Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)

Evaluation of DFID's Health Programmes in Burma

Inception Report

Contents

1.   Introduction

1.1 The Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) is the independent body responsible for scrutinising UK aid. We focus on maximising the effectiveness of the UK aid budget for intended beneficiaries and on delivering value for money for UK taxpayers. We carry out independent reviews of aid programmes and of issues affecting the delivery of UK aid. We publish transparent, impartial and objective reports to provide evidence and clear recommendations to support UK Government decision-making and to strengthen the accountability of the aid programme. Our reports are written to be accessible to a general readership and we use a simple 'traffic light' system to report our judgement on each programme or topic we review.

1.2 We have decided to review the impact and value for money of the Department for International Development's (DFID's) aid programme directed at improving health outcomes in Burma, including the health components of humanitarian programmes. We will assess how well DFID manages the delivery of its assistance in a difficult environment, including assessing the relative merits of different delivery channels. We will review the extent to which lessons learnt from past assistance have informed future programming choices. We will also consider the extent to which DFID's health programming contributes to promoting peace-building and state-building in Burma.

1.3 This Inception Report sets out the evaluation questions, methodology and work plan for the evaluation. It is, however, intended that the methodology and work plan be flexible enough to allow new questions and lines of inquiry to emerge over the course of the evaluation.

2.   Background

2.1 The background to this review is described in the Terms of Reference.[1]

3.   Purpose of this review

3.1 To assess whether DFID is achieving impact and value for money in Burma through its bilateral aid to the health sector and to humanitarian programmes with a health component.

4.   Relationship to other reviews

4.1 The relationship to other reviews is described in the Terms of Reference.[1]

5.   Methodology

Analytical approach

5.1 The evaluation will address a number of important themes, in particular it will:

- assess DFID's overarching health strategy, including the rationale for and coherence of its portfolio of health programmes;
- compare and contrast the different delivery channels used by DFID, looking particularly at the challenge of delivering effectively in an environment where access is restricted;

---

[1]   *Terms of Reference: Evaluation of DFID's health programmes in Burma*, ICAI, http://icai.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/Evaluation-of-DFIDs-health-programmes-in-Burma.pdf.

- assess how well the programmes contribute to DFID's objective of addressing the root causes of conflict and fragility in Burma and whether they support wider peace-building and state-building processes; and

- assess whether lessons learned through past evaluations have led to improved programming choices over time.

5.2 The evaluation methodology will comprise the following elements:

Phase 1: Pre-site Assessment

5.3 We will conduct:

- a literature review, focussing on research and evaluations of other DFID health programmes and similar health aid programmes supported by other agencies;

- interviews, either in person or by phone, with:

  – DFID HQ staff whose work is relevant to DFID Burma's work. This will include staff from the regional team, the Burma desk, Internal Audit and the United Nations (UN) desk; and

  – DFID Burma staff based in Burma and Thailand;

- interviews with National Audit Office staff who are currently carrying out a value for money review of DFID programming on malaria. Burma was one of four country case studies which they carried out between September 2012 and January 2013. We have sought to avoid unnecessary duplication by consulting with them in advance of our work.

- a desk-based assessment of the use of evidence in the design of DFID's Burma health programme portfolio. Using the literature review, we will assess how well project documentation (especially logframes and planning documents) has taken on board knowledge and lessons from health programme evaluations in other countries. We will assess whether or not there is an appropriate evidence base to support DFID Burma's health programme portfolio design and whether DFID used all available evidence appropriately; and

- a desk-based assessment of the previous evaluations and reviews of the DFID Burma health portfolio. This will give a view on the quality of the evaluative process in each case, the certainty of results and the utility of the reports, including helping to establish baseline data and how this is used to inform subsequent programming and future evaluations. It will consider how the full range of monitoring and evaluation activity that is undertaken and available to DFID Burma is used to assess the impact that its entire health portfolio is having.

Phase 2: Field Work, including site visits to Burma and Thailand (details to be finalised during pre-site assessment)

5.4 We will visit DFID-funded health programmes in Burma and for Burmese people based in Thailand to assess directly the level of impact of the health programmes on the recovery and livelihood opportunities of conflict-affected or fragile communities. Security and practical considerations permitting, we will conduct a mixture of announced and unannounced visits to collect a range of evidence. To maximise our interaction with intended beneficiaries, we will hold meetings with certain groups in workshops if feasible. Specifically, we will seek to arrange an intended beneficiary workshop at each pre-arranged site visit. We will attempt for at least one of the site visits to be unannounced and, therefore, pre-arranging a workshop will not be possible in that location.

5.5 Visiting programmes in Burma where aid is provided to intended beneficiaries presents a number of logistical difficulties as the point of delivery is often in remote, conflict-affected areas or where access is strictly controlled by the Burmese authorities. We have, therefore, selected the following case study projects:

Project title	Allocation	Dates	Funding channel and location
Three Millennium Development Goals (3MDG) Fund	£40 million for 2011-12 – 2013-14; *up to* £40 million for 2014-15 – 2016-17[3]	2012-16	Multi-donor trust fund managed by the UN The aid is delivered in Burma
Three Diseases Fund	£34.1 million	2006-13	Multi-donor trust fund managed by the UN The aid is delivered in Burma
Improving Maternal and Child Health After NARGIS	£4.95 million	2009-13	Multi-donor trust fund managed by the UN The aid is delivered in Burma
Health Services Programme	£532,000	2009-12	Accountable Grant to Mae Tao Clinic The aid is delivered in Thailand
Accessible Tuberculosis Treatment	£176,000	2009-12	Accountable grant to Shoklo Malaria Research Unit The aid is delivered in Thailand

5.6 We will also assess the following project to understand how DFID monitors and manages a programme in areas where access is difficult for foreign nationals. While we will not be able to visit this project on the ground, we will carry out our assessment via document review and interviews, including, if possible, interviewing people involved in the project who are able to access the area:

Project title	Allocation	Dates	Funding channel and location
Emergency Health Care Project in Eastern Burma	£834,000	2011-13	Accountable Grant to Christian Aid (NGO) This programme is for internally displaced people, particularly women and children, living in the target conflict-affected areas in eastern Burma. It gives access to emergency health care provided by trained health personnel

---

[2] Data provided to ICAI by DFID.
[3] Subject to reviews of progress and government and other donor commitments.
[4] Data provided to ICAI by DFID.

5.7 We have not selected the following projects for detailed review, although we will consider them as part of our assessment of DFID's strategy and overall portfolio of health programmes:

Project title	Allocation	Dates	Funding channel and reason for non selection
Addressing Drug Resistant Malaria in Burma	£11.3 million	2011-14	Accountable Grant to Population Services International (NGO) To improve access to quality-assured treatment for malaria by replacing sub-standard drugs in the private sector. Reliance will be placed on the work of the National Audit Office undertaken in December 2012
Primary Health Care Programme in Burma	£3.2 million	2006-12	Accountable Grant with Health Poverty Action (NGO) The aid is delivered to people in Burma via China and is inaccessible to foreign nationals
Health Services for Burmese Refugees in 3 Camps	£85,000	2010-11	Accountable Grant to Aide Medicale Internationale (NGO) The aid was delivered to people in Thailand and the programme was completed in 2011

5.8 The programmes selected for review cover the different delivery channels: non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS). The selection of programmes also covers the three strategic objectives of the health programme in Burma contained in the Terms of Reference.

5.9 We will examine a range of documentation, as set out in the evaluation framework (see pages 6-14). This will include further review of documentation in-country as required and a detailed examination of DFID's operational files and evaluations related to its health programme work.

5.10 We will evaluate the health programmes' financial information, focussing on the last five years. This will include analysis of the financial reports of a sample of partner organisations and the overall project to try to identify costs and the proportion of allocated funds reaching intended beneficiaries. This review is dependent on receiving sufficient and appropriate financial reports from partner organisations. It will attempt to consider funds flow, accounting and reporting systems, audit and costs at each stage of the delivery chain. By comparing the different delivery channels and partners used in the DFID Burma health portfolio and the strategies and methods they employ for managing the difficult operating environment, it will seek to draw lessons on effective programme delivery in fragile environments that are facing a rapidly changing political situation.

5.11 The full list of interviewees will be drawn up in discussion with DFID Burma and other key informants. We will conduct face-to-face interviews with DFID staff who worked on the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the health programmes in the portfolio, to inform analysis of the use of data, impact and

---

[5] Data provided to ICAI by DFID.

performance management. We will review, in particular, how these evaluations have used the lessons identified to inform future programmes.

5.12 We will conduct face-to-face and telephone interviews with partner organisation staff who deliver the DFID health programmes. By comparing the different delivery channels and partners used in the Burma health aid portfolio and the strategies and methods they employ for managing the difficult operating environment, the review will seek to draw lessons on effective programme delivery in conflict-affected environments.

Evaluation framework

5.13 The evaluation framework for this review is set out in the table below. It is based on the standard ICAI guiding criteria and evaluation framework, which cover four areas: objectives, delivery, impact and learning.

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
(1) Objectives: what is the programme trying to achieve?			
Does the programme have clear, relevant, realistic objectives that focus on the desired impact? (1.1)	**Does the programme have clear, relevant and realistic objectives that focus on the desired impact? (ToR 6.2.1)** **Does the programme support peace building by reducing marginalisation and strengthening state-citizen relationships? (ToR 6.2.5)**	• Evidence of clear and relevant objectives being set at country and health programme levels • Evidence of clear and relevant objectives being set at programme, project and intervention levels • Evidence of objectives being specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time-bound • Evidence of objectives being informed by country context including supporting peace building • Evidence of a strategic vision for the programme that was reviewed in line with change of circumstances • Evidence of assessment by DFID Burma of capacity to monitor the delivery of health programme by partners • Evidence of improvements in reducing marginalisation and strengthening state-citizen relationships • Evidence of DFID Burma considering the capacity of the Government of Burma to deliver a coherent health programme	• DFID, UNOPS and NGO programme planning and implementation documentation • Programme reviews • DFID interviews • Interviews with the Burma Ministry of Health • UNOPS interviews • NGO interviews • Interviews with other donors

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work? (1.2)	**Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work based on the lessons of previous programme implementation and the changing context of delivering aid in Burma? (ToR 6.2.2)**	• Evidence of a sound theory of change from documentation (analysis of problem, options, solution generation, implementation model) • Evidence of appropriate design detail for each intervention • Evidence of comprehensive approaches for each intervention • Evidence that this theory of change model is appropriate for the Burma health programme	• DFID, UNOPS and NGO programme planning and implementation documentation • Programme reviews • DFID interviews • Interviews with the Burma Ministry of Health • UNOPS interviews • NGO interviews • Interviews with other donors
Does the programme complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (1.3)	**Does the programme complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (ToR 6.2.3)**	• Evidence of appropriate design detail for each programme • Evidence of sound approaches that include other partners in design for each programme • Evidence of well-founded protocols for engagement • Evidence of effective dialogue taking place with government and other aid providers • Evidence of a lack of duplication with government and other aid providers • Evidence of effective planning and co-ordination with other donors	• DFID and other donor programme planning and implementation documentation • Programme reviews • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with the Burma Ministry of Health • UNOPS interviews • NGO interviews • Interviews with other donors • Third party reporting

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Are the programme's objectives appropriate to the political, economic, social and environmental context? (1.4)	**Are the programme's objectives appropriate to the political, economic, social and environmental context? (ToR 6.2.4)**	• Evidence of appropriate contextual analysis being undertaken • Evidence of soundly based needs assessments • Evidence of planning and implementation using contextual analysis and needs assessments to inform decisions • Evidence of a coherent DFID country strategy for health at all levels	• Country office strategy and programme documentation • Programme reviews • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with the Burma Ministry of Health • UNOPS interviews • NGO interviews • Other donor interviews and documentation • Risk assessments • Interviews with intended beneficiaries
(2) Delivery: is the delivery chain designed and managed so as to be fit for purpose?			
Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? (2.1)	Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate?	• Evidence of appropriate options appraisal • Evidence of appropriate capacity and quality assessment of partners • Evidence from implementation of a robust delivery chain (reporting, achievements)	• DFID option appraisals and business cases • Interviews with DFID • Partner interviews and documentation • Interviews with intended beneficiaries • DFID logframes

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Does programme design and roll-out take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries? (2.2)	**Does programme design and roll-out take into account the needs of intended beneficiaries? (ToR 6.3.1)**	• Evidence of meaningful consultation with intended beneficiaries in design, governance, implementation and monitoring • Evidence of satisfaction of intended beneficiaries with these processes • Evidence of known or sought-out needs of beneficiaries against assumed needs • Evidence of involvement of intended beneficiaries in the programme design and roll-out • Evidence of how DFID Burma assesses effectively the needs of intended beneficiaries where the project is inaccessible to foreign nationals	• Interviews with intended beneficiaries • Third party reporting • Programme reports • Programme documentation and analysis • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with partners • DFID logframes

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption? (2.3)	**Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption? (ToR 6.3.2)**	• Evidence of sound financial management • Evidence of appropriate anti-corruption activity • Evidence that good practice and recommendations from ICAI's anti-corruption report are being acted upon • Evidence of effective challenge and accountability around programme design and resource allocation • Evidence of robust partner selection criteria and capacity assessment • Evidence of strong oversight of implementing partners, including reporting requirements • Evidence that DFID Burma has adequate capacity to assess governance arrangements • Evidence of how DFID Burma assesses the governance arrangements where the project is inaccessible to foreign nationals	• Interviews with DFID and partners • Technical review of systems • Audit and other financial management reports • Guidance material • Review of programme documents • Interviews with intended beneficiaries
Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact? (2.4)	Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact?	• Evidence of appropriate options appraisal • Evidence of other finance sources being used • Evidence of all funds being managed holistically • Evidence of how well the programme and DFID worked with others, whether costs were shared and whether joint reviews were undertaken	• Programme reviews • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with DFID • UNOPS interviews • NGO interviews

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Do managers ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery chain? (2.5)	**Do managers ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery chain? (ToR 6.3.3)**	• Evidence of appropriate cost review and management • Evidence of appropriate options analysis in procurement • Evidence of appropriate changes to budgets, design and delivery to improve cost-effectiveness • Evidence of an effective assessment of the quality of technical assistance provided • Evidence that DFID Burma has sufficient capacity to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of delivery chain arrangements • Evidence of how DFID Burma assesses the effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery chain where the project is inaccessible to foreign nationals	• Financial reporting • Management minutes • Evaluation reviews • Programme documentation • Third party assessments • Interviews with DFID • UNOPS interviews • NGO interviews • Interviews with other donors
Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain? (2.6)	Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain?	• Evidence of appropriate cost appraisal assessments • Evidence of appropriate financial reporting • Evidence of assessments being provided by all partners • Evidence that DFID Burma has sufficient capacity to assess costs throughout the delivery chain	• Financial reporting • Programme documentation

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively? (2.7)	**Are risks to the achievement of programme and project objectives identified and managed effectively? (ToR 6.3.4)** **Is the programme delivered in a conflict-sensitive manner? Does it manage political and conflict-related risk effectively? (ToR 6.3.7)**	• Evidence of appropriate risk appraisal at strategic level prior to design • Evidence that DFID Burma has considered risks associated with health programmes in other countries • Evidence of each element of delivery having an effective risk appraisal • Evidence of appropriate risk registers throughout the delivery chain • Evidence of appropriate management of identified risks including political and conflict-related risks • Evidence of DFID delivering the programme in a conflict-sensitive manner • Evidence that DFID Burma is considering how similar programmes are delivered in other countries • Evidence of how DFID Burma assesses the achievement of objectives where the project is inaccessible to foreign nationals	• Risk appraisals • Risk registers • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with the Burma Ministry of Health • Programme review documentation
Is the programme delivering against its agreed objectives? (2.8)	**Are activities delivering on their agreed objectives? (ToR 6.3.5)**	• Evidence of effective delivery against key targets • Evidence of an appropriate link between DFID funding and its key targets • Evidence of how DFID Burma assesses whether the programme is delivering against its agreed objectives where the project is inaccessible to foreign nationals	• Programme evaluation reports • Third party reporting • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with other parties, including intended beneficiaries

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances? (2.9)	**Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances? (ToR 6.3.6)**	• Evidence of analysis of considering changing circumstances • Evidence of decision-making based on analysis • Evidence of appropriate changes in delivery having taken place • Evidence of agility by decision-makers to enable effective changes	• Management minutes • Programme documentation • Evaluation reviews • Third party assessments
(3) Impact: what is the impact on intended beneficiaries?			
Is the programme delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries? (3.1)	**Is the programme delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries through improving the health outcomes for the people of Burma including do the poorest have access to the health outcomes? (ToR 6.4.1)**	• Sufficient evidence of delivery to intended beneficiaries • Sufficient evidence of short-term benefits • Sufficient evidence of long-term benefits • Sufficient evidence of assessment of broader health outcomes and trends and factors impacting on these • Sufficient evidence of how DFID Burma assesses the benefits for intended beneficiaries where the project is inaccessible to foreign nationals	• DFID reporting • Evaluation and monitoring reports • Observation • Third party reporting • Programme reports • Interviews with intended beneficiaries

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is the programme working holistically alongside other programmes? (3.2)	**Is the programme working holistically alongside other programmes? (ToR 6.4.2)**	• Evidence of joint design with other programmes • Evidence of effective integration with other DFID Burma programmes • Evidence of effective joint management with other bilateral donors and NGOs in the delivery of programmes • Evidence of effective assessment of broader health outcomes and trends and factors impacting on these • Evidence of coherent outcomes being achieved and avoidance of negative unattended effects	• Programme documentation • Partner assessments • Third party assessments • Programme reviews • DFID interviews • Interviews with NGOs • Interviews with other donors
Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the programme? (3.3)	**Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the programmes and activities? (ToR 6.4.3)**	• Evidence of meaningful systemic change achieved through the programmes and activities • Evidence of meaningful improvement in both quality and coverage of programmes • Evidence of meaningful social impact achieved through the programmes and activities • Evidence of meaningful impact of Technical Assistance • Evidence of meaningful assessment of health outcomes and trends and factors impacting on these • Evidence of how DFID Burma assesses the long-term and sustainable impact where the project is inaccessible to foreign nationals	• Programme documentation • Evaluations • Partner assessments • Third party assessments • Programme reviews • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with NGOs • Interviews with intended beneficiaries

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there an appropriate exit strategy involving effective transfer of ownership of the programme? (3.4)	**Is there an appropriate exit strategy involving effective transfer of ownership of the programme? (ToR 6.4.4)**	• Evidence of appropriate targets to build sustainable capacity • Evidence of achievement of sustainable capacity being in place • Evidence of robust exit strategy for external support in place	• Programme documentation • Partner assessments • Third party assessments • Programme reviews • DFID interviews • Interviews with other donors
Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers? (3.5)	**Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers? (ToR 6.4.5)**	• Evidence of details of assistance being publicly available in formats that are accessible to stakeholders in the UK, internationally and in-country • Evidence of appropriate involvement of local community and civil society organisations in providing feedback	• Publicly available reports (online, media, other) • Interviews with intended beneficiaries • Interviews with donors • Public information • Programme evaluation and reporting

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
(4) Learning: what works best and what needs improvement?			
Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact? (4.1)	**Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact?** **(ToR 6.5.1)**	• Evidence of activities designed with clear intended results, to support ease of evaluation and learning • Effective programme and project reporting and monitoring • Evidence of adequate use of independent evaluation • Use of lessons learnt to inform strategies, corporate guidance and future programming decisions • Evidence of DFID Burma soundly assessing impact of aid for intended beneficiaries • Evidence of DFID Burma soundly monitoring the inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact where the project is inaccessible to foreign nationals	• UNOPS interviews • NGO interviews • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with a sample of programme managers and country teams • Programme reviews • DFID monitoring and evaluation reports
Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice? (4.2)	**Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice? (ToR 6.5.2)**	• Evidence of lesson-learning incorporated in design and implementation of the programme and constituent projects • Evidence of innovation and use of global best practice • Evidence of DFID Burma identifying innovation from other Burma programmes and incorporating it into the health programme	• Programme planning and implementation documentation • Programme reviews • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with intended beneficiaries

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken? (4.3)	**Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken? (ToR 6.5.3)**	• Evidence of effective comparison with best practice • Evidence of effective comparison with recommendations from evaluations	• Programme planning and implementation documentation • Programme evaluations and monitoring reports • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with intended beneficiaries • Literature review
Have lessons about the objectives, design and delivery of the programme been learned and shared effectively? (4.4)	**Have lessons from previous programmes about objectives, design and delivery been fed into the design of successor programmes, both for the UN-managed trust funds and for UK-supported health programmes more generally? Specifically, have lessons relating to programme management capacity and effectiveness been taken into account in defining programme management arrangements for the Three MDG Fund? (ToR 6.5.4)**	• Evidence of lesson-learning from previous and comparable exercises incorporated in design and implementation of the programme and constituent projects • Evidence of recommendations from annual monitoring incorporated into operations • Evidence of lesson-learning being shared effectively with other similar programmes • Evidence of DFID staff visiting the field at appropriate and sufficiently frequent times • Evidence of knowledge capture • Evidence of dissemination of knowledge captured to inform other DFID programmes	• Review of evaluation of the three disease fund • Review of monitoring reports • Review of programme documentation • Interviews with DFID • UNOPS interviews • NGO interviews • Interviews with other donors

6. Roles and responsibilities

6.1 KPMG will provide oversight of this review under the overall leadership of the ICAI Project Director. Supplementary analysis and peer review will be provided by KPMG and Agulhas staff.

6.2 The team will comprise the following members:

Team member	Role
Team leader	Team Leader
Team member 1	Support to Team Leader
Team member 2	Team Member
Team member 3	Team Member
Team member 4	Peer Reviewer
Team member 5	Peer Reviewer
Team member 6	Analyst

Team leader (KPMG)

He has wide-ranging experience of the public sector and of charities at both national and local levels in the United Kingdom and New Zealand. He is a senior and experienced team leader and has held roles on many large, complex and high-profile projects. This has involved engaging with stakeholders at very senior levels often working on difficult or contentious issues. His relevant experience is in the health sector in the UK and New Zealand covering acute, community and primary care services. For example, he has led reviews and evaluations on the implementation of payment by results tariffs to hospitals and health commissioners in England. He has undertaken and reported on redesign of care pathways from primary care into consultant outpatient services. He has also led many reviews evaluating value for money (for example covering ward staffing, medicines management, medical staffing, Accident and Emergency Services and pathology services) and has led reviews of cost improvement plans for major health bodies.

He has led on the development and delivery of inspection programmes on how organisations use their resources by evaluating value for money, governance and organisational effectiveness. He has undertaken board-level development workshops and helped organisations to design and implement performance improvement programmes, giving him the skills and experience to assess and evaluate performance and effectiveness more widely.

Team member 1 (KPMG)

He is a Director and the contractor Team Leader for the ICAI programme overall. He has wide-ranging experience of the public, private and civil society sectors in the UK and internationally. He is an experienced team leader and he led the review of DFID's Oversight of the EU's Aid to Low-Income Countries. He was also a team member of the review of health programmes in Zimbabwe. He is a value for money expert and has particular experience of evaluating value for money and helping organisations to design and implement performance improvement programmes.

He will provide mentoring and support to the team leader, including ensuring he is aware of ICAI requirements and processes. Although he will not participate in the country visit, he will support the analytical process and the drafting of the evaluation report.

Team member 2 (Agulhas)

She is an Associate of Agulhas Applied Knowledge. She is an economist specialising in health, education and labour market economics. She has over 20 years' experience in all aspects of international development from strategy development to evaluation. She was also the team leader of the ICAI review of health programmes in Zimbabwe.

Team member 3 (Independent)

He has 20 years of institutional and management experience in international economic and social development in both the public and private sector, including 16 years in the health sector (HIV, malaria, TB and health system strengthening). He has extensive experience in developing and transitional countries in Asia and Africa. He has lived and worked in Burma for two years, primarily undertaking work in the health sector. His work has included advanced management and strategic planning with national and international organisations. He has led intercultural negotiations and policy dialogues in aid schemes. He has undertaken independent reviews of aid programmes.

Team member 4 (Agulhas)

She is an experienced leader and manager of people, programmes and projects. She has more than 18 years' experience in the UK civil service and consultancy roles, including in positions in senior leadership.

She has particular expertise in health and development policy issues, having worked for a range of clients in areas relating to health systems reform, drug policy, drug resistance, communicable and non-communicable disease.

Team member 5 (Independent)

She has over 30 years' development experience working for the DFID, UNICEF and the Save the Children Fund. This work has emphasised health system strengthening, to deliver evidence-based essential reproductive, maternal, neonatal and child health services. These services have targeted poor women and children in a wide range of countries and contexts, including fragile states.

She has extensive experience of working with governments at the policy and strategic level both in health in general and HIV/AIDS. She has worked with ministries in the areas of health financing, human resources and public sector reform. Through her roles, she has worked closely with and within bilateral and multilateral organisations such as the World Bank and the UN.

Team member 6 (KPMG)

She works in KPMG's Public Sector Audit Department specialising in external audit and internal audit. Her client base is varied, ranging from central government, local government, health services, trade unions and housing associations. She has over five years' professional experience, including the provision of legal representation at an international level and the provision of pro bono services to a range of high-profile not-for-

profit organisations. She also took part in the ICAI Approach to Effectiveness and Value for Money review.

7. Management and reporting

7.1 We will produce a first draft report for review by the ICAI Secretariat and Commissioners by w/c 15 April 2013, with time for subsequent revision and review prior to completion and sign off in July 2013.

8. Expected outputs and time frame

8.1 The main deliverables will be:

Phase	Timetable
Planning Finalising methodology Drafting Inception Report	 December 2012 December 2012 - January 2013
Phase 1: Field Work UK field work Burma Field Work	 January 2013 w/c 11 and 18 February 2013
Phase 2: Analysis and write-up Roundtable with Commissioners Further analysis and first draft Report quality assurance and review by Secretariat and Commissioners Report to DFID for fact checking Report finalisation	 26 March 2013 w/c 15 April 2013 w/c 22 April – w/c 3 June 2013 w/c 10 June 2013 w/c 1 July 2013

9. Risks and mitigation

9.1 The following sets out the key risks and mitigating actions for this evaluation.

Risk	Level of risk	Specific Issues	Mitigation
Inability to access key information	Low	Unable to see all relevant DFID files Unable to obtain information from NGOs	Ensure clear authorisation is given at start up Team sampling to assess whether DFID Burma and NGOs have provided sufficient information DFID Burma and NGOs to provide hard copies where possible, if not easily available in electronic form

Risk	Level of risk	Specific Issues	Mitigation
Security risks associated with case studies in conflict zones	Medium	Risks to the review team in insecure areas Risk to the person	The work programme and visits will be planned carefully, in line with guidance from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and Control Risks Security Services and with security approval from KPMG in the UK
Lack of impact data makes impact assessment impossible	Medium	Impact data absent, incomplete or unreliable	A range of methods will be used to access available impact data, including review of project reporting and evaluations, review of surveys carried out by UN agencies and other international partners and interviews with intended beneficiary communities
Intended beneficiary voices not heard	Medium	Access to intended beneficiaries proves difficult due to security constraints	Gathering intended beneficiaries into focus groups may prove inappropriate in difficult security conditions, due to the need to disseminate a time and place for meeting in advance. We will consult with DFID Burma and implementing partners on whether this is an issue. Ethical considerations mean that we will not proceed with any activity deemed to pose unnecessary risk to intended beneficiaries. An alternative is to organise impromptu focus groups during unannounced visits to local communities. We will ensure sufficient time in field and aim for a sufficient range of intended beneficiary consultations to enable concerns to emerge. We will engage local interpreters as required
Visits to sites of intended beneficiaries is not feasible	Medium	Access to intended beneficiaries proves difficult due to isolated geographical location or being in a neighbouring country	A field visit in Mae Sot will be undertaken prior to the Burma visit. Two of the humanitarian assistance to conflict-affected areas with health component programmes will be reviewed. Some locations will not be visited. We will ensure sufficient time in field and aim for a sufficient range of intended beneficiary consultations to enable concerns to emerge. We will engage local interpreters as required.

10. How this ICAI review will make a difference

10.1 This review will examine the impact of DFID's health programme in Burma. Findings will support direct improvements in the ability of these programmes to deliver impact for intended beneficiaries.

10.2 The review will compare the use of different delivery channels and how this is evaluated by DFID Burma and incorporated into the future design of health programmes in Burma.

10.3 This will not be the first ICAI review within a state with a political environment that is undergoing rapid change. Given increasing DFID expenditure in Burma, improving DFID's impact requires that these issues are better understood. It is also helpful to be able to identify common lessons of good practice and areas for improvement across a range of countries. This review will, therefore build on the lessons from previous ICAI reports where appropriate, including our reviews of DFID's programming in Afghanistan,[6] Zimbabwe[7] and Nepal.[8]

10.4 This ICAI review will look explicitly at how this health programme supports the wider peace-building and state-building agenda. This places a premium on programme management, using monitoring and evaluation to feed back into future programme design. This review will assess this cycle in detail.

10.5 A number of programmes have been operating in Burma for some time and funding is coming to an end. This review will assess how learning from past evaluations has been used to inform future health programme choices in Burma.

[6] *The Department for International Development: Programme Controls and Assurance in Afghanistan,* March 2012, ICAI, http://icai.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/ICAI-Afghanistan-Final-Report_P1.pdf.
[7] *The Department for International Development's Support to the Health Sector in Zimbabwe,* November 2011, ICAI, http://icai.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/DFIDs-Support-to-the-Health-Sector-in-Zimbabwe.pdf.
[8] *The Effectiveness of DFID's Peace and Security Programme in Nepal,* February 2013, ICAI, http://icai.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/ICAI-report-DFIDs-Peace-and-Security-programme-in-Nepal.pdf.