams will involve, discuss and take the feedback from the advisory group at key points of the systematic review process. Bidders are required to provide CVs for proposed team members in their technical proposal.

Protocol preparation: A protocol helps review teams in describing and explaining their methods for answering the review question in an appropriate and explicit way. A protocol is an essential component of an open, consultative approach to undertaking reviews. Trainee teams will be expected to develop the protocol with the involvement of the advisory group, the EPPI-Centre support group (EPPI-SG) and SARH (DFID). Please see the EPPI-Centre website (https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?tabid=88) for guidance on preparing protocols and final reports (Gough et al. 2012).

The trainee teams will prepare a **preliminary protocol** during stage I with a clear search strategy for this stage. Based on the results of stage I and conclusions of discussion with advisory group, the protocol will be revised before the beginning of stage II to clearly define the scope review, search strategy and inclusion criteria. This will be called the **final protocol** for the systematic review.

The protocol should include the following sections: (1) Background; (2) Objectives; (3) Review team; (4) Methods (inclusion criteria, search strategy, methods of appraisal and data analysis); (5) Timeline; (6) Statement of conflicts of interest, if any; (7) References.

classification, review synthesis through review management etc. Being a web-based system, this tool also allows multiple users at a time from different locations.

[4] Travel cost for training programme will be provided from selected South Asian countries (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Afghanistan and Myanmar) to the place of training.

Evidence search: There are several research databases which include primary research studies and systematic reviews on international development. Teams will be expected to search SR databases to find existing reviews related to their respective research questions. Existing SRs on related topics can help trainee teams in finding suitable primary studies as well as in refining their methodology for conducting the reviews. Examples can be found in the following databases:

- Research for Development (http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/SystematicReviews.aspx)
- 3ie/DFID systematic review database (http://www.3ieimpact.org/en/evidence/systematic-reviews/)
- EPPI-Centre-Evidence Library (https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?tabid=56)
- The Environmental Evidence Library (http://www.environmentalevidence.org/Library.html)
- Evidence Aid (www.evidenceaid.org)
- Health Systems Evidence (http://www.mcmasterhealthforum.org/healthsystemsevidence-en)
- WHO Reproductive Health Library (http://apps.who.int/rhl/en/)
- WHO electronic Library of Evidence for Nutrition Actions (eLENA) (http://www.who.int/elena/en/)
- Epistemonikos (http://www.epistemonikos.org/)

Teams will also be expected to search for primary studies on key on-line databases specific to international development. This is a very important step in conducting SRs and hence it is required that trainee teams comprehensively search for existing literature and primary studies in areas related to their research question.

Trainee teams may refer to the guide provided by Campbell Collaboration "Systematic Reviews in International Development: Key Online Databases", which provide information about key electronic databases to search when undertaking an international development related systematic review. (http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/artman2/uploads/1/Database_Guide_for_SRs_in_International_Development__.pdf).

For conducting Systematic reviews, **it is important that trainee teams have access to such databases and journals that publish and provide primary research and study papers in relevant sectors.** *Applicants are thus required to provide information regarding relevant databases and journals that they have access to in their proposals.*

Systematic review summary document & contextualisation document: Along with the detailed report of the final systematic review, the teams will be expected to prepare a **systematic review summary** document (not more than 4-5 pages) and a power point presentation to present review findings to DFID advisors and other relevant stakeholders. The SR summary document will have to be supplemented with a **contextualisation document** that analyses and presents the relevance of review findings for the South Asia region and specific South Asian countries (if required). The contextualisation document will be particularly important where the search for evidence finds only a few studies in the South Asian context and the Systematic review includes evidence largely from other regions. The contextualisation document may also include issues for readers to consider when drawing on the findings for South Asian region.

Peer Review: Trainee teams will be required to submit their protocols and draft reports to academic and policy specialists, and experienced systematic reviewers who will assess the work in terms of its relevance for the review question, methods for addressing the review question, and their involvement of potential users in the work. Our Quality assurance team (The EPPI-Centre) will provide support to trainee teams in arranging for the peer review of a) protocols and b) draft/final reports**.**

Dissemination: An important part of the review process is the dissemination of the final report and research findings. Trainee teams should identify who the report is intended for at an early stage of the review. Trainee teams will be expected to undertake dissemination of research findings by developing summaries and abstracts which will be published on various online and print media platforms and by participating in events involving sector discussions. Trainee teams will also be required to organise a dissemination workshop towards the end of the review. The purpose of the workshop will be to disseminate findings of the review and to discuss the viewpoints and perspectives of policy-makers and stakeholders.

In addition to above, trainee teams may be invited by DFID or the SR consortium for one-to-one discussion or meeting with relevant stakeholders or for making presentation to them. As the requirement for these meetings / presentations cannot be envisaged in advance, hence travel expenses relating to these for the review teams will be reimbursed separately, based on actual expenses.

Coordination: Trainee teams will be expected to liaise efficiently with the SR consortium (specifically with LMT and QAT) and SARH (DFID) during the review process to ensure that timelines are kept and reviews are progressing in a desirable manner. Further, trainee teams will also coordinate with the advisory group and peer reviewers during appropriate stages of the review.

5. Deliverables

1. The **final Protocol** to be submitted for review not later than the end of **4th month** from commencing the contract, which will include (1) Background; (2) Objectives; (3) Review team; (4) Methods (inclusion criteria, search strategy, methods of appraisal and data analysis); (5) Timeline; (6) Statement of conflicts of interest; (7) References. The final protocol will be signed off by, registered and published at the EPPI- Centre.

2. A draft report, including all elements of the final systematic review, not later than the **end of 10th month** (from date of contract signing) to the SR Consortium. It will be reviewed by the EPPI-Centre, peer reviewers (as arranged by QAT) and approved by SARH (DFID).

   The report will include (1) Structured abstract (background, methods, results, conclusions). (2) Executive summary; (3) Background; (4) Objectives; (5) Methods; (6) Search results; (7) Details of included studies; (8) Synthesis results; (9) Limitations; (10) Conclusions and recommendations; (11) References (included studies and studies excluded when inspecting full reports). The systematic review report will also include a section on policy relevant implications of findings.

3. The **final report,** in **one month from** receiving comments on the draft report from the EPPI-Centre and the SARH (DFID).

4. **Systematic review summary document** (not more than 4-5 pages), to be submitted along with the final report, in a language accessible to non-specialists, and including:

   - Key messages for policy-makers, practitioners and/or researchers which provides the headline findings of the review;
   - The purpose of the systematic review and the question(s) it seeks to answer;
   - Summary of main findings of the paper(s);

- Broad findings relating to the body of evidence as a whole;
- Reflections on the assumptions and quality of the evidence;
- Specific gaps in the evidence relating to important policy concerns;
- Visual representation of key evidence to help with readers understanding and to attract their attention;
- An overview of the evidence more detailed than is given in the short summary above, relevant for policy-makers and development practitioners, and referring to policy implications wherever appropriate.
- Relevance of the review findings for the South Asian region and specific South Asian countries (if required); this section will also present issues for readers to consider when drawing on the findings for the South Asian region.

5. **An accompanying contextualisation document**
6. Quarterly **status reports,** to be submitted to PwC describing progress till the relevant date.
7. A **presentation** on key findings from the final report to SARH (DFID) at the end of the study. This will include presentation at an external meeting/seminar or any other event/conference that will be decided and agreed with SARH (DFID) in due course.
8. Trainee teams will be encouraged to produce various types of **dissemination** products, which may include, but not limited to popular columns, blog postings, leaflets, newsletters, etc. for different types of audiences to encourage debate and uptake in the region to a larger extent. Trainee teams will also organise a dissemination workshop towards the end of the study.
9. All deliverables must include SARH (DFID) and the SR Consortium branding, acknowledgement of funding and a disclaimer declaring that the deliverables are independent research products. The deliverables must be provided in an editable format; Word documents or equivalent using templates to be provided by the SR consortium.

6. Team Composition and Desired Expertise

The trainee team composition should meet these criteria:

- Members with sector experience and good familiarity with specific issues covered by the research question;
- Members with experience in conducting impact evaluations or empirical research;
- An information scientist or experienced librarian to undertake and supervise searching;
- Members with statistical expertise for quantitative analysis / statistical meta-analysis; and / or
- Members with expertise in qualitative synthesis methods and theory of change analysis.

Note: Depending on the requirement of the review, it may be possible that only quantitative or qualitative expert will be required in the team. Thus, trainee teams should propose methods experts depending on scope of review questions, nature of evidence and proposed methodology.

You may refer to Appendix 5 for indicative team composition for systematic review teams.

Organisations based in South Asia are strongly encouraged to apply. If relevant, organisations may form consortium that include non-South Asia partners. However, the lead organisation of the consortium should be based in South Asia. Support for capacity building would normally be available only to the South Asian organisations.

It should be noted that in case of a consortium, contracting will be done with the lead organisation of the consortium, while the lead organisation may have sub-contracting arrangement with collaborating institutes or researchers.

It is important that trainee team have substantial dedicated time to complete the work. This requirement includes sufficient staff time to ensure systematic searching of the existing literature, the independent double reading of full text articles, data extraction and quality appraisal of included studies, with third party referral in case of disagreement.

Teams should describe their relevant links with policy makers, practitioners and development community in South Asia in their proposal.

Note: Though there is no limit on the number of members in the proposed team, however, participation in the training programmes will be available for a maximum of 5 members per trainee team only.

7. Cost for the Review

The budget for conducting each training systematic review has been fixed as **GBP 45,000, including applicable taxes** (withholding tax, service tax or other applicable taxes). Each selected trainee team will receive a payment of GBP 45,000 (or INR equivalent of GBP 45,000) for conducting the training SR, in addition to the training and quality assurance support being provided under the programme. The above mentioned budget is inclusive of all expenses that may be incurred for conducting the review including accommodation, travel, subsistence, subscription, dissemination or any other cost in relation to the review. Training teams should earmark a minimum of GBP 3000 from the above mentioned budget to cover expenses of conducting the dissemination workshop.

However, the above mentioned budget **does not include** cost of peer reviews, expenses for attending the training programme, or access to EPPI-Reviewer (review management software) as these will be funded from the programme. Also, travel expenses for dissemination activities (only those where review team members are invited by DFID or the SR consortium for one-to-one discussion or meeting with relevant stakeholders or for making presentation to them) will be reimbursed on actuals (based on DFID norms) and hence, are not included in the above mentioned budget.

Applicants are required to provide a **confirmation** that they agree to conduct the review at above mentioned budget, if selected, in the format provided in Appendix 3.

Note: If selected entity is an Indian organisation, then payments will be made in INR. The exchange rate prevailing at the time of processing the invoice will be used for estimating the INR equivalent of invoice amount. Current exchange rates published on RBI's website will be used as reference. If selected entity is not an Indian registered organisation, then payments will be made in GBP.

If the selected entity is located outside India, then there will be incidence of withholding taxes (WHT), which will be deducted from their payments, as per the applicable tax treaty between India and the respective country. PwC will provide a WHT deduction certificate to these organisations for claiming tax credits in their respective tax jurisdictions.

If selected entity is located in India and comes under the purview of service tax, then above mentioned budget will be considered as "inclusive of service tax[5]".

8. Timeframe and Payment Terms

The systematic review is expected to be completed **within 14 months** from contract signing to submission of final reports.

Payment for the reviews will be tied to the deliverables that meet agreed timelines and will be given in three tranches, as following:

Milestones/Deliverables	Payment Terms
Acceptance of preliminary protocol	15% of total payment
Acceptance of final protocol along with scoping report (at the end of stage I)	15% of total payment
Acceptance of draft SR report, drafts of systematic review summary and contextualisation documents	40% of total payment
Approval of the final SR report, SR summary document, and accompanying contextualisation document for publication; satisfactory completion of dissemination activities including organisation of dissemination workshop	15% of total payment
SR report and accompanying documents published on the EPPI-Centre website	15% of total payment

The trainee teams are expected to follow the timeline and ensure timely delivery of their responsibilities.

9. Criteria for Evaluation and Award of Contract

The proposals will be evaluated by a **Quality Based Selection (QBS) methodology**. Applicants will be required to submit only a technical proposal including details about their organisation / consortium, team, approach and methodology, timelines and project management structure.

Technical proposal will be evaluated based on pre-determined criteria. Applicants obtaining the highest score in the technical proposal will be invited for negotiations and award of contract. The evaluation method to be used for assessing technical proposals under the programme is described below.

Evaluation of Technical Proposal: The technical evaluation for training SRs will take place in **two stages**. In stage I, proposals will be assessed and scored based on the 'Capacity to undertake work' criteria as listed in the Table 1. The maximum score attainable in stage I is 30 and **applicants scoring 20 and above will qualify for stage II of evaluation**.

In stage II of the evaluation, short listed proposals will be assessed and scored based on the 'Quality of proposed team' and 'Quality of technical proposal' criterion as listed in Table 1. The maximum score attainable in stage II is 70.

Scores of stage I and stage II will be added to estimate final score of shortlisted applicants. The applicant attaining the highest final score will be selected for conducting the corresponding training SR.

Criteria to be used for stage I and stage II evaluation of technical proposals are given in Table 1.

[5] If service tax rate increases beyond the current rate of 14.5%, then the additional service tax amount will be paid in addition to the fixed budget mentioned in this RfP.

Table 1: Criteria for Evaluation of Technical Proposal

Criteria	Definition	Sub-components	Score
Stage I evaluation *(A minimum score of 20 (out of 30) will be required for qualification to stage II evaluation)*			
Capacity to undertake the work	The experience and ability of the bidding organisation / consortium in the relevant sector and in conducting evidence research (qualitative and quantitative)	Track record of the bidding organisation / consortium in conducting empirical research, impact evaluation, secondary research and reviews, particularly for the academic disciplines and policy sectors to be studied.	10
		Access to knowledge sources (databases and journals) relevant to the SR question for identifying relevant primary studies and retrieving information;	10
		Contacts and networks with policy makers, practitioners and development community in South Asia.	5
		Ability of the organisation to strengthen SR capacity in South Asia	5
		Criteria Sub-Total	***30***
		Stage I evaluation total	***30***
Stage II evaluation *(Technical proposal of applicants qualifying stage I will be evaluated for following criteria)*			
Quality of proposed team	The skills of the proposed team in the relevant research and policy area and in conducting evidence based research	Experience and skills of the Principal Investigator/Team Leader in undertaking and leading evidence based research studies, impact evaluation studies, secondary research and reviews. It is preferable that the individual has experience in academic disciplines and policy sectors to be studied under the review.	10
		Experience and skills of other team members in conducting primary and secondary research, evaluation and literature reviews, substantive knowledge in the area to be reviewed, and relevant skills in quantitative and/or qualitative analysis; (It is required that proposed team members should have good research experience in South Asia (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Afghanistan or Myanmar)	20
		Evidence of abilities to gain from capacity building support	10
		Criteria Sub-Total	***40***
Quality of technical proposal	Understanding of research theme and use of appropriate methods of search, quality appraisal, data collection and synthesis of evidence along the causal chain.	Understanding of research theme and policy issues that the systematic review will address;	10
		Use of appropriate methods of search, quality appraisal, data collection and synthesis	5
		Methodology for analysing findings in the context of South Asian region and specific South Asian countries;	5
		Effective strategy for uptake/ dissemination of research findings and evidence	10

Criteria	Definition	Sub-components	Score
		Criteria Sub-Total	***30***
		Total of stage I and stage II evaluation scores	**100**

10. Submission of Proposal

Proposals are invited separately for each of the review questions (mentioned in Section 3), as the systematic review for each question shall be separate. Applicants interested to participate in more than one systematic review can do so by submitting separate proposals for each question.

All applicants are expected to submit the Technical Proposal in the format provided in **Appendix 2** and confirmation of financial budget in the format provided in **Appendix 3**. The acceptable page limit for each section is mentioned with the format.

The proposal should be submitted through email to the email id - sr.southasia@in.pwc.com, by **18th January, 2016 (Monday) by 17:00 UK time.**

In the subject line of the email, the applicant must mention "The SARH Systematic Review for South Asia- <*question title*>" when submitting the application. Before submitting the proposal, the applicant shall ensure that the technical proposal is in "pdf" format.

The applicants can send their queries to the SR Consortium by **17th December, 2015** to the email ID – sr.southasia@in.pwc.com. Please mention, "The SARH Systematic Review programme for South Asia - RFP - Query" in the subject line when asking questions. The responses to the queries will be posted on EPPI-Centre's website **by 23rd December, 2015.**

The SR Consortium team and SARH (DFID) may choose to ask further clarifying queries to the applicants, if necessary, either by email or telephone.

Please note that the final decision making power regarding the selection and funding rests with the evaluation panel comprised of members of SR Consortium and the SARH (DFID).

The schedule of procurement for this tender will be as following:

#	Details	Date
1.	Issue of RfP document	7th December, 2015
2.	Last date for receiving pre-bid queries	17th December, 2015
3.	Last date for submission of bid	18th January, 2016 (Monday) by 17:00 UK time
4.	Opening of technical bid	19th January, 2016
5.	Communication to stage I shortlisted bidders	1st February, 2016
6.	Communication to successful bidder(s)	7th March, 2016
7.	Negotiation and Signing of Contract	Approx. 3 weeks from communication to successful bidders
8.	Commencement of Work	Within 1 week from signing of contract or as may be agreed in contract

Note: If above mentioned schedule undergoes any change due to unforeseen reasons, we will inform applicants about corresponding changes either through mail or notice on EPPI-Centre's website.

Appendix 1. Capacity building and quality assurance support to be provided under the programme

The quality assurance team and capacity building team of the SR consortium will provide following support to the trainee teams:

- **Welcome / introductory emails:** Welcome letter will be sent via emails at the beginning of the projects to trainee teams. It aims to give information about what the teams can expect and where to get advice in terms of support from the EPPI-SG team.

- Support to trainee teams in registering their reviews with EPPI-Centre;

- **Residential training workshop** covering following topics for training systematic reviews and evidence summaries:

    - Principles and rationale of systematic review
    - Use of logic models and other conceptual frameworks
    - Searching and identifying literature
    - Study designs and best available evidence
    - Data extraction or coding and management
    - Project management for systematic reviews / evidence summaries

- **Online training session**, customised to the requirement of individual teams, broadly covering following topics:

    For systematic review:
    - Principles of synthesis
    - Coding of studies to prepare for synthesis
    - Assessment of risk of bias
    - Effect size calculation
    - Synthesis of the quantitative or qualitative studies
    - Analysing contextual relevance to South Asia
    - Drawing conclusions and developing implications from the findings

    For evidence summary:
    - Principles of synthesis
    - Categorisation of systematic reviews by various study aspects, to prepare for synthesis
    - Assessing the quality of existing systematic reviews
    - Ranking & summarising most relevant SRs; structured narrative synthesis
    - Analysing contextual relevance to South Asia
    - Drawing conclusions and developing implications from the findings

- **On-going guidance and support** to trainee teams via emails, phone, and Skype at key stages of preparing the systematic reviews / evidence summary including during development of research question, search strategy, inclusion/exclusion criteria, mapping tool, quality assessment framework, critical appraisal, synthesis, etc.;

- **Web-based resource interface** where training materials and sources of information and supplementary materials can be freely available to trainee teams;

- **Information management support through EPPI-reviewer**, including free of charge access to EPPI-reviewer for the purpose of preparing systematic review / evidence summary under the programme: Support will be provided in using EPPI-reviewer (information management software of the EPPI-Centre) to manage systematic review/ evidence summary information from the start of the study: e.g. handling citations from initial searches through the screening for relevant studies, data extraction, and data analysis;

- **Standardised research tools** (e.g. systematic review / evidence summary templates, study mapping tool) will be provided to trainee teams; support will be provided in understanding and using these templates;

- **Contextualisation support**: Support will be provided in developing methodology for contextualising review findings for relevance of South Asia and for applying these in the review;

- **Addressing peer review comments:** Support will be provided to trainee teams in addressing peer review comments on the draft protocol and draft report and in improving these documents;

- Support in **formatting, copyediting and publishing** the systematic review / evidence summary.

Appendix 2. Format for Technical Proposal

Section A: Introduction

Section B: Proposed team

Section C: Description of Approach and Methodology to Conduct the Review

Section D: Project Management and Timeline

Section A: Introduction

(Write-up for this section should not exceed 3 pages)

1. **Title of Proposed Review:** *(Please mention the Systematic Review question, as given in the RfP, for which the study will be conducted)*

2. **Propose Start and End date:** Teams should aim to start work shortly after signing the contract; please mention proposed timelines for the review.

   Proposed start date: (MM/YYYY) Proposed end date: (MM/YYYY)

   Contract duration will be ___ months.

3. **About Your Organisation/ consortium:** *(Please provide following information about your organisation / consortium)*

   A. Name of the organisation / lead member (in case of consortium):

   B. Type of organisation *(Academic institute, NGO, research organisation etc.)*:

   C. Constitution / Legal Status: (Company/Society/Firm /any other form of entity whether incorporated in India or outside to be mentioned in details):

   D. Registered office address of the organisation:

   E. Name & contact details of the key contact person/ authorised representative: *(Please note that all key correspondence related to this application will only be sent to this person)*

   F. Type of applicant (Single organisation / Consortium / Lead organisation with individual sub-contractors):

   G. Name & location of other consortium members (if any):

4. **Experience of your organisation / consortium:** Please describe briefly experience of your organisation / consortium in conducting (1) empirical research, impact evaluations, secondary research and reviews for the sectors to be studied; and (2) in conducting impact evaluation, empirical research and reviews in South Asia. If you have prior experience in conducted systematic reviews, please include this here *(While systematic review experience is not mandatory for conducting training SRs, this information will be used as an input to design of training programmes).*

5. **Policy engagement:** (Briefly describe your contacts and network with policy makers, practitioners and development community in South Asia and past experience of disseminating research findings & results to them)

6. How do you plan to utilise capacity building support provided under this programme to promote systematic reviews in South Asia?

7. **Access to databases:** Please confirm whether your organisation / consortium has access to following databases. Also mention additional databases that your organisation / consortium has access to.

#	Databases (not providing open access)	Whether your organisation / consortium has access (Y/ N)
1.	JSTOR- www.jstor.org/	
2.	SSRN- www.ssrn.com	
3.	SAGE www.sagepub.in	
4.	ASSIA: Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts http://www.proquest.com/products-services/ASSIA-Applied-Social-Sciences-Index-and-Abstracts.html	
5.	Researchgate- www.researchgate.net/	
6.	Emerald Insight- http://www.emeraldinsight.com/	
7.	NBER-www.nber.org/	
8.	Policy Press www.policypress.co.uk/	
9.	Sociological Abstracts: http://www.proquest.com/products-services/socioabs-set-c.html	
10.	EconLit- https://www.ebscohost.com/academic/econlit	
11.	American Economic Association: https://www.aeaweb.org/econlit/	
12.	Scopus http://www.scopus.com/	
13.	PubMed- www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed	
14.	Embase/Elsevier- www.embase.com	
15.	Web of Science- webofknowledge.com/	
16.	PsycINFO- www.apa.org/pubs/databases/psycinfo/	
17.	POPLINE- www.popline.org/	
18.	LILACS- lilacs.bvsalud.org/en/	
19.	BIOSIS Previews	
20.	Indian Economic Journal: http://www.indianeconomicjournal.org/	
21.	ScienceDirect- www.sciencedirect.com/	
22.	Wiley Online library - http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/	
23.	International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS) http://www.proquest.com/libraries/academic/databases/ibss-set-c.html	
24.	Other databases that your organisation / consortium has access to: • • • • •	

Section B: Proposed team

I. **Trainee Team members**
Please indicate names of all team members, their role and proposed tasks in the review, current job tile and name of the employer organisation or specify independent researcher as appropriate and their input days. Please use the table given below to provide this information:

Title	Name	Role in the review	Tasks assigned for the review	Current job title & employer organisation	No. of Days
Dr. / Prof./ Ms. / Mr.	Xxx	*E.g. Principal Investigator; Information scientist; research assistant etc.*	*E.g. leading the review; guiding team on research methodology; coordinating with team members & with client; etc.*	*E.g. Lecturer of development studies with abc university*	*e.g. 50 days*

II. **Declaration of competing interests:**
Are you aware of any interests arising from research, financial or personal reasons which might reasonably lead to biases in your work? **Yes/No**
If **yes**, list these here alongside any primary studies of relevance for the review to which you have contributed.

III. Please provide here, **CVs of all the proposed team members and advisory group members in the following format**. *(a CV should not exceed 4 pages)*

1. **Personal details:**

   Name:

   Date of Birth:

   Nationality:

   Country of residence:

2. **Education and relevant trainings:**

3. **Employment record/ Posts held:**

#	Name of the employing organisation	Position held	From (MM/YY)	To (MM/YY)

4. **Do you have any systematic review experience or have attended any systematic review trainings? (Yes / No).** If yes, please provide brief summary about each review including its start and end date / training content and training providers. *(While systematic review experience is not mandatory for conducting training SRs, this information will be used as an input to design of training programmes)*

5. **Experience in primary and secondary research, particularly in sectors to be studied:** *(Please provide a brief summary about each study / project or future commitments including its start date and end date) (Project experience in South Asia will be preferred):*

6. **Experience in qualitative and/or quantitative analysis** *(Please provide a brief summary of each project / study or future commitments including its start date and end date)***:**

7. **Publications related to the research theme:**

8. **Please write a short note on how your research skills and experience makes you a suitable candidate for developing systematic reviewing skills and how you will utilise the opportunities offered under the current programme** *(this will help us in understanding ability of the researcher to gain significantly from the structured training provided under the programme)*

9. **Experience in managing research projects** *(only applicable for the CVs of Team Leader and Principal Investigator) (Please provide a brief summary of each project / study or future commitments including its start date and end date)***:**

10. **Experience of conducting search of existing studies and literature for primary and / or secondary researches:** *(applicable only for the information scientist / librarian) (Please provide a brief summary of each project / study including its start date and end date)***:**

Section C: Description of Approach and Methodology to conduct the review

(Write-up for this section should not exceed 3 pages)

I. **Background to the Project –** *(Please provide a write-up on below mentioned sub-sections)*

   A. **Policy Issue(s)** – Provide a brief outline of the policy or implementation issue(s) that this systematic review will address

   B. **Existing Evidence –** Indicate the state of existing evidence on this topic including any existing systematic reviews and some relevant primary studies. (Bidders are encouraged to mention 3-5 empirical studies that they could include in the review)

II. **Understanding of the research theme** - *(Please provide a write-up on below mentioned sub-sections)*

   A. **Suggestions on research question & PICOs analysis (Population, Interventions, Comparison, Outcomes and Study design) provided in the research briefing:** Based on your understanding and experience in the research theme, provide your comments on the research questions and indicative PICOs analysis included in the RfP.

III. **Review Methods-** *(Indicate how the review will be undertaken, using the following headings)*

   A. **Search methodology -** Describe your proposed search strategy for identifying published and unpublished studies, which are likely to include, but are not limited to, the following sources:

      - Electronic sources (e.g., database, e-library, internet)
      - Print sources (e.g., journals, library shelves, hand search)
      - Grey literature (e.g., databases, conference proceedings, research funders)
      - Reference snowballing from published and unpublished literature

   B. **Determining the quality of studies:** Describe how the quality of the quantitative and qualitative studies to be included in the review will be assessed

   C. **Data extraction and organisation -** Describe how data from primary studies will be coded, extracted and reconciled.

   D. **Analysis-** Describe how quantitative and qualitative data (if applicable) will be analysed and synthesised

   E. **Report Writing -** Describe a report-writing plan, including contributions of participating team members, the section(s) of the report in which they will be involved, and the approach for communicating findings in a user-friendly manner (e.g. summary of findings, shorter version of the report).

IV. **Systematic review summary and contextualisation documents-** An important deliverable of the review is SR summary document and contextualisation document. *Indicate your understanding of policy issues and plan for involving policy and development network in the review, using the following headings:*

A. **Potential policy impact –**Describe the potential policy impact of the systematic review. This should include the policy influence objective(s), the target audiences (especially the policy stakeholders) for the study, and main rationale, strategies and expected outcomes of engaging with each of the target audiences.

B. **Contextualisation:** Describe the methods that will be employed to analyse (and preferably maximise) the relevance of systematic review findings to the South Asian region as well as specific South Asian countries.

C. **Dissemination plan and user engagement –** Provide a brief dissemination plan, explaining (1) potential end users of the review findings; (2) how to involve and inform potential end users of the review questions, progress and findings (through publications, participating in seminars, conference etc.); (3) identifying online and print media platforms for publishing research summary and abstracts; and (4) plan for organising dissemination workshop.

Section D: Project Management and Timeline

I. **Accountability arrangement -** Indicate the following:

- The accountability arrangements for the team (who is coordinating the work and who will report to whom)
- The arrangements for team meetings

II. **Timetable –** Below is the indicative timetable & schedule of deliverables for the review. If required, bidding teams can change schedule of activities leading to deliverables. However the schedule of deliverables should not be changed.

Table 2: Format for timetable of the review

Tasks	Description	Start date	End date
Title Registration	Selected teams will register their reviews with the EPPI-Centre. The team is allowed around 2 weeks to complete the process after contract signing.	28-Mar-16	11-Apr-16
Preparation of Preliminary Protocol	The teams may take about 6 weeks to prepare their preliminary protocols before submitting it to the QAT for their review. Preliminary Protocol preparation will start simultaneously with title registration.	28-Mar-16	12-May-16
Review of preliminary protocol by QAT	The QAT will provide their feedback on the preliminary protocol in about a week.	12-May-16	20-May-16
Stage I: Streamlining review scope based on availability of existing evidence	The purpose of stage I is to streamline scope of the review based on QATs feedback and on the availability of existing evidence. It will include preparing search strategies and identifying relevant databases. This stage will also include identifying and describing existing research in terms of the focus, design and context of studies. Review teams will use results of this stage to suggest modifications in scope of the review based on availability of existing evidence. This stage may take two months.	12-May-16	11-Jul-16
Presentation of Stage I finding to advisory group and finalising the scope for stage II	The teams will present their Stage I findings to the advisory group for review. The Advisory group will take approximately a week to provide their feedback.	12-Jul-16	19-Jul-16
Revising preliminary protocol to prepare final protocol	The team will revise the preliminary protocols based on the feedback received from QAT and advisory group. The review team may take around 2 weeks to make the revisions and prepare final protocol.	19-Jul-16	2-Aug-16
Protocol submitted for peer review (with scoping report) (allow 1 month)	The revised protocol will be submitted to the peer review team for final feedback. One month is allotted for feedback.	2-Aug-16	1-Sep-16
Stage II starts	Stage II will start with freezing the key terms for initiating	2-Aug-16	9-Aug-16

Tasks	Description	Start date	End date
	search in discussion with QAT. This can be done parallel to the peer review of the final protocol.		
Study search	At this stage, relevant databases and libraries will be searched using key terms appropriate for revised scope of the review. The information expert/librarian will help in conducting the search. This process may take around 3 weeks and can be started simultaneous to the peer review process.	10-Aug-16	31-Aug-16
Assessment of Study relevance	Screening will be carried out for titles, abstracts and full text. This process may take 6 weeks.	25-Aug-16	6-Oct-16
Data Extraction and Critical Appraisal	Relevant data and information will be extracted from selected studies using data extraction sheet; quality assessment of existing studies will be carried out. This step may take more than two months.	9-Sep-16	16-Nov-16
Qualitative Analysis	The Qualitative Experts will initiate the qualitative synthesis of the findings. This will take about 21 days.	8-Nov-16	29-Nov-16
Quantitative analysis	The Quantitative expert will pool the data and initiate quantitative synthesis and/or Meta-analysis. This will take about 21 days.	16-Nov-16	7-Dec-16
Synthesising findings of qualitative and quantitative analysis	Findings of qualitative and statistical meta-analysis will be synthesised to arrive at conclusions.	7-Dec-16	17-Dec-16
Contextualisation of findings to South Asia relevance	The team will contextualise the findings to South Asia and specific countries mentioned in the RfP. This process may take a month of effort.	7-Dec-16	6-Jan-17
Preparation of draft report and summary	The team will prepare the draft SR report and summary	7-Dec-16	27-Jan-17
Draft report submitted for peer review (with contextualisation and SR summary) (allow 2 months)	The Draft summary will be submitted for peer review.	28-Jan-17	28-Mar-17
Revision of draft report	Based on the peer review comments, draft report will be revised and finalised. Teams may take a month in finalising the SR report and accompanying documents.	28-Mar-17	27-Apr-17
Dissemination of draft report/ findings	Stakeholder engagement and dissemination.	27-Apr-17	18-May-17
Submission of Final report	Incorporating feedback received during dissemination in the final report.		28-May-17

Note: Tasks in the timelines may overlap. First training workshop (residential) is tentatively scheduled to be organised after one or two weeks of starting the SR.

Table 3: Format for schedule of deliverables

Deliverable	Due date *(dd/mm/yyyy)*
Title registered	11-Apr-16
Preliminary protocol	12-May-16
Final Protocol (for peer review) (with scoping report)	2-Aug-16
Draft report with draft contextualisation document and summary (not later than 10 months from date of contract signing)	28-Jan-17
Final report with systematic review summary and contextualisation document; completion of dissemination activities including dissemination workshop	28-May-17

Appendix 3. Confirmation of budget for conducting the review

(On letterhead of the applicant / Lead Organisation (in case of Consortium)

Date:

Dr. Manoranjan Pattanayak,
Programme Manager and Team Leader
The SARH Systematic Review Programme for South Asia
PricewaterhouseCoopers Private Limited
Building 10, Tower C, 17th Floor, DLF Cyber City
Gurgaon – 122002, Haryana| India

Subject: Confirmation of budget for conducting Training Systematic Review titled "……."

Dear Sir,

In response to your Request for Proposal, we agree to conduct the systematic review on the above-mentioned topic for a payment of **GBP 45,000, including applicable taxes** (withholding tax, service tax or any other tax which may be applicable).

We agree that this amount covers personnel cost (professional fees, honorarium, etc.) and project expenses including accommodation, airfare, subsistence, subscription, dissemination cost or any other cost in relation to the project as defined in Para-7 of RFP (*Cost for the Review*).

Signature of authorised signatory of lead organisation
Name and designation of authorised signatory

Appendix 4. Research briefing for systematic review questions

Question 1 - Market-led rural development approaches: A Training Systematic Review

Research question: What is the effectiveness of market led development approaches in low and middle income countries? What are the factors which determine its success in subsistence and migration driven rural economies?

Background

"Market led" can be understood as an approach to business or economic activity where consumer's requirements are identified and understood for supplying goods and services. Thus, market-led development can happen when producers identify which goods and services have unmet demand and take advantage of the opportunity by supplying those goods and services. This can happen both by producers shifting their production to required goods or services or if they supply to the markets where the demand is unmet.

Market led development approaches can be particularly important in the context of small and rural producers, especially subsistence farmers, who are often not familiar with market demand and supply gaps, face low productivity and either sell their products at low price or produce just for self-consumption. If they can be educated on market conditions (demand-supply gap for specific goods, services or in specific locations) and empowered through knowledge, capacity and skill development, then they can improve their economic condition by selling more goods at better prices. Further, they can be better connected to local, national and/or international markets through improvement in infrastructure, information support, by organising them into groups and creating networks to avail market opportunities. This will further encourage the rural producers to invest more in expanding their businesses and in increasing the quantity, quality and diversity of the goods produced.

Thus, educating rural producers on market conditions and establishing strong links to markets can help in improving rural development by increasing productivity, raising household incomes and enhancing their access to affordable goods and services. The box below illustrates a successful case for market-led development intervention.

Example of "market led development" intervention: Pig enterprise in Katundulu Village, Ukwe Planning Area, Malawi[6]

An objective of increasing incomes through better markets for existing products and high value market options was identified for Katundulu village. For achieving this objective, the Department of Agriculture Research Services (DARS) and Lilongwe Agricultural Development Division (LADD) supported the villagers.

The village community was organised into a club called "Tigwirane Dzanja Club" which means, "Let us hold each other's hand." In partnership with DARS and LADD, the community was taken through the rural agro-enterprise development process, starting with participatory diagnosis, market opportunities identification and enterprise selection, farmer participatory research.

[6] Source: Empowering Communities through Market led Development: Community Agro-enterprise Experiences from Uganda and Malawi; Link: http://www.future-agricultures.org/farmerfirst/files/T1b_Njuki.pdf

Community formed committees to carry out market assessments in different markets to identify market options and to understand market requirements. From the analysis, one of the two enterprises selected included the “pig enterprise”.

For the pig enterprise, the community started with 10 sows (female pigs) and 2 boars (male pigs). The 10 sows were distributed to 10 households out of 35 households and it was agreed that after farrowing, two female piglets would be passed on to two different households as a form of repayment. Before the start of the enterprise, farmers were trained on pig production, pig feed formulation, pen construction, disease and pest management. Two types of pig markets were identified, local markets for piglets where the main market was other farmers and NGOs that were willing to buy pigs for their livestock distribution projects, and a meat processing factory that was then importing pork from Brazil.

The farmers have been very successful in supplying the local and NGO piglets market. Pig production has now become a common activity in the village with all households having pigs, some households having as many as 14-20 pigs at any one time. Due to the capacity built, the farmers have become trainers of other farmers in the country. Every piglet sale to NGOs is accompanied by training which is provided by the farmers themselves at a fee.

Despite the advantages of market led development, particularly for rural and subsistence economies, there can be serious risks associated with exposing unprepared and resource-poor producers to the competitive markets. To ensure that the small producers and farmers benefit from market-led development interventions, it is important to know what works and what does not by drawing from the experience of regions where such interventions have been implemented.

Market-led approaches to rural or local development can be implemented with the help of direct and/or indirect interventions, including market study, knowledge sharing, skill development, capacity building, technical assistance, and by strengthening links to markets by creating networks. The effectiveness of such interventions can be assessed based on its economic and social impact on the local population.

Thus, the **objective of this study** is to review available evidence regarding different types of market-led development interventions implemented in low and middle income countries and assess their effectiveness in improving economic and social conditions of local producers. The secondary focus of this review will be to draw lessons for the successful design of market led development programmes, particularly in the context of subsistence and migration driven rural economies.

Research Questions:

This systematic review will answer the following research question:

- What is the effectiveness of market led development approaches in low and middle income countries? What are the factors which determine its success in subsistence and migration driven rural economies?

This systematic review will be conducted in 2 stages. Stage I will involve identifying and describing the available research in terms of their focus, design and context of studies. The findings from this stage of the work will be presented to the review’s Advisory Group (in the form of a presentation and working papers) for a discussion about the most useful and productive focus for the second stage.

Based on results of stage I, the scope of the review may be further revised and refined. Stage II will involve reviewing the selected evidence and synthesising findings.

Population

The population of interest in this review is the rural and semi-urban population of the low and middle income countries.

Intervention

The interventions of interest in this review are various market-led development approaches aimed at increasing income and livelihood of small and rural producers by improving their participation and transactions in markets.

These approaches can include supporting producers in doing more than just increasing their productivity, but also connecting producers to new markets, educating producers about new products or product innovations which have higher demand, building on the value of products, helping them in achieving quality improvement, and increasing their access to market information. The common intention of these measures is to improve the economic wellbeing of the rural population by enabling them to take advantage of market opportunities.

Some of the interventions included in market-led development approaches are:

- Encouraging Private sector participation (through financial and other interventions);
- Infrastructure development (roadways, power grids, etc.);
- Asset creation;
- Inclusive market development;
- Information sharing and knowledge dissemination (market study, demand and supply assessment);
- Innovation, research and development (innovative cultivation techniques, enabling rural innovation);
- Skill development & capacity building;
- Empowerment (through membership based associations to strengthen bargaining power)
- Improving value chains (helping farmers sell directly to processors and not wholesalers)

Comparison

An effects review will require studies where people offered or exposed to the intervention are compared with other people offered or exposed to a different intervention, no intervention, or an intervention with a different intensity. The criteria for comparison can be determined after initial screening of available primary studies on the topic. If stage I identifies no such studies, the stage II will review other study designs to inform the development of interventions, without offering strong evidence of their effects.

Outcomes

The outcomes of interest under this review are economic and social well-being of beneficiaries and rural communities. By enabling small and rural producers to participate more efficiently and profitably in markets, market led interventions are expected to improve their income, productivity, expenditure, capital formation and other economic aspects.

Improvements in economic well-being may be accompanied with improvement in social conditions during the medium to long term. Further, market led programmes often being accompanied with interventions like organising producers into groups, improving their skill and knowledge and interventions targeted especially for women, these programmes may achieve improvements in social well-being.

Examples of outcomes of interest include:

1. Economic indicators
    - Poverty indicators
    - Household income
    - Per capita income
    - Household expenditure
    - Workforce productivity
    - Agricultural productivity
    - Savings
    - Investments
    - Assets
2. Livelihood outcomes of rural households
3. Food security
4. Social impact indicators
    - Gender equality and environment friendly practices
    - Employment opportunities
    - Improvement in living standards
    - Access to basic services

Study Design

As mentioned earlier, this systematic review will be conducted in two stages. Stage I will involve identifying and describing the available research in terms of its focus, design and context of studies. Stage II will involve inspecting the selected evidence in detail to answer the research question.

For Stage I, the review should include all study designs outlined below as well as any existing systematic reviews relevant for the research questions set out above.

Relevant study designs for assessing harm or causation:

- Cohort studies
- Case control studies
- Cross-sectional surveys

Relevant study designs for assessing impact include:

- Randomised controlled trials
- Quasi-experimental studies with a known allocation rule (e.g. regression discontinuity design and natural experiments)
- Quasi-experimental studies with a comparison group using some methods to control for confounding (such as difference-in-differences estimation, instrumental variables estimation, statistical matching, etc.)
- Interrupted time series designs.

Relevant study designs for investigating implementation include:

- Qualitative research studies (i.e. interviews/surveys, case studies, oral histories)
- Process evaluations of feasibility and acceptability
- Case studies

Contextualisation of findings: The review can draw evidence from low and middle income countries. However, the findings of the review should be analysed in the context of South Asia (India, Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, and Myanmar) and particularly with reference to Nepal.

Question 2- Natural Resource Revenue Management: Training systematic review

Research Question: What are the effects of various natural resource revenue management approaches adopted by countries rich in natural resources but experiencing fragile circumstances, including approaches for managing Natural Resource funds?

Background

Developing countries that have a rich endowment of natural resources like oil, gas and minerals can greatly benefit from revenues generated from such resources. Revenue from natural resources provides opportunities for countries to fast-track their development, satisfy socio-economic needs of their people, meet capital investment demands and accelerate overall economic growth. Thus, it is important for countries to implement policies that allow efficient management of revenue from natural resources.

Natural Resource Revenue Management refers to policies and techniques adopted by the government to manage and augment revenues from natural resources. It includes fiscal measures to maximise government's share of the natural resource revenue. For instance, governments use a variety of fiscal instruments including profit taxes, revenue or volume-based fees or taxes, production sharing, explicit rent-capture mechanisms, bonuses, equity participation and competitive tenders to generate revenues from natural resources. Natural resource revenue management also include policies designed to optimise allocation of natural resource revenue to promote inclusive growth, sustainable development, private sector growth and attain inter-generational equity. Building accountability and transparency in managing natural resources and revenues from these is also an integral part of natural resource revenue management.

The **exhaustibility** (number of years natural resources are expected to last and generate revenue) and **volatility** (unpredictable revenue stream due to volatile commodity prices) of natural resource revenues may pose severe economic challenges for countries dependent on natural resources. If revenues from natural resource form a significant part of export earnings and government revenues, then there is risk of experiencing fiscal shocks during downturns in natural resource demand or prices. To address the issue of volatility in revenues from natural resources and attain inter-generational equity, resource -rich countries normally save a part of their resource revenue in resource funds, also known as **Natural Resource Fund** (a type of ***Sovereign Wealth Fund***).

These funds are deposited and invested in income-generating assets including investment in foreign financial assets. These funds can serve various macroeconomic and governance objectives including saving for future generations, covering unexpected budget deficits, sterilizing capital inflows, earmarking resource revenues for specific expenditure items, and ring-fencing resource revenues[7]. More than **55 natural resource funds** have been established in about **40 countries** at the national and subnational levels and hold approximately **$4.0 trillion** in assets as of July 2014.[8]

With the above background, this systematic review will seek to investigate available evidence to determine effectiveness of various Natural Resource Revenue Management techniques, especially, different approaches to managing Natural Resource Funds (Sovereign Wealth Funds).

Situations of fragility: It has been observed that around 80 percent of countries in fragile situations or affected by conflict are endowed with valuable extractive resources that have great demand in the global economy. Natural resources like oil, gas, and minerals often stimulate conflict, affecting poor the worst.

In fragile circumstances, a region or state has weak capacity to carry out basic governance functions, and lacks the ability to develop mutually constructive relations with society. In such circumstances, states are also more vulnerable to internal or external shocks such as economic crises or natural disasters (OECD definition of fragility). There can be different types of fragile situations like prolonged political crisis; post-conflict or political transition; deteriorating governance; brittle dictatorships etc.

Management and effective utilisation of natural resource revenues become all the more challenging in fragile situations. Natural resource revenues in fragile conditions can encourage rent seeking by elites and political groups and create opportunities for corruption. As this source of revenue is not dependent on taxing the citizens, thus there are fewer incentives to build and uphold a strong social contract. Further, dependency on natural resource revenues may jeopardize the economy by limiting incentives for investment in manufacturing and services and exposing economies to shocks of commodity prices.

On the other hand other, if managed properly, natural resources can create conditions for employment opportunities, economic growth and domestic revenues and can greatly help states experiencing fragility in achieving economic improvement. It is important for countries to take into account their vulnerabilities, inefficiencies and challenges when designing and implementing policies for utilising natural resource revenues and thus findings and inferences may be different in fragile situations. **This review will focus only on countries experiencing fragile conditions.**

Research Questions

It is understood that reviewing evidence relating to both Natural Resource Revenue Management techniques and approaches to managing Natural Resource Funds may be too large to be incorporated in a single review. Hence, the systematic review will be conducted in 2 stages.

Stage I will involve identifying and describing the available research in terms of its focus, design and context of studies. The findings from this stage of the work will be presented to the review's Advisory Group (in the form of a presentation and working papers) for a discussion about the most useful and productive focus for the second stage.

---

[7] Link: http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2013/09/daniel.htm

[8] Link: http://www.resourcegovernance.org/natural-resource-funds

Based on results of phase I, a more precise and focussed scope of the research will be developed, either by focussing on “natural resource revenue management approaches” or “approaches for managing natural resource funds” or parts of both, which can be reasonably analysed within the given timelines of the review.

Thus, Stage I of this work will address following question:

- What existing research addresses the effects of various natural resource revenue management approaches adopted by countries rich in natural resources but experiencing fragile situation, including approaches for managing Natural Resource Funds?

Stage II will address one of the following two questions, to be decided in discussion with DFID and the EPPI-Centre after completion of Stage I.

- What are the effects of various natural resource revenue management approaches adopted by countries rich in natural resources but experiencing fragile circumstances?
- What are the effects of various approaches for managing Natural Resource Funds adopted by countries rich in natural resources but experiencing fragile circumstances?

Population

The population of interest under this review is governments of natural resource rich countries but experiencing fragile conditions, which have implemented policies for managing natural resource revenue and / or Natural Resource Funds.

Interventions

The interventions of interest under this review will be policies, regulations, and programmes implemented by governments of natural resource rich countries to manage revenues from such resources. These interventions may include approaches to increase government’s revenue from natural resources, improve efficiency in allocation of natural resource revenues, enhance transparency and accountability in managing natural resources and approaches to manage challenges associated with natural resource revenues.

Following are some of the approaches and instruments available to governments for management of natural resource revenue:

Fiscal instruments to maximise government’s revenue from natural resources:

- Competitive bidding;
- Royalties;
- Explicit rent taxes;
- State participation through national resource companies;
- Production sharing
- Equity participation

Different approaches for allocation and distribution of revenue from natural resources:

- Direct distribution of resource revenues to citizens (conditional or unconditional transfers);
- Setting up resource funds (also known as sovereign wealth funds, stabilization funds, and funds for future generations);

- Optional Budget allocations (Sectors where revenues from natural resources will be invested, whether revenue from natural resources will be used for current expenditure or capital expenditure etc.)
- Sharing resource revenue with sub-national levels of government;
- Regional distribution of revenue (should producing regions benefit to a greater degree than non-producing regions);
- Equitable distribution (Should the benefits be distributed in such a way that all people benefit equally, or should they be distributed in a manner such that some, like the poor or high potential industries, stand to benefit more);

Interventions for enhancing transparency and accountability in managing natural resources revenues:

- Transparency of revenues earned and where they are allocated;
- Transparency of the rules that regulate decisions on when, where and how revenues are allocated;
- Regular reporting and audits of all government and investments by an external accounting firm;
- Separation between decision makers and oversight boards;
- Strong legal sanctions brought against anyone who takes government funds or misuses the power of their office.

Other approaches for managing challenges associated with natural resource revenues:

- Using monetary policy instruments like interest rates, government bond purchases/sales, exchange rate control, monetary sterilization etc. to manage large inflow of foreign capital causing an overvaluation of the real exchange rate and macroeconomic volatility;
- Improving public finance management practices and systems to ensure optimal utilisation of revenues earned.

Various approaches to managing resource funds may include:

- Establishing resource funds with single or multiple objectives (saving for future generations, stabilizing expenditures, sterilizing capital inflows, earmarking resource revenues for specific expenditures, protecting resource revenues from mismanagement, corruption or patronage, saving in case of environmental, financial or social crisis)
- Establishing fiscal rules for deposit and withdrawal from funds that align with the objective(s)
- Establishing investment rules (proportion of funds that can be invested in equities or foreign financial assets
- Establishing institutional structure for managing fund (Clarifying roles and responsibility of different institutions involved in managing fund, set and enforce ethical and conflict of interest standards etc.)
- Setting disclosure requirements of key information (e.g., a list of specific investments; names of fund managers) and audits;
- Establish strong independent oversight bodies to monitor fund behaviour and enforce the rules[9].

Comparison: An effects review will require studies covering countries which have implemented natural resource revenue management interventions compared to countries where such interventions have not

[9] Source:http://www.resourcegovernance.org/sites/default/files/NRF_Complete_Report_EN.pdf

been implemented, implemented with different intensity or different policies altogether. The criteria for comparison can be determined after initial screening of available primary studies on the topic. If stage I identifies no such studies, the stage II will review other study designs to inform the development of interventions, without offering strong evidence of their effects.

Outcomes: The ultimate objective of natural resource revenue management is generally to maximise revenue generated from natural resources, achieve efficient utilisation of these resources for growth and development of the country and maintain environmental sustainability.

Thus, intermediate outcomes of interest for this review will include increase in natural resource revenue, allocative efficiency of resource revenue, improvement in management of natural resource revenue and controlling macroeconomic volatility associated with revenues. These can be measured through following indicators:

Criteria	Indicators
Natural resource revenue and outputs	Production volumes, production value, share of government in natural resource revenues generated, subsidies, returns on private investment in natural resource sector, taxes and royalties paid by mining companies to government, returns on natural resource funds
Allocative efficiency	Sharing of natural resource revenue with sub-national governments, transfer of revenue to natural resource funds, direct transfer to citizens, petroleum subsidies
Reporting practices	Environmental and social impact assessments, Exploration data, Comprehensive reporting by State Owned Companies, Comprehensive fund reports, Comprehensive subnational transfer reports
Institutional and Legal Setting	Comprehensive sector legislation, Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) participation; Clarity in revenue collection; Fund rules defined in law, Subnational transfer rules defined in law
Transparency and accountability indicators	Checks on licensing process, Checks on budgetary process, Government disclosure of conflicts of interest, Reports of State Owned Companies (SOC) audited, Fund reports audited, Checks on fund spending, corruption in natural resource management
Controlling macroeconomic instability	Fluctuations in exchange rate, foreign exchange reserves, interest rate, inflation, GDP growth, capital flows

The long terms outcomes that can be studied include poverty reduction and economic growth, including impact on GDP, per capita income, poverty indicators, inequality indices, regional inequality and environmental sustainability.

***Study design*:** As mentioned earlier, this systematic review will be conducted in two stages. Stage I will involve identifying and describing the available research in terms of their focus, design and context of studies. Stage II will involve studying the selected evidence in detail to answer the research question.

For Stage I, the review should include all study designs outlined below as well as any existing systematic reviews relevant for the research questions set out above.

Study designs for investigating acceptability and feasibility of interventions include:

- Qualitative or mixed methods research studies (i.e. interviews/surveys, case studies, oral histories)

Study designs for assessing harm or causation:

- Cohort studies
- Case control studies
- Cross-sectional surveys

Study designs for assessing impact include:

- Randomised controlled trials
- Quasi-experimental studies with a known allocation rule (e.g. regression discontinuity design and natural experiments)
- Quasi-experimental studies with a comparison group using some methods to control for confounding (such as difference-in-differences estimation, instrumental variables estimation, statistical matching etc.)
- Interrupted time series designs.

Study designs for investigating implementation include:

- Qualitative research studies (i.e. interviews/surveys, case studies, oral histories)
- Process evaluations of feasibility and acceptability
- Case studies

Contextualisation of findings**:** The review can draw evidence from all countries rich in natural resources but experiencing fragile circumstances. However, the review team should then consider the relevance of the review findings for South Asia (India, Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, and Myanmar) and particularly for Afghanistan.

In 2010, large mineral deposits were discovered in Afghanistan. Based on the estimated value of the mineral deposits, there is a need to adopt mechanisms to manage and augment mining revenues which can play an important role in Afghanistan's economic development. Thus, findings of this review will be particularly relevant in the context of Afghanistan.

Question 3 - Urbanisation and insecurity: Training systematic review

Research Question: What is the impact of urbanisation on insecurity and urban violence? What is the impact of approaches for addressing insecurity or violence among urban population?

Background

Urbanisation refers to the gradual increase in the proportion of people living in urban areas (such as cities and towns) and the ways in which societies and nations adapt to this change. The population moves out of rural areas (agriculture regions, villages) and into the urban centres in search of employment opportunities, higher incomes, access to health and education facilities and a better life overall. Urbanisation is not only restricted to movement of people but refers to a phenomenon that effects and transforms a region with respect to its economic structure, socio-economic landscape, population demography and cultural norms. In the recent past, the low and middle income countries across the developing world have experienced rapid urbanisation and continue to urbanise; making urbanisation a high-priority development issue within the international development network.

Rapid urbanisation increases the threat of conflict and insecurity. Urban centres often create conditions of significant disparities in standards of living, which lead to conflict over resources. Urban slums also become a haven for criminal elements, youth gangs, arms trade and create insecurity for much of the population. Cities frequently serve as the seats of power and gateways to resources and thus become centre of violence and conflicts. Specific populations, such as women, migrants, and refugees, often face severe lack of security in urban areas, with significant impacts on their livelihoods, health, and access to basic services.

The importance of growing insecurity with urbanisation is highlighted by the 'Safe and Inclusive Cities' project, launched in collaboration between IDRC and DfID. This collaborative research initiative is aimed at generating an evidence base on the connections between urban violence, inequalities and poverty and on identifying the most effective strategies for addressing these challenges. For the purpose of informing the design and scope of the Safe and Inclusive Cities research initiative, Robert Muggah prepared a research paper titled '***Researching the Urban Dilemma: Urbanisation, Poverty and Violence***[10]***'***. This paper talks about the rising insecurity and violence as consequences of rapid urbanisation in the low and middle income countries. The author asserts that rapid urbanisation, marginalization of specific groups, and the inability of national, state and municipal-level governments to absorb the excluded groups is contributing to a rise in organised forms of urban violence. The very nature of urban violence in many parts of the world is now transforming, moving away from civil war and conflict and towards violence, terrorism and civil unrest. Violence and its direct and indirect costs are a major developmental challenge and need to be addressed in order to draw maximum benefits from urbanisation.

Based on above, the purpose of this review is to study the available evidence regarding the impact of urbanisation on insecurity and to investigate the relationship between urbanisation, urban violence and insecurity in the context of South Asia. This paper will also review the effectiveness of interventions that seek to mitigate the insecurity impact of urbanisation and increase the urban resilience and resistance of marginalised population groups to the emergence of widespread urban violence.

[10] **Researching the Urban Dilemma: Urbanization, Poverty and Violence** By Robert Muggah http://www.idrc.ca/EN/PublishingImages/Researching-the-Urban-Dilemma-Baseline-study.pdf

Research Questions

This systematic review will be conducted in two stages.

Stage I will involve identifying and describing the available research in terms of their focus, design and context of studies. The findings from this phase of the work will be presented to the review's Advisory Group (in the form of a presentation and working papers) for a discussion about the most useful and productive focus for the second stage.

Based on results of phase I, a more precise and focussed scope of the research will be developed, either focussing on how violence and insecurity arise from urbanisation, or the impact of interventions addressing violence and insecurity in urban settings or parts of both, which can be reasonably analysed within the given timelines of the review.

Thus, Stage I of this work will address following question:

- What is the nature of the existing research that addresses the relationship between urbanisation and insecurity or violence?

Stage II will address one of these two questions, to be decided in discussion with DFID and the EPPI-Centre after completion of Stage I.

- What is the impact of urbanisation on insecurity and urban violence?
- What is the impact of approaches for addressing insecurity or violence among urban population?

Addressing either of the above questions will involve giving particular attention to more vulnerable members of society such as women, migrants or people living in poverty.

Population

The population of interest in this review is the urban population of the low and middle income countries.

Interventions

A review addressing the "impact of urbanisation on insecurity and urban violence" would focus on the available evidence regarding the influence of urban density, poverty, in-migration and youth bulge in shaping urban violence (and where it gets concentrated – by population group and/or geography).

A review addressing the "impact of approaches for addressing insecurity or violence among urban populations" would evaluate the effectiveness of programmes and interventions aimed at managing the insecurity impacts of urbanisation and increasing urban resilience and resistance, specifically of poor and marginalised groups.
Such interventions may include urban renewal and regeneration programmes, inclusive and responsive urban governance, community policing, slum up-gradation programmes, capacity building programmes for youth, youth rehabilitation programmes, etc.

Comparison

An effects review will require studies where people offered or exposed to a particular intervention are compared with other people offered or exposed to a different intervention, no intervention, or an intervention with a different intensity. The criteria for comparison can be determined after initial screening of available primary studies on the topic. If stage I identifies no such studies, then stage II will review other study designs to inform the development of interventions, without offering strong evidence of their effects.

Outcomes

For assessing how insecurity and violence arise from urbanisation, the indicators of violence may include crime rates (bifurcated for different criminal activities like armed conflicts, robbery, kidnapping, drug-trafficking, communal riots, sexual abuse, road rage, etc.), mortality rates associate with violence, displacement / resettlement rate, crime reporting rate, access to justice / conviction rate, perception of safety and security, prison population, etc. Additionally, indicators for insecurity can be drawn from the Index of Human Insecurity (IHI), wherein human insecurity is a function of complex set of characteristics and processes.

For assessing the impact of approaches aimed at addressing insecurity or violence among urban population, the review would focus on the effectiveness of interventions in influencing the levels (real and perceived) of urban violence and insecurity through indicators mentioned in the paragraph above.

Study Design

As mentioned earlier, this systematic review will be conducted in two stages. Stage I will involve identifying and describing the available research in terms of their focus, design and context of studies. Stage II will involve studying the selected evidence in detail to answer the research question.

For Stage I, the review should include all study designs outlined below as well as any existing systematic reviews relevant for the research questions set out above.

Study designs for investigating acceptability and feasibility of interventions include:

- Qualitative or mixed methods research studies (i.e. interviews/surveys, case studies, oral histories)

Study designs for assessing harm or causation:

- Cohort studies
- Case control studies
- Cross-sectional surveys

Study designs for assessing impact include:

- Randomised controlled trials
- Quasi-experimental studies with a known allocation rule (e.g. regression discontinuity design and natural experiments)
- Quasi-experimental studies with a comparison group using some methods to control for confounding (such as difference-in-differences estimation, instrumental variables estimation, statistical matching, etc.)
- Interrupted time series designs

Study designs for investigating implementation include:

- Qualitative research studies (i.e. interviews/surveys, case studies, oral histories)
- Process evaluations of feasibility and acceptability
- Case studies

Contextualisation of findings: The review can draw evidence from low and middle income countries. However, the review team should then consider the relevance of the findings for South Asia (India, Pakistan, Nepal, Afghanistan, and Myanmar) and particularly for Nepal.

Appendix 5. Indicative team composition for conducting systematic reviews

Table 4 presents an indicative composition of systematic review team. Bidders can use this table as reference for suggesting proposed team structure for the training systematic reviews.

Please note that Table 4 presents only an indicative team structure and bidders are allowed to suggest their own team composition based on the requirement and scope of the specific questions.

Table 4: Indicative team composition for conducting systematic reviews

Role description	Role	Desired qualifications	Indicative time inputs	Required for:
Principal investigator (PI) / Team leader	▪ In-charge of the systematic review; ▪ Providing strategic guidance to team in conducting the review, including preparation of protocol, reports, summaries and contextualisation documents to ensure that all review outputs are delivered within the specified time frame; ▪ Allocation of tasks to team members; ▪ Supervising and guiding activities relating to searching relevant databases and sources of grey literature, quality appraisal and synthesis of information; ▪ Work with Methods expert in designing systematic review methodology and overseeing the data extraction process; ▪ Coordinating with advisory group and peer reviewers; ▪ Has ultimate responsibility for the drafting and final publication of all review outputs.	▪ Experience in conducting impact evaluation, empirical research, literature reviews, non-evaluation research; ▪ Good understanding of sector to be studied & policy issues concerned; ▪ Experience in managing/collaborating research projects/review teams ▪ Experience in drawing policy implications from research findings; ▪ Understanding of South Asian context ▪ Excellent interpersonal and communication skills	Approx. 4 months of involvement across all key stages of the SR process	Required for all research questions
Methods Expert (Quantitative)	▪ Provide methodological and statistical support for preparation of protocol, determination of inclusion and exclusion criteria and for information synthesis; ▪ Provide support in reviewing quality of data and analysis from selected primary studies; also support in comparing data and analysis across selected studies; ▪ Conduct statistical analyses on data retrieved; ▪ Co-author/ participate in writing systematic review	▪ Good understanding of or experience in statistical and /or quantitative analysis; ▪ Experience of conducting impact evaluations or reviewing quality of quantitative studies will be an advantage.	Approx. 3 months of involvement	Required for research themes where available primary studies include RCTs or quantitative

Role description	Role	Desired qualifications	Indicative time inputs	Required for:
	outputs.			studies.
Methods Expert (Qualitative)	▪ Provide methodological support for preparation of protocol, determination of inclusion and exclusion criteria and for information synthesis; ▪ Provide support in reviewing qualitative studies and literature and assessing their quality; ▪ Developing framework for synthesising qualitative data; ▪ Contribute to theory building involved in the systematic review, if required; ▪ Co-author/ participate in writing systematic review outputs.	▪ Good understanding or experience in qualitative synthesis methods and theory of change analysis; ▪ Experience of conducting impact evaluations or other types of empirical research; ▪ Experience of reviewing quality of research studies will be an advantage.	Approx. 3 months of involvement	Required for research themes where available primary studies include qualitative studies, literature or case studies.
Information specialist or experienced librarian	▪ Provide support in identifying local, regional and global studies on the research theme, particularly those that may be less easily access via published literature or web; ▪ Provide support in locating relevant studies and evidence; ▪ Provide consultation and guidance on regional issues related to evidence search, if any;	▪ Good understanding and familiarity with online databases and libraries on primary studies; ▪ Experience of conducting searches for secondary reviews; ▪ Experience in identifying and locating grey literature	Approx. 1 month of involvement	Required for all research questions
Research assistant(s)	▪ Assist with identification, location and retrieval of relevant documents for review; ▪ Assists PI and methodological expert in undertaking data coding and extraction; ▪ Provide support in preparing protocol, draft and final reports, summary and contextualisation documents.	▪ Reasonable understanding of the sector; ▪ Experience of conducting primary or secondary researches. ▪ Experience of information management or systematic	2 research assistants with approx. 5 months of involvement each.	Required for all research questions

Role description	Role	Desired qualifications	Indicative time inputs	Required for:
		reviewing software(e.g. Endnote, Reference manager)		

Notes:

- *Lead PI can be assisted by a "Co-PI" who will provide overall support in the conducting the review.*
- *Research assistants on a review can be more than 2, depending on the scope of the research questions and/or availability of junior researchers. The time involvement of each can be spread accordingly among the available research assistants.*
- *Sector experts can be included in the team to enhance team's understanding of the sector and provide support in drawing policy implications of the findings*
- *A minimum of one methods expert (quantitative or qualitative) is required in systematic review team. Two methods experts may be required if the review question/scope/approach needs both types of data analysis (quantitative/qualitative). Thus, review teams should propose methods experts depending on scope of review questions, nature of evidence and proposed methodology.*
- *Bidders have the flexibility to nominate more than one person for a role or nominate one person for multiple roles, provided their qualifications and proposed time inputs justifies the same. Thus, the teams can have more than 5 members in their team. However, as stated earlier, participation in training programmes will be available for a maximum of 5 members per trainee team only (preferably including PI, information specialist/librarian and hands-on reviewers).*
- *Time inputs provided in the table above will be required for conducting the review, attending training, responding to peer review feedback, dissemination activities, providing regular reports of progress and consolidating learning.*