

**Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)**

**Evaluation of DFID's Bilateral Aid to Pakistan**

**Inception report**

**Contents**

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Background.....	2
3. Purpose .....	4
4. Relationships to other initiatives and evaluations.....	4
5. Methodology .....	5
6. Roles and responsibilities.....	23
7. Management and reporting .....	24
8. Expected outputs and time frame .....	25
9. Risks and mitigation .....	26
10. How will this review make a difference?.....	27

## 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 will review the impact and value for money of the UK aid programme in Pakistan, focussing on three sectors: education, humanitarian and health. This Inception Report builds on the Terms of Reference to outline the purpose of the investigation and identifies the detailed areas of assessment.

## 2. Background

- 2.1 With 170 million people, Pakistan is the sixth most populous country in the world.<sup>1</sup> The population is increasing fast: it is expected to exceed 210 million by 2020 and nearly 40% of these people will be between 10 and 29 years old. This could yield a demographic dividend and drive economic growth over the next decade. Yet Pakistan faces many challenges. Around 36 million Pakistanis live below the national poverty line.<sup>2</sup> The country's path to development has been punctuated by frequent crises, including the 2005 Kashmir earthquake and the 2010 floods, which affected the lives of 20 million people. The country remains off-track against the education and health Millennium Development Goals: more than 17 million children do not attend school, 14,000 women die in childbirth every year and one in ten children die before reaching their fifth birthday.
- 2.2 Pakistan has strong connections to the UK. The UK has one of the largest Pakistani diasporas in the world and is amongst Pakistan's largest investors. These ties are reflected in the UK aid programme, for which Pakistan is a key partner. The country received £213 million in 2010-11, the third-largest annual amount of bilateral assistance provided by the UK, behind only India and Ethiopia. The current Operational Plan shows that humanitarian assistance accounted for almost half of this total expenditure, reflecting the scale of the response to the 2010 floods. Of the remaining sum, education and health accounted for a little over 15% and governance and wealth creation approximately 20% between them. This profile is expected to change over the next four years, as DFID focusses significantly more resources on tackling Pakistan's 'education emergency'<sup>3</sup> and improving reproductive, maternal and child health. If Pakistan can demonstrate results at the federal and provincial levels, DFID will scale up its efforts to support reform and accelerate progress. It is envisaged in the DFID Pakistan Operational Plan that, by 2014-15, the Pakistan country programme may approach £450 million a year, with education and health accounting for three-quarters of this expenditure.<sup>4</sup> This would make Pakistan DFID's largest bilateral recipient of UK aid.
- 2.3 The overall direction for DFID Pakistan's activities is set out in its Operational Plan. The Plan identifies four priorities: peace and stability; making democracy work; macroeconomic stability, growth and jobs; and getting the state to deliver. Within this framework, DFID aims to maintain a flexible approach, adapting its portfolio to developments on the ground. As more powers and responsibilities have been devolved from the federal government to the four provinces, so DFID has concentrated its efforts at the provincial level. Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) together account for over 70% of the population and the largest share of the poor and thus are DFID's primary focus. DFID also operates on the understanding that Pakistan is not aid

---

<sup>1</sup> The figures quoted in this paragraph are taken from the *DFID Pakistan Operational Plan 2011-15*, DFID, February 2012, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/op/pakistan-2011.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> *Pakistan Economic Survey 2007-08 for Pakistan 1998-99 – 2005-06*, Government of Pakistan, 2008. The Pakistan national poverty line is based on a dietary intake of 2,350 calories per person per day or 673 rupees at 1998-99 prices.

<sup>3</sup> In 2010, the Prime Minister of Pakistan declared an 'education emergency' in Pakistan, <http://educationemergency.com.pk/>

<sup>4</sup> *DFID Pakistan Operational Plan 2011-15*, DFID, February 2012, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/op/pakistan-2011.pdf>.

dependent. Many donors are active in Pakistan<sup>5</sup> but, in 2010, total Official Development Assistance represented less than 2% of the country's Gross National Income. DFID, therefore, seeks to use its investments to support and catalyse reform, responding where there is evidence of positive change at federal and provincial levels.

2.4 Assistance to Pakistan is, however, challenging. Security, volatility and the incidence of natural disasters remain major concerns. These factors make it hard for DFID to undertake normal development activity. They limit the range of potential implementing partners and constrain DFID's ability to assess the impact of its work on intended beneficiaries.

2.5 Sitting beneath the four priorities set out in the Operational Plan, DFID has six pillars to its Pakistan country programme: education; humanitarian; governance and security; health; wealth creation; and poverty, hunger and vulnerability. Education represents 35% of DFID's portfolio,<sup>6</sup> humanitarian 20%, health 14%, wealth creation 11%, governance and security 13% and poverty, hunger and vulnerability 7%. DFID is in the process of shifting its education, health and governance programmes towards its two target provinces.

**Table 1: Summary of DFID Pakistan projects per sector: past, current and planned<sup>7</sup>**

Sector	Planned <sup>8</sup>		Active		Recently closed		Total	
	Number of projects	Lifetime budget £ million	Number of projects	Lifetime budget £ million	Number of projects	Lifetime budget £ million	Number of projects	Lifetime budget £ million
Education	3	267.52	6	327.00	1	2.30	10	596.82
Health	3	141.00	2	91.00	1	1.50	6	233.50
Governance and Security	3	97.90	5	71.40	4	42.10	12	211.40
Humanitarian	1	50.00	3	76.40	2	207.00	6	333.40
Wealth Creation	3	93.30	2	80.00	2	15.19	7	188.49
Poverty, Hunger and Vulnerability	1	60.00	-	-	1	60.00	2	120.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>709.72</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>645.80</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>328.09</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>1,683.61</b>

<sup>5</sup> The US is the largest bilateral donor to Pakistan. The International Monetary Fund, World Bank and Asian Development Bank are significant donors. Other UK Government Departments are also active, including the Foreign Office, Ministry of Defence and Home Office.

<sup>6</sup> This is calculated as a proportion of the total lifetime budgets of projects that are currently active, recently completed or in the planning stage, using data provided to ICAI by DFID.

<sup>7</sup> Data provided to ICAI by DFID.

<sup>8</sup> Includes projects that are in design, at tender stage or just commencing.

### 3. Purpose

3.1 To assess whether DFID is achieving impact and value for money in Pakistan with its bilateral aid to education, humanitarian assistance and health.

### 4. Relationships to other initiatives and evaluations

4.1 The Pakistan country programme as a whole was last subject to internal review in 2008.<sup>9</sup> Amongst its conclusions, this review found that:

- DFID Pakistan had an increasing tendency towards budget support, seeing it as a productive way to build the relationship between the UK and Pakistan and to assist in the implementation of the country's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). This focus on budget support was not, however, sufficiently balanced by other aid instruments: 'the diminished range of investments and partners has led to fewer opportunities for innovative interventions and lesson learning';
- DFID Pakistan produced well-regarded analytical work. The link between analysis and delivery on the ground, however, was not always apparent. In particular, it was unclear how DFID's work would address the 'deep-rooted obstacles to change' in Pakistan, such as poor access to justice, corruption, weak civil society and feudal land tenure;
- DFID Pakistan had not found 'an appropriate balance between government and non-state actors'. Engagement with civil society was considered to be inadequate, given the potential for civil society organisations to press for improved services and for greater government accountability and transparency; and
- the previous country assistance plan made no provision for mitigating the risk of natural disasters.

4.2 These findings helped to inform the preparation of DFID's subsequent country assistance strategy.<sup>10</sup> The 2008 evaluation will provide useful background for the team undertaking this review. The team will seek to establish whether the concerns raised four years ago have been addressed.

4.3 In the aftermath of the 2010 floods, the UK Government examined the adequacy, timeliness and efficiency of the humanitarian response. DFID commissioned an independent Humanitarian Emergency Response Review<sup>11</sup> and the International Development Committee (IDC) conducted its own subsequent enquiry following the Review's publication.<sup>12</sup> The resulting reports will serve as valuable reference points for the review team. They note that DFID responded quickly to the Pakistan floods, with a generous financial contribution and good leadership and co-ordination. These reports found that:

- the previous experience of responding to the 2005 earthquake in Kashmir significantly strengthened the ability of the Government of Pakistan to respond to the floods, demonstrating the value of lesson learning, local capacity and leadership; and
- DFID played a key role as a 'network enabler', shaping the way the UN and other multilateral organisations operate and making them more effective.

4.4 IDC's report recommended that DFID should indicate how its increased spending in Pakistan will result in an increased focus on disaster preparedness and risk reduction: 'predicted increases in

---

<sup>9</sup> *Evaluation of DFID Country Programmes: Country Study: Pakistan Report*, DFID, April 2008, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/evaluation/ev687.pdf>.

<sup>10</sup> *Development in Pakistan 2008-13*, DFID, 2008.

<sup>11</sup> *Humanitarian Emergency Response Review*, chaired by Lord Ashdown, March 2011, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/HERR.pdf>.

<sup>12</sup> *The Humanitarian Response to the Pakistan Floods*, House of Commons International Development Committee, Seventh Report of Session 2010-12, <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmintdev/615/61502.htm>.

the incidence and severity of natural disasters, coupled with demographic trends call for a step change in the [humanitarian] system. DFID must play a key role in promoting changes in the system and must itself better integrate disaster risk reduction into its own development programmes.' The review team will, therefore, wish to understand whether DFID's response to the 2011 floods reflected lessons learned from earlier natural disasters and whether DFID is giving consideration to disaster preparedness and risk reduction in its current programming.

- 4.5 In 2011, the National Audit Office (NAO) published a report on DFID's financial management.<sup>13</sup> Though not specific to Pakistan, the report's findings will provide useful background for the review. NAO's report acknowledged that DFID has made considerable progress in strengthening its financial systems but concluded that 'a better information environment is needed to deal with the heightened levels of assurance required in targeting future aid at higher risk locations'. DFID's future plans involve channelling increased funding to more fragile states, with the most significant increases in countries with relatively low scores in the Transparency International index. Pakistan ranks 134th out of 182 countries in the 2011 Corruption Perceptions Index<sup>14</sup> and the UK aid programme in Pakistan is expected to grow significantly. The review team will, therefore, wish to investigate what DFID is doing to assure itself that it minimises the risks of fraud and corruption in Pakistan.

## 5. Methodology

### *Analytical approach*

- 5.1 The evaluation will focus on aid delivery and impact. It will examine three contrasting areas of the DFID Pakistan programme, covering a range of funding channels and delivery partners. Across these three areas, the evaluation will examine:
- the extent to which programmes have achieved sustainable impact for the intended beneficiaries; and
  - the effectiveness, efficiency and value for money of the different funding and delivery channels in delivering that impact, including whether DFID has delivery chains in place that will enable it to cope with the substantial scaling-up of the UK aid programme envisaged in the next four years.
- 5.2 The evaluation will not attempt to assess the impact of the DFID Pakistan programme as a whole, beyond the three selected programming areas. Nor will it assess DFID's overall approach to governance and security in Pakistan. It will, however, examine how DFID has dealt with institutional and security issues within the three focus areas.
- 5.3 The evaluation will examine programming over the past five years in each of the three areas, including both closed and ongoing operations. It will not examine programmes under design or which very recently commenced, as impact assessment would not be feasible in these cases.
- 5.4 We plan to examine three sectors: education, humanitarian assistance and health. For each of the three sectors, we will:
- conduct an overall review of programming, including current projects, projects completed during the last five years and plans for future assistance (particularly where scaling up is planned); and
  - select a number of current programmes for detailed review, including interviews with DFID staff, implementing partners and counterparts, site visits and interviews with beneficiaries.

---

<sup>13</sup> *DFID Financial Management Report*, National Audit Office, April 2011, [http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/1011/dfid\\_financial\\_management\\_rept.aspx](http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/1011/dfid_financial_management_rept.aspx).

<sup>14</sup> *Corruption Perceptions Index*, Transparency International, 2011, <http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2011/results/>.

## ***i) Education***

5.5 Education is the largest sector in the DFID Pakistan programme and is expanding substantially. It is projected to account for 45% of total expenditure over the five-year period covered by the current Operational Plan. Current and recent programming includes:

- a series of projects at the national level to promote innovation, encourage voice and accountability in the education sector and build the capacity of the federal government to promote and monitor reform;
- an £80 million Punjab Education Sector Programme that is now in its fourth year of implementation, with a £260 million second phase under design. It consists of sector budget support with accompanying technical assistance. The programme supports both the public education system and the low-cost private system. In addition, the 'Punjab Education Roadmap', established at the request of the Chief Minister, aims to focus political attention on education to help inject pace into reform processes. McKinsey and Company provides technical support to the Roadmap. Sir Michael Barber serves as DFID's Special Representative for Education in Pakistan, working with the Government on educational reform; and
- new provincial programmes in KPK (£203.5 million) and Sindh (£16 million), both in their first year of operation. The Sindh programme is innovative in that delivery is via the private sector, in recognition of the limitations of state capacity to provide education to marginalised groups.

5.6 The review will focus on a number of issues, including:

- the mix of aid instruments and delivery channels used, with a particular focus on the Punjab programmes;
- the use of state and non-state education providers; and
- the extent to which the assistance focuses on educational outcomes as well as enrolment.

## ***ii) Humanitarian assistance***

5.7 Humanitarian assistance has been a significant part of DFID Pakistan's programming in recent years, including major responses to the 2005 earthquake (£84 million), 2010 floods (£123 million) and 2011 floods (£11.4 million, through a mixture of non-governmental and multilateral organisations). In 2011, DFID terminated its general budget support programme. Around the same time, new programming in the form of the Citizens' Damage Compensation Programme (CDCP) was approved to the value of £65 million. The CDCP provides cash payments directly to households in flood-affected areas to meet their immediate, life-saving needs, reaching some 1.6 million households in its first phase.<sup>15</sup> The use of cash payments is a fairly new approach to humanitarian assistance that has not been extensively evaluated internationally. DFID Pakistan is considering increasing its use of cash transfers in the future through a contribution to the government's Benazir Income Support Programme, a social safety-net programme targeting the poorest households.

5.8 As some of the earlier humanitarian programmes have already been substantially reviewed, this evaluation will focus on the response to the 2011 floods. It will assess the extent to which lessons from the 2010 floods were taken into consideration. It will examine the shift from short-term emergency support to longer-term reconstruction and development assistance, with a particular focus on the use of cash transfers. It will also explore the extent to which DFID has helped to build Pakistan's capacity for disaster preparedness and risk mitigation.

---

<sup>15</sup> CDCP Business Case and Intervention Summary, <http://projects.dfid.gov.uk/project.aspx?Project=202276>.

### **iii) Health**

5.9 Health is an important sector for DFID Pakistan, with £122 million being spent across current and recently closed health programmes and another £111 million allocated to programmes in the planning stage. The focus to date has been on maternal and child health programmes. A contribution of £69 million (supported by an additional £22 million in technical assistance) to a federal health programme supports service delivery across the provinces. In June 2011, the Federal Ministry of Health was abolished following a constitutional amendment. The programme continues to fund provincial maternal and child health services in the provinces via the federal government on an interim basis, while new provincial programmes are being designed in Punjab and KPK. Focus areas for this part of the review will include how DFID engages with different levels of Pakistan's federal system and how it ensures value for money when spending through government systems.

#### *Sampling of programmes to review*

5.10 The three sectors we will examine in this review represent 72% of current and recently completed programmes by budgeted expenditure.<sup>16</sup>

5.11 Within each of the three sectors, we have selected a number of programmes for more detailed review. The selection has been based on a number of criteria:

- it covers a substantial proportion of expenditure in that sector;
- it covers the most important funding modalities and delivery channels being used in that sector; and
- it covers as broad a geographical scope as practicable, given time and logistical constraints.

5.12 Table 2 on page 8 shows the sample of programmes chosen in each sector and the reason why the sample has been selected.

---

<sup>16</sup> Calculated as a proportion of the lifetime budgets of projects that are currently active or were completed in the past five years.

**Table 2: Sampling framework for detailed review**

Sector	Sample of programmes for detailed review	Rationale
Education	<p>i) <b>Transforming Education in Pakistan</b> (£20 million; commenced August 2011) and <b>Education Sector Voice and Accountability Programme</b> (£5 million; commenced late 2011): these are civil-society based projects at the national level designed to strengthen civic voice and participation in education policy-making processes;</p> <p>ii) <b>Punjab Education Sector Programme</b> (£80 million; commenced June 2009). A follow-up Punjab Education Sector Programme II (£260 million) is under design.</p> <p>Major education programmes excluded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KPK Education Sector Programme (£203.5 million; commenced July 2011); and</li> <li>• Education Fund for Sindh (£16 million; commenced February 2012).</li> </ul>	<p>Share of total current and projected education expenditure: 62%</p> <p>This sample offers the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it includes empowerment and accountability programming;</li> <li>• it includes the provincial education programme that has been running the longest;</li> <li>• it covers a range of assistance modalities (civil society; provincial budget support; an innovative technical assistance package; funding to state and non-state education providers);</li> <li>• it enables us to assess the challenges associated with a major planned scaling up of assistance with Phase II of the Punjab Education Sector Programme; and</li> <li>• it provides readier access for field visits than the KPK programme.</li> </ul>
Health	<p>i) <b>Maternal and Newborn Health</b> (£71 million; commenced 2008) and an associated <b>Technical Assistance Facility</b> (£20 million; co-financed with AusAID; commenced 2008). These programmes involve funds given to the Federal Government that are then passed on to provinces according to their share of the population to support the delivery of maternal and child health programmes. We will focus our review on programming in Punjab, which receives approximately half of total funding.</p> <p>Major health programmes excluded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None. Other programming is either under design or in procurement.</li> </ul>	<p>Proposed focus on Punjab covers approximately 50% of financial aid under the Maternal and Newborn Health Programme.</p> <p>The proposed focus on Punjab offers the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ready access for field visits;</li> <li>• coverage of a larger share of expenditure than any other province; and</li> <li>• an opportunity to review readiness for scaling up with a new £71 million Provincial Health and Nutrition Programme for Punjab currently under design.</li> </ul>



Sector	Sample of programmes for detailed review	Rationale
Humanitarian	<p>i) <b>Floods 2011</b> (£11.4 million, with a subsequent £10 million extension); commenced October 2011; delivered through international NGOs and multilateral agencies). Our field work will take place in southern Sindh Province, in the Indus River delta between Hyderabad and Thatta.</p> <p>ii) <b>Citizens' Damage Compensation Programme</b> (£63 million; commenced July 2011) and associated <b>Technical Assistance</b> (£2 million).</p> <p>Major humanitarian programmes excluded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earthquake Programme (£84 million; commenced 2006);</li> <li>• Floods 2010 (£123 million; commenced August 2010).</li> </ul>	<p>Sample covers 36% of humanitarian programming over the past five years and is 100% of current humanitarian programming.</p> <p>Rationale for sample</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sample covers all current humanitarian programming;</li> <li>• past humanitarian responses have already been extensively reviewed;</li> <li>• sample includes a range of delivery channels (UN; NGOs) and funding modalities, including an innovative cash transfer programme.</li> </ul>

## Evaluation Framework

5.13 The evaluation framework for this review is set out in the table below. The evaluation framework focusses on the two overarching themes (delivery chains and impact) set out in paragraph 5.1 above. Under each of the four sections of the standard ICAI evaluation framework (objectives, delivery, impact and learning), a single primary question is identified (marked in bold). These four questions will be compared and contrasted across the three sectors and delivery channels and will form the bulk of the evaluation report. The remaining questions in the evaluation framework (marked in italics) will be examined by the evaluation team but discussed in the evaluation report only insofar as they prove pertinent to the exploration of the two overarching themes and four primary questions compared across the sectors. Note that the primary questions have been refined since the Terms of Reference. A primary question has been included for each of the four sections of the Evaluation Framework in order to facilitate scoring and the primary question under delivery has been modified following choice of the programme sample.

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
<b>Objectives: what is the programme trying to achieve?</b>			
Does the programme have clear, relevant and realistic objectives that focus on the desired impact? (1.1)	<b>Do the programmes have clear, relevant and realistic objectives that focus on the desired impact?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and relevant objectives</li> <li>• Clear and appropriate criteria for the choice of geographical focus for each sector</li> <li>• Objectives that are appropriate and realistic in the country context</li> <li>• For health and education: a clear focus on quality of education and health outcomes, as well as access to services</li> <li>• For humanitarian: an appropriate balance between short-term relief, medium-term recovery and building long-term resilience to future natural disasters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID and partner project planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Project reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Pakistan (GoP) officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
<p>Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work? (1.2)</p>	<p><i>Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programmes will work?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convincing theories of change</li> <li>• Technical adequacy of programme designs</li> <li>• Rigorous selection of delivery options, based on evidence of past experience in Pakistan and similar contexts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID and implementing partner project planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Project reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>
<p>Does the programme complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (1.3)</p>	<p><i>Do the programmes complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment of programmes with GoP strategies and preferences</li> <li>• Clear division of roles among donors in each sector</li> <li>• Joint working with other donors</li> <li>• Effective structures and processes for policy dialogue and co-ordination</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID and implementing partner project planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Project reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> <li>• Third party reporting</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
<p>Are the programme's objectives appropriate to the political, economic, social and environmental context? (1.4)</p>	<p><i>Are the programmes' objectives appropriate to the political, economic, social and environmental context?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate political analysis used to inform programming choices</li> <li>• Appropriate strategies for dealing with governance issues in each sector and links with wider governance programmes</li> <li>• Assessment of conflict risk and measures in place to avoid unintended negative impact on conflict</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID and UK Government analytical work (conflict assessments; governance assessments)</li> <li>• DFID and implementing partner project planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Project reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
<b>Delivery: is the delivery chain designed and managed so as to be fit for purpose?</b>			
Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? (2.1)	<b>Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery and funding options appraised</li> <li>• Quality of business cases and supporting evidence</li> <li>• Capacity assessments of partners</li> <li>• Fiduciary risk assessments</li> <li>• Appropriate measures to mitigate fiduciary risk and leakage of funds</li> <li>• Quality of policy dialogue and advisory inputs</li> <li>• Adequacy of supervision of decentralised services</li> <li>• Appropriate choice of state and non-state delivery channels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID/GoP programme documentation</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>
Does programme design and roll-out take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries? (2.2)	<i>Does programme design and roll-out take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequacy of consultation</li> <li>• Adequacy of participation in design, governance, implementation, monitoring</li> <li>• Civil society and intended beneficiary satisfaction with these processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> <li>• Third-party reporting</li> <li>• Programme reports</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review 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)	<i>Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programmes informed by and support wider governance objectives</li> <li>• Alignment with Pakistan systems for fiscal decentralisation</li> <li>• Adequacy of fiduciary controls</li> <li>• Adequacy of anti-corruption measures in programme design</li> <li>• Adequacy of response to corruption allegations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> <li>• Country reporting</li> <li>• Technical review of systems</li> </ul>
Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact? (2.4)	<i>Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of UK funding in total programme budget</li> <li>• Success in leveraging funding from other sources</li> <li>• UK support aligned with other funding sources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID and implementing partner project planning, implementation and financial documentation</li> <li>• Project reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>
Do managers ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery chain? (2.5)	<i>Do managers ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery chain?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate options analysis during procurement</li> <li>• Effective supervision of implementing partners</li> <li>• Adequacy of measures taken to ensure value for money of funds spent through national budgetary processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial reporting</li> <li>• Management minutes</li> <li>• Reviews and evaluation</li> <li>• Third-party assessments</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain? (2.6)	<i>Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequacy of cost appraisals</li> <li>• Adequacy of financial reporting</li> <li>• Appropriateness and consistency of definition of costs</li> <li>• Unit cost analysis undertaken</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial reporting</li> <li>• Programme documentation</li> </ul>
Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively? (2.7)	<i>Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequacy of risk appraisals</li> <li>• Quality of risk monitoring and mitigation</li> <li>• Evidence of actions in response to crystallised risks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk appraisals</li> <li>• Risk registers and monitoring arrangements</li> <li>• Programme reports</li> </ul>
Is the programme delivering against its agreed objectives? (2.8)	<i>Are the programmes delivering against their agreed objectives?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of delivery of programme inputs and outputs against timetables</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme reports</li> <li>• Third-party reporting</li> </ul>
Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances? (2.9)	<i>Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequacy of implementation reviews and management responses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documentation</li> <li>• Management minutes</li> <li>• Evaluation reviews</li> <li>• Third-party assessments</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
<b>Impact: what is the impact on intended beneficiaries?</b>			
<p>Is the programme delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries? (3.1)</p>	<p><b>Are the programmes delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increases in quantity of services delivered</li> <li>• Improvements to access and equity in service delivery, including measures to target marginalised and hard-to-reach groups</li> <li>• Improvements in quality of services delivered</li> <li>• Improvements in education outcomes</li> <li>• Improvements in health outcomes</li> <li>• Numbers of vulnerable households and communities reached</li> <li>• Progress in rehabilitating communities affected by 2011 floods</li> <li>• Reduction in vulnerability of intended beneficiary communities to future natural disasters</li> <li>• Improvements in GoP policies and programmes for disaster risk reduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID and implementing partner reporting</li> <li>• Evaluation and monitoring reports</li> <li>• Consultation with intended beneficiaries, NGOs and informed observers</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels</li> <li>• Third-party reporting</li> </ul>



Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is the programme working holistically alongside other programmes? (3.2)	<i>Are the programmes working holistically alongside other programmes?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cohesion of programme results and results from other GoP and donor programmes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• GoP and other donor reporting</li> <li>• Third-party assessments</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>
Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the programme? (3.3)	<i>Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the programmes?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of improvements in relevant GoP policies, systems and capacities</li> <li>• Financial sustainability of increases in the scope and quality of education and health services</li> <li>• Increased readiness and capacity of GoP to respond to future disasters</li> <li>• Increased resilience of communities to future natural disasters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Evaluations and reviews</li> <li>• Third-party assessments</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there an appropriate exit strategy involving effective transfer of ownership of the programme? (3.4)	<i>Are there appropriate exit strategies involving effective transfer of ownership of the programmes?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptance of programme approaches by intended beneficiaries</li> <li>• Emergence of sustainable capacity</li> <li>• Extent of leadership by GoP counterparts</li> <li>• Exit strategies incorporated into programme designs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Evaluations and reviews</li> <li>• Third-party assessments</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>
Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers? (3.5)	<i>Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme information (including objectives, expenditure and results) adequately publicised</li> <li>• Increased capacity of national stakeholders to make use of results information to hold authorities to account</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme reporting</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
<b>Learning: what works and what needs improvement?</b>			
Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact? (4.1)	<b>Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programmes designed to facilitate impact assessment</li> <li>• Quality of monitoring and evaluation systems</li> <li>• Improvements in national information systems and data collection</li> <li>• Usage of monitoring and evaluation reports to strengthen programme design and execution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Programme reviews and evaluations</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs</li> </ul>
Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice? (4.2)	<i>Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme design based on evidence and best practice</li> <li>• Appropriate adjustments to project design and implementation arrangements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme design documents</li> <li>• Programme reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, NGOs</li> </ul>
Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken? (4.3)	<i>Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take-up of international evidence and best practice</li> <li>• Take-up of recommendations from programme evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme design documents</li> <li>• Programme reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, GoP officials at federal, provincial and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Have lessons about the objectives, design and delivery of the programme been learned and shared effectively? (4.4)	<i>Have lessons about the objectives, design and delivery of the programme been learned and shared effectively?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons identified</li> <li>• Lessons disseminated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Documentation</li> </ul>

## *Methodology*

5.14 A visit to Pakistan will be undertaken between 20 May and 1 June 2012, involving three international and two Pakistan-based team members. The visit will involve visits to Islamabad, Lahore and Karachi and field trips into southern Punjab and Sindh Provinces.

5.15 The methodology for this evaluation will involve the following elements (a number of specific meetings remain subject to confirmation):

- short literature reviews prepared by the Center for Effective Global Action (CEGA) and the team on (i) lessons from primary education programmes in South Asia, including the use of non-state providers; (ii) lessons from maternal and child health programming in South Asia; and (iii) lessons from the use of cash transfers in humanitarian programmes;
  - collection by CEGA of alternative sources of primary data on health and education outcomes in Pakistan;
  - detailed review of programming documents, activity and financial reports and reviews and evaluations provided by DFID;
  - a meeting between the Chief Commissioner and Sir Michael Barber;
  - briefings from DFID Pakistan and the British High Commissioner on the country context, including the economic, political and institutional context, conflict dynamics and fiduciary risks;
  - detailed briefings from DFID on the overall country strategy and plans for scaling up;
  - detailed briefings on each of the focus sectors;
  - consultations with Islamabad-based stakeholders and partners, including GoP (Cabinet Division, the Prime Minister's Special Representative for Education and Health, the National Disaster Manager Agency, the National Database and Registration Authority), other donors (the World Bank, Canadian International Development Agency, AusAID), UN agencies (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs; International Organisation for Migration) and implementing partners (DAI, MKRF);
  - a series of roundtables with national NGOs, including separate meetings with education NGOs in Islamabad and Lahore, health NGOs and the Pakistan Humanitarian Forum;
  - detailed consultations with implementing partners, provincial government counterparts (e.g., Punjab Chief Minister, Secretary Education, Secretary Finance, Planning and Development Commission, Punjab Education Project Management and Implementation Unit, Teacher Training College, Punjab Education Commission), implementing partners (McKinsey) and NGOs in Lahore regarding the education programme;
  - detailed consultations with implementing partners, provincial government counterparts (Secretary of Health; Special Secretary of Health; Maternal, Neonatal and Child Health Programme Manager, Health Sector Reform Programme Team, Lady Health Worker Programme Manager), implementing partners and NGOs in Lahore regarding the health programme;
  - visits to district education officers, schools and community groups in southern Punjab (provisionally scheduled to Lahore neighbourhood and Kasur);
  - visits to district health officers, health clinics and community groups in southern Punjab (provisionally scheduled to Lahore neighbourhood and Shikapur);
  - visits to flood-affected areas and beneficiary groups of humanitarian assistance (provisionally scheduled for Sanghar, Tando Allah Yar, Mirpur Khas, Thatta and Badin Districts);
  - visit to Karachi for meetings with implementing partners and beneficiaries of the cash transfer (CDCP) programme and to the WATAN centre (which manages the electronic payments system);
  - a series of focus groups with community-based organisations active in the health, education and humanitarian fields (including a focus group on the cash transfer programme; and

- follow-up discussions in London as required with DFID Asia Regional Division and relevant policy teams.

5.16 Consultations with intended beneficiaries will be carried out both directly and through representative community groups. In respect of the humanitarian component, we will visit flood-affected communities across districts, in each case meeting with community representatives and affected individuals. From these communities, we will collect feedback on the speed and appropriateness of the humanitarian response and determine whether the communities are better prepared for future disasters. We will conduct a focus group with beneficiaries of the cash transfer programme in Karachi to receive feedback on the timeliness of payments, the appropriateness of beneficiary selection and the relative merits of cash transfer compared to other forms of humanitarian assistance. For the health and education components, we will conduct site visits to primary schools and health clinics for discussion with doctors, teachers, parents, patients and pupils. From these consultations, we will gather feedback on the accessibility and quality of health and education services, on the changes that have been observed in recent years, on attendance rates of teachers and health workers, on availability of medicines and educational materials and related matters. We will also consult with health and education NGOs, who will provide their own point of view on the above matters and in addition provide us with a view on the transparency, responsiveness and accountability of provincial and district health and education authorities to citizens. While such beneficiary feedback does not on its own necessarily amount to hard evidence on results, it provides an invaluable method of testing results data collected by DFID or government monitoring and evaluation systems.

5.17 In each sector, we will ask DFID to present the results data obtained through monitoring and evaluation of past and current programming. We will examine the adequacy of the monitoring and evaluation arrangements and the credibility of the results data. We will then assess the extent to which it can be verified through consultations with implementing agencies and counterparts, other data sources, direct observations in the field and consultations with beneficiaries.

5.18 In each sector, we will also examine the relative efficiency and effectiveness of the different delivery channels and funding modalities (i.e., funding through UN agencies, international NGOs, the provision of technical assistance, sector budget support, earmarked financial aid and cash transfers to households). For each delivery channel, we will collect and analyse data regarding management and administrative overheads, input costs, the cost-effectiveness of the delivery of commodities and services and the effectiveness in terms of results delivered to intended beneficiaries. Using a series of like-for-like comparisons (e.g., humanitarian assistance delivered through UN agencies and NGOs; material aid versus cash transfers for flood victims; private vs. state-provision of primary education), we will seek to draw conclusions as to how well DFID maximises effectiveness and value for money and whether it is prepared for the planned scaling up of UK assistance to Pakistan.

## 6. Roles and responsibilities

- 6.1 It is proposed that this evaluation is undertaken by a core team of five (indicated with a \* in the table below), of whom three are international and two are Pakistan-based, together with some additional London-based support. While lead responsibility for answering sections of the framework is shown, all will contribute to the analysis supporting the findings for each section.

<b>Role</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Project Director	KPMG
Team Leader*	Agulhas
Education Lead and Deputy Team Leader*	KPMG
Health Lead*	Independent
Humanitarian Lead*	Agulhas
Finance Lead*	Independent
Researcher	CEGA (various)
UK-based support	KPMG
Peer reviewer	Independent

### ***Team Leader***

With over 15 years in policy analysis, he has worked for a variety of clients on a range of high-level policy issues including implementation of the Paris Declaration, aid effectiveness and fragile states. He specialises in aid effectiveness and governance processes at all levels, including policy development, programme design and evaluation. He has led past ICAI evaluation teams on budget support and the Conflict Pool and participated in evaluation teams for the value for money and effectiveness review, anti-corruption review, East Africa education and UNDP electoral assistance.

He will lead the team. He will have overall responsibility for delivery of the methodology and for drafting the evaluation report. During the country visit, he will participate in meetings in Islamabad, Lahore and Karachi and field visits in Sindh.

### ***Education Lead and Deputy Team Leader***

He is a member of KPMG's International Development Assistance Services practice and has spent more than a decade working on donor-funded programmes designed to strengthen governance and accountability. His knowledge cuts across a number of sectors, including education. He has a strong track record in the field of monitoring and evaluation, having led reviews for a range of institutions, including the OECD Development Assistance Committee, UNDP, UNICEF and JICA. He also holds a Masters degree in Development Management from the London School of Economics and has experience in a wide range of countries across Africa, Asia, the Caribbean and Eastern Europe.

He will act as deputy team leader. He will lead on the education component and participate in the health component of the evaluation, through meetings in Islamabad and Lahore and field visits in southern Punjab.

### ***Health Lead***

He is a health management and governance specialist with 21 years' experience. He has worked with large government departments on systems development, sector reforms, strategic planning and evaluation of institutions and large programmes and projects in the health and development sectors. He has extensive experience of project design and management and in developing and implementing strategies to strengthen government and non-government sectors for performance optimization and enhanced effectiveness and efficiency. He is also an expert in health communications and advocacy. He is a medical

graduate with Master's degrees in Health Management, Planning & Policy and in Business Administration. He comes with extensive experience of working in South & Central Asia.

He will lead on the health component of the evaluation, under the supervision of the team leader and deputy team leader. He will participate in meetings in Islamabad and Lahore and field visits in southern Punjab.

### ***Humanitarian Lead***

She is a consultant with Agulhas Applied Knowledge and a former programme manager in the DFID Somalia team. As an independent consultant for the past three years, she has undertaken reviews of the aid architecture in Kenya and Kyrgyzstan. Recently, she has prepared a series of studies on financial support for climate change adaptation in Africa. She conducted much of the field research for ICAI's Bangladesh climate change review.

She will lead on the humanitarian component of the evaluation, under the supervision of the team leader. She will participate in meetings in Islamabad and Karachi and field visits in Sindh.

### ***Finance Lead***

An independent consultant, he is a public financial management specialist with more than 15 years of experience in public expenditure management in South Asia, the Middle East and the Far East. He has extensive experience of delivering and managing large reform projects relating to budgeting, public sector accounting, reforming treasury operations and the selection, evaluation and implementation of Integrated Financial Management Information Systems. He has worked with a broad range of multilateral and bilateral financial institutions (the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, UNDP, Asian Development Bank, DFID and USAID) in designing, implementing and providing quality oversight to reform programmes.

He will provide financial analysis across all three components of the evaluation, looking at the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of different delivery channels. In particular, he will examine constraints on effective financing of health and education services through government systems and assess whether DFID has in place adequate strategies for maximising the value for money of its on-budget assistance.

### ***UK-based support***

He is a financial management advisor in KPMG, with seven years of consulting experience within the public sector. His experience ranges from audit of charities, universities and housing associations to undertaking financial management reviews and change implementations across the public sector. He has experience of public sector reform across a number of sectors, including local and regional government, health, central government including HM Treasury, home affairs and Office of Government Commerce, national security and (UK) development agencies.

He brings a track record in successfully undertaking financial management assessments and improvement implementations for maximising value for money for the UK taxpayer, reducing cost and improving public services. His main role on this review will be to analyse data sources and figures to support the findings of the report and to work with and support the team's Finance Lead.

## **7. Management and reporting**

7.1 The team will present their interim findings to the Commissioners on 21 June and prepare a first draft report for review by the ICAI Secretariat and Commissioners by 18 July 2012, with time for subsequent revision and review prior to completion and final sign off in the week commencing 15 October 2012.



## 8. Expected outputs and time frame

8.1 The following timetable is based on ICAI's work plan.

<b>Phase</b>	<b>Timetable</b>
<b>Planning</b> Finalising methodology Drafting Inception Report	April-May 2012 By 11th May 2012
<b>Phase 1: Data Collection</b> UK-based research and document review	30th April – 18th May 2012
<b>Phase 2: Field Work</b> Pakistan field work	20th May – 1st June 2012
<b>Phase 3: Analysis and write-up</b> Roundtable with Commissioners First Draft Report to DFID Report finalisation	21st June 2012 18th July 2012 w/c 17th September 2012 w/c 15th October 2012

## 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	Medium	<p>Unable to access intended beneficiaries in insecure areas</p> <p>Some documents may be classified as Restricted or Confidential making access more difficult</p>	<p>Identify areas to visit that enable good access to intended beneficiaries and speak to a good cross-section of other stakeholders to obtain a range of views</p> <p>Identify whether there are Restricted or Confidential documents early on to plan for appropriate access</p>
Safety and Security	Medium	Risks to the review team in insecure areas	Discuss with DFID the arrangement of appropriate security whilst the team is in the field
Lack of impact data makes impact assessment impossible	Medium	Impact data weak or incomplete	<p>Evaluation team to examine a range of programmes with different implementing organisations, to obtain sufficient results data</p> <p>Views of intended beneficiaries and third-party sources of information will be sought</p>
Intended beneficiary voices not heard	Medium	<p>Access to intended beneficiaries is managed or otherwise restricted so that a skewed view is heard</p> <p>Language and cultural barriers may make it difficult to hear intended beneficiaries' views</p>	<p>Ensure sufficient time in field and focus on getting a wide range of views from selected interventions</p> <p>Seek to gain at least three different routes through partners to access intended beneficiaries</p> <p>Several of the team members are native Urdu speakers</p>

## **10. How will this review make a difference?**

- 10.1 This ICAI review will focus on aid delivery and impact. It will examine three contrasting areas of the DFID Pakistan programme – education, health and humanitarian support – covering a range of funding channels and delivery partners.
- 10.2 The evaluation will enable us to determine the extent to which the DFID programmes that we examine in these three areas have achieved sustainable impact for intended beneficiaries. It will also provide us and DFID with an understanding of the relative effectiveness, efficiency and value for money of different funding and delivery mechanisms in delivering that impact.
- 10.3 The review will also help DFID to determine whether it has delivery chains in place that will enable it to cope with the substantial scaling-up of the UK aid programme in Pakistan envisaged in the next four years.