3ie Systematic Reviews Call 8

Request for Proposals

Issue date: 10 April 2015
Proposal submission deadline: 12.00 noon GMT, 22 May 2015

1. Introduction

The International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie) requests research organisations or consortia to submit proposals for systematic reviews of international development interventions on sanitation and hygiene, humanitarian assistance and/or climate change.

Systematic reviews are an important way of facilitating the widespread use of existing evidence to inform policy and programming. 3ie is announcing a call for proposals for systematic reviews to increase the international development community’s use of evidence in policymaking. This is the eighth call for proposals under 3ie’s systematic reviews programme.

2. Systematic reviews call 8 questions

3ie, respectively with the Water Supply & Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC), Children’s Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Office of Foreign of Disaster Assistance (OFDA), have developed four systematic review questions, which are provided below. Please see Appendix A for further details about each question.

3ie requests research teams having the experience and expertise in research synthesis to submit proposals to undertake systematic reviews on these. This is an opportunity to work on highly policy-relevant research that will directly inform the policies of these funding agencies. There will be one award for each of these questions, but 3ie and its partners may choose to fund fewer reviews if insufficient proposals of adequate quality are received.

Question 1 (WSSCC): To what extent has the sanitation and hygiene sub-sector taken into account the life-cycle approach in the design, implementation, maintenance and use of programmes during the Millennium Development Goal period (2000-2015)?

Question 2 (WSSCC): What is the effectiveness of interventions aiming to promote sanitation and hygiene behaviour change in communities?
Question 3 (USAID): What is the comparative efficiency and effectiveness of providing humanitarian non-food item in-kind distributions versus cash and vouchers in the immediate aftermath and recovery period following natural disasters and political instability?

Question 4 (CIFF): What are the effects of land use change and forestry sector programmes and policies on greenhouse gas emissions and human welfare outcomes? (Evidence gap map and two systematic reviews)

3. 3ie’s approach to systematic reviews

Systematic reviews use transparent decision-making processes to find, appraise and synthesise evidence in ways that can help policymakers and other decision makers make better decisions (Lavis, 2009).

3ie supports systematic reviews that follow well-established procedures for searching, critically appraising and extracting data from published and unpublished literature, which is then rigorously analysed and synthesised to establish the consistent findings and the more variable and contextually specific messages. Identifying the likely effect of a policy or programme intervention, based on the evidence included in the review, is a key element of a 3ie systematic review.

3.1 Requirements for 3ie-funded reviews

- 3ie takes a broad perspective on the types of questions and evidence on which a systematic review can be based. Evidence of effectiveness requires mixed methodological approaches, including factual quantitative and qualitative studies, and counterfactual experimental, quasi-experimental and simulation studies in controlled and real-life settings.

- A clear theory or theories of change that specifies how, why and under what conditions a policy or programme intervention is supposed to work in order to achieve the desired outcomes. This requires analysis of the evidence from included studies along the causal chain.

- A stakeholder engagement and communication plan (SECP), which is a detailed plan for engaging in two-way communication and, where appropriate, collaboration with key users when conducting the systematic review in order to ensure maximum policy support for the review being done and uptake and use of eventual findings in policy and programming. One component of the SECP is the requirement to set up an advisory group (see section 6 below).

- Attendance at the 3ie-organised grantee inception workshop in September 2015.

- The presentation of the findings of a review according to the 3ie review report template, which is a 25-30 page report written in a user-friendly style and plain language that does not require a technical background in research or evaluation.
3.2 3ie funds the following types of reviews 3ie funds (see also Table 1):

- Reviews of effects of interventions from studies that have counterfactual evidence and that examine intermediate as well as final outcomes. For an example review, see Baird et al. (2013).
- Portfolio reviews examining intervention design and implementation fidelity. For an example review, see Waddington et al. (2014a).
- Reviews examining barriers to and enablers of targeting, uptake, compliance and implementation, and drawing on a broad range of evidence. For examples, see Munro et al. (2007), Phillips et al. (2014b) and Snilstveit et al. (2014).
- Reviews that rigorously analyse the full theory or theories of change and assumptions underlying the implementation and outcomes of a policy or intervention, by using appropriate quantitative and qualitative methods. This may involve specifying more than one PICOS (populations, interventions, outcomes, studies and contexts relevant to the review) and search strategy, which should be presented and accounted for separately. For examples, see Harden et al. (2009) and Waddington et al. (2014).

3ie systematic reviews are generally restricted to interventions in low- and middle-income countries, though they may sometimes draw on evidence from high-income countries. A list of 3ie systematic reviews that have been completed and others that are currently in progress is available at http://www.3ieimpact.org/en/funding/systematic-reviews-grants/.

A more complete listing of systematic reviews in international development is available in the 3ie’s Systematic Reviews Database.

Table 1: Evidence eligible for systematic review research questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review sub-question</th>
<th>Type of evidence</th>
<th>Theory of change component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are interventions designed and implemented?</td>
<td>Project and programme documents, process evaluations and completion reports.</td>
<td>Intervention design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation fidelity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the experiences and challenges with</td>
<td>'Factual’ (qualitative and/or quantitative) evidence.</td>
<td>Beneficiary targeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge and attitudes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uptake and adherence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What difference is made to outcomes?</td>
<td>'Counterfactual’ evidence from experimental and quasi-experimental impact</td>
<td>Impacts on intermediate outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluations and simulation studies.</td>
<td>Impacts on endpoint or final outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unintended impacts and adverse effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Societal and economy-wide impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3ie partners with the Campbell Collaboration in the production and quality assurance of systematic reviews. Similar collaborations exist between 3ie and the Cochrane Collaboration, the Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre, and the Collaboration for Environmental Evidence. All 3ie-funded review teams should aim to register
their reviews with one of these collaborating groups. 3ie’s staff can advise successful teams on the most appropriate group with which any particular review should be registered. 3ie staff cannot give advice on individual proposals during the application stage or be named as part of teams submitting proposals.

4. Resources on Systematic Reviews

There are a number of sources of guidance on how to produce a systematic review.

4.1 Reviews of intervention effects

- The standards required by the Campbell Collaboration and 3ie, in terms of establishing the effectiveness and likely effect size of interventions is available at:\n  http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/lib/download/3308/C2_Policies_Guidelines_Version_1_0.pdf
- General guidance on effectiveness reviews can be found in the Cochrane Collaboration Handbook available at: http://handbook.cochrane.org/
- A 3ie paper on doing effective systematic reviews in international development (open access) can be found in the Journal of Development Effectiveness http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19439342.2012.711765
- A 3ie paper on incorporating broader evidence into reviews of effects (open access) can be found in the Journal of Development Effectiveness http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19439342.2012.709875

4.2 Qualitative reviews

- The Cochrane Collaboration provides qualitative evidence guidance is available at http://cqim.cochrane.org/supplemental-handbookguidance
- The paper on Narrative approaches to systematic review and synthesis of evidence for international development policy and practice (open access) can be found in the Journal of Development Effectiveness http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/19439342.2012.710641

4.3 Useful impact evaluation resources

- 3ie’s guidance on what constitutes impact evaluation is available at: http://www.3ieimpact.org/media/filer_public/2012/05/17/principles_for_impact_evaluation.pdf

5. Team composition

The study team must comprise:

- Members with sector and substantive expertise in the topic to be reviewed.
- Members with training and experience in conducting systematic reviews (including systematic searching, quality appraisal, data extraction and data analysis).

1 Guidance on the steps required in registering a review with Campbell are available at http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/systematic_reviews/index.php
• An information specialist or experienced librarian (to undertake and supervise searching).
• Statistical expertise for quantitative analysis, including statistical meta-analysis if applicable; and
• Expertise in qualitative synthesis methods and theory of change analysis.

5.1 Research assistants dedicated to the project

It is important that a systematic review team has substantial dedicated research staff time. Proposals with insufficient dedicated staff time will not be successful. Sufficiency is defined as enough staff, with relevant language skills, 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 are required to consult search librarians or information specialists as part of the process of developing a protocol, and should budget appropriate resources for this requirement.

6. Advisory group

To help the study teams establish the review’s relevance for policymaking and programme implementation, successful teams are required to form an advisory group, preliminary details of which should be included in the application. An advisory group typically consists of a mix of policymakers, substantive and topic experts. Please see the Campbell Collaboration Stakeholder Advisory Group guidance. Additionally, representative(s) from the agency funding the review and the 3ie Synthesis and Review Office (SRO) liaison will be part of this advisory group.

7. Application process

7.1 Eligibility

• Only proposals under the Systematic Review Call 8 questions will be accepted. The list of questions on which 3ie requests review proposals is available in Appendix A.

• Only legally registered organisations and consortia of registered organisations, not individuals, may apply. The applicant organisation must be able to sign the 3ie grant agreement which is available on the 3ie website. For-profit organisations are eligible to apply but are restricted to the same indirect cost limits as non-profit organisations and may not charge a fee.

• A team applying for a grant may include consortia of multiple organisations, but a single organisation must apply for the grant as the prime grantee and then issue sub-awards to other team members. It is not required, however, that teams include multiple organisations.

• The lead grant-holding organisation may be located anywhere in the world. Qualifications must include at least one named principal investigator (PI). Each proposal must be submitted by a single organisation that may include others as sub-grantees or sub-contractors (subject to 3ie’s direct and indirect cost policies).
Organisations may only submit one proposal per question (there is no limit on the number of questions for which an organisation may submit a proposal). Organisations or PIs may be included on more than one proposal. They should, however, have the capacity to implement any and all grants awarded to them under the 3ie Systematic Reviews Call 8 grant window.

- 3ie encourages proposals and research teams from low- and middle-income countries. The research team may include other researchers who are not employees of the grant-holding organisation.

### 7.2 Budget

3ie expects to fund grants of up to US$100,000 for each systematic review. As an approximate guide, the average budget of studies financed under previous calls for proposals was US$82,500. We expect costs to vary depending on a range of factors, including the scope of the review and the methods of synthesis employed.

Importantly, applicants should aim to allocate approximately 10 per cent of their total budget to SECP activities and should budget additional resources accordingly in their proposals.

Additionally please include in your budget the cost of attending a grantee inception workshop in September 2015 in London. 3ie recommends that you budget for three researchers to travel economy class and include costs for accommodation and meals for three full working days in London at a maximum of US$255 per person per day.

### 7.3 Timeline

Applications should submit their proposal(s) by **22 May 2015**.

Grant signing is contingent on approval of requested revisions to the full proposal and agreement to attend the post-award grantee inception workshop in London in September 2015. The grant signing process will take six to eight weeks after submission of the full application, depending on the degree of revisions requested to the proposed research designs.

Reviews are expected to take approximately 12-18 months from contract signing for the grant to submission of the report. Applicants must give serious attention to this timeline when preparing their timetables, milestones and deliverables. All studies should be completed with final reports due no later than 31 December 2016. The activities timeline is given in Table 2.
Table 2: Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity or deliverable</th>
<th>Key dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFP is posted</td>
<td>10 April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic review proposal is submitted to 3ie</td>
<td>22 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards announced</td>
<td>22 June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial due diligence and grant agreements signed</td>
<td>31 July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of title registration form and Stakeholder Engagement and Communication Plan (SECP)</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee inception workshop in London</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of protocol</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of draft report</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final report</td>
<td>31 December 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4 Selection criteria

The systematic review technical proposal and budget will be reviewed and scored by at least one internal and at least two external reviewers, and include a representative of the funding agency.

3ie may provide comments and request a resubmission of a proposal that does not receive adequate scores. If the proposal is accepted, 3ie will award the research team a grant to conduct the systematic review under 3ie’s standard terms and conditions. Please see 3ie grant agreement template for details. 3ie reserves the right not to award any grant in case no applicant meets the requirements.

Teams that demonstrate their commitment to equity and diversity are encouraged to apply.

Team members should have excellent writing and verbal communication skills in English.

The following table provides the evaluation criteria and weighting for the systematic review proposal. The full systematic review proposal criteria are in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of technical proposal</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management and budget</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of developing country researchers</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy relevance and potential for impact</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Deliverables

The following deliverables are requirements of the grant:

- PIs must attend the grantee inception workshop.
- Establish the advisory group
• Register the study title, subject to approval by 3ie, and submitted to the Campbell Collaboration or another recognised systematic review group.
• Submit a study protocol, subject to approval by 3ie, to the Campbell Collaboration or another recognised systematic review group.
• Develop a stakeholder engagement and communication plan (SECP), subject to 3ie review and feedback.
• Deliver a final full review report, subject to approval by 3ie and submitted to the Campbell Collaboration or another recognised systematic review group.
• Deliver a summary report in 3ie format of no more than 30 pages (see 8.1).
• Provide a two- or four-page policy brief, based on 3ie guidelines for policy briefs after the final report has been approved by 3ie.
• Provide a summary for the 3ie systematic review database, in the 3ie database record template to be provided by your 3ie SRO liaison.
• Provide a list of all included impact studies with a summary in a format suitable to be included in the 3ie’s impact evaluation repository (please budget for this output in the proposal).

8.1 Summary reports

3ie expects studies to be policy relevant and findings to be taken up and used in policy and programmes. To this end, the findings of 3ie-funded systematic reviews need to be accessible to a wide audience of policymakers, international development professionals and other users of evidence. Teams are required to submit a summary report of no more than 30 pages in the style and format provided in the 3ie summary report template (the updated version will be provided at a suitable time).

9. Instructions for applicants

Proposal applications must include the following information, which can be completed or uploaded through the 3ie online grant management system:

• Completed application form.
• Curriculum vitae (CV, not to exceed three pages each) of all proposed PIs and CVs of all additional named researchers or specialists that will be involved in conducting the systematic review. Applicants need to provide only information relevant to the grant in their CV.
• A proposed budget (as per the template provided in the GMS system).

10. Submission guidelines

Applications must be submitted through 3ie’s online grant management system no later than 12:00 noon GMT, 22 May 2015.

In case of queries, please refer to the frequently asked questions page. Queries that are unanswered can be sent to sr8@3ieimpact.org by 28 April 2015. Within three working days, we will post the questions and answers here.

Successful teams will be notified in June 2015.
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Appendix A: Four review questions and background information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: To what extent has the sanitation and hygiene sub-sector taken into account the life-cycle approach in the design, implementation, maintenance and use of programmes during the Millennium Development Goals period (2000-2015)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Sponsored by:** Water Supply & Sanitation Collaborative Council

**Policy background**

The Water Supply & Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC) follows and promotes a life-cycle approach so that the practical needs of individuals at every stage of their lives are respected and met. This includes addressing the differential needs of people at different age, gender as well as physical ability. The purpose of the study is to provide credible evidence for accountability, decision-making and learning to improve policies, strategies, plans, programmes and projects for the Millennium Development Goals post-2015 period.

**PICOS**

*Populations relevant to the review:* children (0-9 years), adolescents (9-19 years), women of reproductive age (9-49 years), senior age (49+ years) and people with disability based in WSSCC priority low- and middle-income countries.

*Interventions relevant to the review:* sanitation and hygiene projects, programmes and policies developed and implemented since 2000.

*Outcomes relevant to the review:* the review should cover the design, implementation, maintenance and use of programmes.

*Studies and contexts relevant to the review:* the scope of the literature should cover programme documents at the global level (e.g. documents of United Nations agencies and international non-governmental organisations), national (e.g. poverty reduction strategy papers) and sector levels (e.g. government policies and schemes on sanitation and hygiene and sector-wide approaches), and project design and implementation documents in selected WSSCC priority countries. Given the large scope, teams are encouraged to restrict coverage to a manageable sample of WSSCC priority countries.

**Portfolio reviews background**

Portfolio reviews are designed to identify comprehensively all projects, programmes and policies of a given type that have been implemented in a given location or set of locations. In doing so, they aim to gain an understanding of programme design and implementation in a sector as a whole. By capturing data on a range of programme features, they facilitate in-depth descriptive analysis regarding the nature of those interventions. Portfolio reviews can help shed light on questions about how, when and where programmes have been implemented, the objectives that are pursued, the number and characteristics of beneficiaries, the range of funding and costs involved, and questions relating to implementation fidelity.
Programme and project documents\textsuperscript{2} and evaluation reports are likely to be the best source of data for a portfolio review. The search strategy should systematically cover organisational websites, grey literature databases, document repositories and libraries of relevant documentation. However, the search strategy should be supplemented by contacting relevant organisations to obtain documentation which is not in the public domain. Citation-tracking can be another useful source of information.

Portfolio reviews should aim to incorporate as wide a range of documentation as possible, and data sources are not usually restricted by methodology or format, although sources of information contained in included studies may be critically appraised. Internal quality assurance should ensure study selection and coding are verified, usually by two researchers working independently.

Data collection should be content and thematically oriented. Categories should be drawn up with reference to theory and systematically coded, where categories developed are clearly defined, comprehensive and mutually exclusive. Data collection should take into account possible dependency of included studies across projects and programmes. Any decisions taken about how to interpolate missing data values should be reported transparently.

Extracted data may be synthesised using content-analytical approaches, using policy-friendly methods. Phillips et al. (2014a) provides an example report.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Question 2: What is the relative effectiveness of interventions aiming to promote sanitation and hygiene behaviour change in communities?}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Sponsored by:} Water Supply & Sanitation Collaborative Council

\textbf{Policy background}

The WSSCC supports sanitation and hygiene programmes which aim to bring about sustainable and equitable behaviour change and to promote use of sanitation and hygiene as a means of achieving community empowerment and human rights.

Organisations working in the sector use a wide range of approaches to promote sanitation and hygiene, including by increasing demand and relaxing supply side infrastructural constraints. Such approaches include community-led total sanitation and sanitation marketing; programmes providing financial support including national government subsidy programmes, community-based cross-subsidies, vouchers and cash transfers; and programmes supporting the water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) sector governance such as decentralised community-based approaches.

Evidence is needed on the relative effectiveness of different approaches to promote sanitation and hygiene on behaviour change, as well as other outcomes such as community empowerment and gender outcomes. Decision makers need to know the critical facilitators in

\begin{itemize}
\item A broad definition of programme and project documentation would be any document that contains descriptive information about planned, ongoing or completed interventions. Typically, they are reports from implementers and funders that describe the background or design, the resources made available, and/or the way in which it has been implemented.
\end{itemize}
ensuring that impacts are achieved and sustained and how scaling up is best achieved. The objective of the study is to synthesise these effects and experiences to produce evidence that can guide governments and international bodies to formulate effective hygiene and sanitation policies and programmes.

**PICOS**

*Populations eligible for the review:* people in low- and middle-income countries (L&MICs). Evidence of differential effectiveness on population sub-groups should be examined including gender, age, disability, and rural/urban location.

*Interventions eligible for the review:* programmes conducted to promote uptake and use of sanitation and hygiene, including sanitation marketing, community-led total sanitation, national government subsidies programmes, community-based cross subsidies, vouchers, cash transfers and programmes to promote better governance such as decentralised service delivery.

*Comparisons eligible for the review:* questions examining effects of interventions on outcomes may use a range of comparisons, such as other forms of behaviour change promotion or no intervention provided.

*Outcomes eligible for the review:* primary outcomes should include behaviour change (uptake, adherence, sustainability). Secondary outcomes may include other outcomes reported in studies, such as health and education outcomes, gender (e.g. gender relations, decision making, division of labour) and human rights (e.g. dignity, safety). Studies may examine outcomes at individual, household and community levels.

*Study designs eligible for the review:* effects on outcomes should be measured using counterfactual empirical techniques (experimental and quasi-experimental quantitative studies). Evidence on process and implementation can draw on factual (qualitative and quantitative) empirical studies.

**Question 3.** What is the comparative efficiency and effectiveness of providing humanitarian non-food item (NFI) in-kind distributions versus cash and vouchers in the immediate aftermath and recovery period following natural disasters and political instability?

**Sponsored by:** USAID Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistant (OFDA)

**Policy background**

The OFDA does a great deal of work in the aftermath of natural disasters and humanitarian upheaval following social and political instability. OFDA’s work often extends into the recovery phase as well as disaster risk reduction (DRR) work that is very much linked to building resilience.

A range of goods and services are provided to populations in humanitarian settings, including cash, food and non-food items. For the purposes of humanitarian assistance and this review, non-food items (NFIs) are defined as household goods that typically include, but are not
restricted to, plastic sheeting, blankets and other bedding items, hygiene kits (e.g. soap, shampoo and other personal care items), kitchen sets (e.g. pots and pans), and water containers or jerry cans. NFIs do not include agricultural inputs or other livelihood assets, such as specialised shelter or water and sanitation items, food or nutritional inputs.

The study will systematically review the evidence base on the comparative efficiency and effectiveness of in-kind direct distributions of NFIs in humanitarian settings versus distributions of cash or vouchers specifically intended to help affected populations access such goods in local markets. Factors including programme design and implementation, as well as evidence of effects on outcomes and cost-efficiency (including procurement, delivery, registration and administration) will be studied. Eligible studies should meet the following criteria.

**PICOS**

**Population eligible for the review**: People living in humanitarian emergency settings

**Intervention eligible for the review**: Humanitarian aid provided in the form of in-kind non-food items (see examples above) in the immediate aftermath and recovery period following natural disasters and political instability.

**Comparisons eligible for the review**: Humanitarian aid provided in the form of cash grants or vouchers (or electronic versions of these, e.g. debit cards or mobile money transfers) specifically intended for populations to purchase non-food items

**Outcomes eligible for the review**: Evidence of effects should cover intermediate and final outcomes in relevant areas (appropriateness of items delivered; qualitative feelings of beneficiary satisfaction and dignity; level of unmet NFI-related humanitarian need post-intervention; safety of beneficiaries), as well as any evidence on cost-efficiency. Data may also be collected on other aspects of programme effectiveness, including those relating to design and implementation.

**Study designs eligible for the review**: Eligible studies examining impacts on outcomes should use counterfactual empirical methods. Evidence on process and implementation can draw on qualitative and quantitative empirical studies.

**Question 4: What are the effects of land use change and forestry sector programmes and policies on greenhouse gas emissions and human welfare outcomes? (An evidence gap map and two systematic reviews)**

**Sponsored by**: Children’s Investment Fund Foundation

**Policy background**

Recent estimates suggest that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from agriculture, land use change and forestry contributed 21.2 per cent of total GHG emissions in 2010. Emissions from land use have remained stable since 2010, while emissions from agriculture have continued to grow by around 1 per cent annually. In some countries, such as Brazil, emissions from deforestation and agriculture represent an even larger share of total GHG emissions. Agricultural development remains a major driver of emissions and there is a need to develop
policies and programmes that reconcile food production with climate change mitigation strategies in the sector.

The private sector, governments and non-governmental organisations are all involved in the sector. They engage in different activities, including integrated land use management, agroforestry, legislation and programmes providing incentives for avoided deforestation. It is not clear which policies and activities are most effective at reducing GHG emissions and increasing carbon storage from land use at scale and in which contexts. There is a need to develop the evidence base in the sector to drive more effective action to reach national and global emissions reduction targets.

Climate Change mitigation is a priority for the Children’s Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF). CIFF is currently working on a programme to reconcile agricultural production and forest protection in Brazil, and is working with 3ie to collect evidence to assess what works and does not work, to support adjustment to activities as they are rolled out. To inform this programme and to provide a global public good of relevance beyond Brazil, CIFF is funding an Evidence gap map and two systematic reviews. 3ie will commission one team to conduct this work in two stages, as described below.

**Stage 1: Evidence gap map**

Evidence gap maps (EGMs) consolidate what we know about what works in a particular sectors or thematic area. 3ie’s Evidence gap maps identify evidence from systematic reviews and impact evaluations and provide a graphical display of areas with strong, weak or non-existent evidence on the effects of development programmes and initiatives.

This EGM will map the global evidence on ‘The effects of land use change and forestry sector programmes and policies on greenhouse gas emissions and human welfare outcomes’. Work on the EGM must begin mid-July 2015 and the draft report must be submitted to 3ie and presented to the advisory group by August 2015. The map will highlight areas with potential for in-depth synthesis and will inform the scope of up to two systematic reviews. Teams should conduct the mapping according to methodological guidelines and include the following activities in their proposal, together with a timeline.

- Develop a draft framework of relevant interventions and outcomes no later than 4 weeks after signing the contract.
- Present the framework to an advisory group of policymakers to agree on the substantive scope of the mapping.
- Develop a systematic and comprehensive search strategy.
- Implement the search strategy and identify relevant impact evaluations and systematic reviews.
- Extract data from impact evaluations and systematic reviews.
- Upload data on EGM software.
- Draft report.
- Present report to advisory group and identify topics for systematic review.
- Revise and finalise report.
Stage 2: Systematic reviews

We expect the successful team will proceed to conduct up to two systematic reviews, as agreed with the advisory group, CIFF and 3ie. At least one of the systematic reviews should include a section explicitly assessing applicability of findings to the Brazilian context.

Proposals should include details of methods, timeline and budget for stage 2. The EGM will ensure that the systematic reviews can be conducted more efficiently and this should be reflected in both the timeline and budget of the proposal. **Stage 2 is contingent on successful completion of stage 1.** If stage 1 is not completed to a satisfactory standard and timeline 3ie will reserve the right to not proceed with stage 2.

Examples of questions which may be selected for systematic review are outlined below:

- What are effective incentives-based interventions to complement command and control approaches to reconcile food production and GHG emissions reduction?

- What are effective interventions to institutionalise climate-smart land use for production and consumption in low- and middle-income countries?

- What are effective past policies that have affected land use change in different sectors (and in different geographic regions)?

- What are effective policy incentives and financial mechanisms to establish private sector uptake of environmentally friendly land use?

3ie is pleased to have worked with the WSSCC on questions 1 and 2, CIFF on question 3 and USAID on question 4 for this call for systematic reviews.
## Appendix B: Criteria for review of proposals to conduct systematic reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing (20%)</td>
<td>The skills and experience of the proposed team in the relevant research and policy areas and in conducting systematic reviews.</td>
<td>Points are awarded according to these criteria: (1) the PI(s) should have the right mix of experience and skills in systematic reviewing and in leading a project of this nature; (2) team members must have relevant experience in research, evaluation and systematic reviews, substantive knowledge in the area to be reviewed, and relevant skills in quantitative and/or qualitative analysis; and (3) PI(s) have appropriate skills and experience in working with policymakers and international development practitioners and in presenting research evidence in non-technical language to audiences with little or no research background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of technical proposal (40%)</td>
<td>The proposal is for a high-quality systematic review, which will use appropriate evidence to answer the research question(s) posed, and appropriate methods of search, critical appraisal, data collection and synthesis of evidence along the causal chain.</td>
<td>Points are awarded according to these criteria: (1) evidence of a clear and deep understanding of the principles and procedures of systematic reviewing that meet high-quality standards; (2) use of appropriate methods and procedures to answer the research question(s). Counterfactual evidence should be used to answer questions on effects. For applicants wishing to provide a more comprehensive synthesis, broader evidence (including qualitative) can be used to answer questions on programme implementation and adherence; (3) inclusion of a programme theory or theories of change that analyse evidence along the causal chain and explain heterogeneity in findings not just their central tendency; and (4) location of the review question in international development policy and practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management and Budget (10%)</td>
<td>The proposed accountability arrangements for the review, the value-for-money of the budget and the feasibility of the proposed timelines.</td>
<td>Points are awarded according to these criteria: (1) clarity and appropriateness of the accountability arrangements; (2) the appropriateness and value-for-money of the budget; and (3) the feasibility of the proposed timelines for delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of low- and middle-income country (L&amp;MIC) researchers or evaluators (15%)</td>
<td>The extent and nature in which L&amp;MIC evaluators or researchers are involved in the proposed study. L&amp;MIC researchers are defined as L&amp;MIC nationals resident in an L&amp;MIC country.</td>
<td>Points are awarded according to these criteria: (1) the substantial involvement of L&amp;MIC researchers or evaluators in the study team; and (2) evidence that the proposed review will help to build capacity for undertaking high-quality systematic reviews and the use of research evidence in L&amp;MCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy relevance and impact (15%)</td>
<td>Policy-relevant review questions</td>
<td>Points are awarded according to these criteria: (1) policy relevance of the question(s); (2) advisory group composition and engagement; and (3) the potential policy impact from the team’s plans for engaging with policy stakeholders, communicating and disseminating the findings of the review, and getting findings into policy and/or practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>