



Independent
Commission
for Aid Impact

Independent Commission for Aid Impact – Work Plan

1. This document introduces the Independent Commission for Aid Impact's first work plan, setting out the reports we envisage initiating over the next three years, from May 2011 to May 2014.
2. Our mandate permits us to examine all UK Government programmes funded by Official Development Assistance expenditure. In 2009¹, this represented £7.4bn, which was spent through bilateral, joint and multilateral processes by the Department for International Development (DFID) and at least eight other branches of Government. Under the Government's current plans and guided by its recent reviews of bilateral, multilateral and humanitarian work, this expenditure is due to rise significantly and will change in focus. This range of projects and programmes gives us significant discretion in choosing where to focus the attention of our reports.

Development of the Work Plan

3. In order to select proposals from the wide range of suggestions we have received, we have used four criteria – coverage, materiality, risk and interest – which we believe allow our work plan to do justice to the breadth, depth and complexity of UK aid expenditure. These criteria, and the sub-criteria which support them, are set out at **Figure 1**. For ease of reference, the criteria are included in the draft work plan itself as part of the rationale for each report.

¹ This is a calendar year measurement. Figures for 2010 were not available at the time of writing.

Figure 1: Framework for selecting proposals for inclusion in the ICAI work plan

Beneficiary, Parliamentary and Public Interest	Materiality
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What kind of involvement do recipient communities have in this area? • Is this an area of critical development importance for state and non-state actors in recipient countries? • Does the proposal follow up Select Committee or other Parliamentary work? • Did it feature as a priority in the public consultation? • Have other stakeholders requested this proposal? • Is it a topical issue? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many people are likely to be affected by the programme? • Is the programme's budget a financially material proportion of a particular division or directorate's budget? • Is the budget rising, for example because of Ministerial priorities? • How does the size of the budget compare to the controls and assurance currently in place? • Is the programme designed to deliver a transformational effect?²
Risk	Coverage
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the balance between risk and reward for the intended beneficiaries and their communities? • Is the programme³ concerned risky because it is new or innovative? • Is it managed through an unreliable or cumbersome delivery chain? • Is there a delivery risk because of logistical difficulties or political instability? • Is there a particular risk of corruption or financial irregularity? • Is there a risk of elite capture of a programme and its key implementing agents / advisors? • Is the programme likely to be controversial and / or attract public concern? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the programme likely to lead to beneficial change for recipients and their communities? • Does the proposal cover the Millennium Development Goals or other policy priorities?⁴ • Would the proposal contribute to a balanced picture of Official Development Assistance expenditure? • Would the proposal help to cover all Government Departments? • Would the proposal help to cover a range of sectors, programme sizes and geographical areas? • Is the programme likely to lead to beneficial change in the Department concerned? • Is this area currently the subject of an evaluation by another body (e.g. National Audit Office)?

4. This framework sets out our criteria for selecting programmes for inclusion in our work plan. It does not constitute the criteria by which we will judge the impact and effectiveness of programmes, which we will set out in due course.

² By "transformational", we mean that the programme is designed to lead to a qualitative, long-term and sustainable change for the recipient community concerned.

³ We use the term "programme" to describe all activities that DFID and other Departments undertake and that we might examine. This would include everything from a particular scheme in one district of a recipient country to Departments' overall contributions to multilateral bodies. By "proposal" we mean an idea for consideration as the basis for a report.

⁴ More detail on the Millennium Development Goals can be found at: <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>

5. We have compiled the work plan on the basis of analysis, suggestions and proposals from many sources, including:
 - Recommendations from the House of Commons International Development Committee
 - Our recent public consultation, the results of which are set out in more detail at Annex B
 - Meetings with a wide range of stakeholders, including development academics and researchers, non-governmental organisations and other governmental and multilateral donors
 - Discussions with the Department for International Development and other UK Government Departments which spend Official Development Assistance
 - A synthesis study examining centrally commissioned evaluations, parliamentary inquiries and external audits of the Department for International Development from the last five years. This study will be available on our website – www.independent.gov.uk/icaei .

The Work Plan

6. The work plan is structured in two parts for each of the three years considered: a core component of some ten reports a year and a flex component of up to ten further reports a year. The combination of the two should enable us to set out a clear overall direction for our work, while giving us the flexibility to respond to emerging topical issues or requests from Parliament or other stakeholders.
7. It is likely that this work plan, particularly the second and third years, will evolve over time. In addition to the flex component, we will also keep the core component under review. This will help us to respond to changing circumstances, to what we learn in the course of our programme of review and to policy priorities such as fragile states, the private sector and the Millennium Development Goals. We also intend to review what action the Government has taken with regard to our recommendations and therefore over time our work plan will include revisiting progress made.

8. The work plan comprises three types of report: evaluations, value for money reviews and investigations. We do not have fixed templates or checklists for each of these types of report because we wish to take a flexible approach in each case. We do, however, believe that they should focus on the following areas:
- Evaluations: are likely to focus on the sustainable development impact achieved by programmes against initial or updated objectives
 - Value for money reviews: will consider whether objectives have been achieved with the optimal use of resources
 - Investigations: could range from general fact-finding in response to external requests, to assessments of compliance with legal and policy responsibilities and examinations of alleged corruption cases.
- We have specified in the work plan whether each report should be carried out as an evaluation, a value for money review or an investigation. We may, however, choose to amend these decisions as we develop detailed terms of reference for each report.
9. We have to achieve a balance between transparent planning and avoiding the risk of skewing the results by alerting those responsible for programmes too far in advance. For this reason, we have identified the areas we wish to cover over three years but we reserve the right to change details such as the choice of country or programme as we consider appropriate. The order in which we publish reports may also change from the current work plan, since the time and resource required for each report is difficult to predict at this early stage.
10. We have not yet agreed our own definition of terms such as “value for money” and “aid effectiveness”. These are complex issues which are currently under much debate. In the case of value for money we believe that this should include long-term impact and effectiveness. We intend to commission our contractor to help us in our consideration of these matters.

11. We believe that the proposals contained in the core component of this work plan respond to the suggestions we have received and will provide a balanced overall picture of UK aid expenditure. They should enable us to identify both good and poor practice across a wide variety of sectors and geographical areas, thereby helping to maximise the value of the programmes considered for both recipients and taxpayers.
12. The work plan contains both structured interventions and one-off inquiries. For example, in the course of the first three years, we plan to deliver reports which examine the themes of health, education, multilateral bodies, governance/corruption, expenditure in fragile states and spending by Departments other than the Department for International Development. This will allow us to build up a body of knowledge in those areas which we identified as priorities from our preliminary work. The remaining reports are designed as one-off inquiries which allow us to cover the full range of aid expenditure and to which we may return using our flex component.
13. One of the challenges we face in scrutinising the UK aid budget is that it is spent through a variety of channels. These channels include bilateral assistance, multilateral bodies, NGOs and a range of funds and other organisations. The Department for International Development and other Departments have different degrees of assurance over how effectively money is spent through these channels. There are also particular challenges in scrutinising multilateral bodies without inadvertently duplicating their own evaluation and audit activity.
14. Addressing these challenges, some 42% of our consultation respondents suggested that we should focus primarily on bilateral activities. We do not, however, wish to ignore the considerable expenditure on multilateral activity and consider that it is possible to scrutinise it in a number of different ways. For example, there are a number of proposed reports in the work plan which are not aimed primarily at multilaterals (e.g. *Peace and Security Programmes in Nepal*; *Programme Controls and Assurance in Afghanistan*), but which inevitably will cover the Department for

International Development's work alongside, or in partnership with, multilateral donors at the country level. In addition, we are proposing to carry out work on how Government Departments gain assurance over money spent through United Nations bodies, the World Bank and the European Union, as well as a range of joint work with other donors. This will enable us to form a picture of the different ways in which the Government works with multilaterals.

15. We recognise that there is much ongoing work in the scrutiny and evaluation of international development. This is being undertaken by the International Development Committee, the National Audit Office, research bodies and Government Departments themselves in the United Kingdom and by a wide range of international bodies. We will take that work into account both as background to our reviews and also in order to avoid duplication. We do, of course, have a different remit to other bodies but we will seek to make the most of existing knowledge and complement others' work in undertaking our own.

16. To assist further in our consideration of what to include in this work plan, the Department for International Development commissioned a synthesis report on our behalf from an independent consultant. The objective of this work was to review central evaluations of the Department for International Development's work since 2006 and extract common lessons and recommendations. These evaluations included International Development Select Committee reports, OECD Development Assistance Committee peer reviews, National Audit Office reports and the Department for International Development's own evaluations. The full synthesis report will be available on our website – www.independent.gov.uk/icai .

Graham Ward CBE – Chief Commissioner; Mark Foster, John Githongo and Diana Good – Commissioners

Annex A: ICAI Draft Work Plan

Annex B: Results of ICAI Public Consultation

Annex C: Summary of Synthesis Report

Annex A: ICAI Draft Work Plan

Year 1

Core Component		
Product	No.	Candidate Subjects
Investigation	1	Subject: <i>Investigation into DFID's programme controls and assurance in Afghanistan</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>materiality</u>, <u>interest</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Clear public and Select Committee interest • Rising budget and challenging environment means controls are vital to avoid waste and corruption • DFID uses World Bank Trust Fund as proxy for budget support
VFM Review	2	Subject: <i>Comparison of DFID's education programmes in three East African countries</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>interest</u> and <u>materiality</u> elements of strategy • Comparative approach sets baseline for additional ICAI work on education and could provide some lessons on budget support in this sector • Should provide cost comparisons through VFM approach – important in context of increasing expenditure • Would assess contribution towards Millennium Development Goal 2
Evaluation	3	Subject: <i>DFID's Anti-Corruption Strategy</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>interest</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Responds to clear public interest from our consultation • Should provide useful starting-point for additional anti-corruption work

Evaluation	4	<p>Subject: <i>Management of the cross-departmental Conflict Pools</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Some concerns expressed over effectiveness of programme strategy and management • Allows ICAI to examine two other Departments (Foreign and Commonwealth Office and Ministry of Defence) alongside DFID in year 1 • Reflects increasing focus on conflict states
Evaluation	5	<p>Subject: <i>Study of World Bank Evaluation and Performance Measurement Activity</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>materiality</u> elements of strategy • Would allow assessment of one of the Government's largest multilateral partners • Could follow up Multilateral Aid Review analysis
VFM Review	6	<p>Subject: <i>DFID's management of budget support activities</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>materiality</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Would provide assurance over significant annual expenditure with direct impact on Millennium Development Goal targets • Could cover coordination with both bilateral and multilateral donors • A part of DFID's business not widely understood by the public
Joint Evaluation	7	<p>Subject: <i>Joint evaluation of United Nations Programme (e.g. with United Nations Development Programme Evaluation Team)</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>materiality</u>, <u>interest</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Allows us to tackle multilateral expenditure in Year 1

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Choice of programme would depend on agreement with UNDP, but could examine delivery chain effectiveness or UNDP's coordination role • UNDP rated "good" by Multilateral Aid Review and UK contributions likely to remain considerable
VFM Review	8	<p>Subject: <i>DFID's use of technical consultants</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>materiality</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Obvious value for money angle • Clear recommendation from International Development Committee to investigate this topic. Also a theme from the public consultation. • May provide wider lessons for working with private sector
VFM Review	9	<p>Subject: <i>Emergency / humanitarian response to crisis (e.g. in Libya)</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>interest</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Considerable public and recipient interest • Would provide response to Humanitarian Emergency Response Review recommendation for ICAI to focus on this sector • Changing events on the ground in Libya may mean another country provides a better case study by the time we undertake this work
Evaluation	10	<p>Subject: <i>DFID's climate change programme in Bangladesh</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>interest</u>, <u>materiality</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Clear recipient interest, since Bangladesh already suffers effects of climate change • Large programme budget: £75 million (2009-2013) on direct climate change activity and £100 million over eight years to support sustainable livelihoods

Flex Component		
Product	No.	Candidate Subjects
Evaluation	1	Subject: <i>Joint evaluation with Gates Foundation</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could address <i>coverage</i> and <i>interest</i> elements of strategy, depending on scope, but should also address Gates Foundation priorities • Gates Foundation are keen to collaborate • Scope to be decided, but could examine various DFID and Gates Foundation programmes
Evaluation	2	Subject: <i>Evaluation of a Regional Development Bank</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <i>coverage</i> and <i>materiality</i> elements of strategy • Allows further coverage of multilateral expenditure in an area with low public profile • Could follow up Multilateral Aid Review analysis • Choice of Bank to examine will follow after further analysis
VFM Review	3	Subject: <i>DFID's health programme in Zimbabwe</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <i>coverage</i> and <i>interest</i> elements of strategy • Responds to public consultation interest in both Africa and health • Obvious recipient interest and clear link to Millennium Development Goal 6 • Provides opportunity to examine priority areas such as HIV/AIDS and maternal health in context of a fragile state
Evaluation	4	Subject: <i>Study of Value for Money and Aid Effectiveness</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <i>risk</i> and <i>interest</i> elements of strategy

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will consist of a review of the current thinking on the meaning of value for money in the context of international development and aid effectiveness and aim to produce a practical contribution to this important international debate
Investigation	5	Subject: <i>Comparative study of health and education programmes in India</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>risk</u> and <u>interest</u> elements of strategy Would look at a small number of programmes to compare approaches taken to programme management, assurance and results Area of particular public and Parliamentary interest
Investigation	6	Subject: <i>DFID/Nike Girl Hub</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>materiality</u> elements of strategy Would examine this joint venture, examining how the partnership is delivering development impact for recipient communities Could examine how it balances its governance, funding and accountability arrangements with those of its parent institutions - Nike Foundation and DFID Reflects policy priority of increasing role of private sector
	7	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	8	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	9	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	10	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:

Year 2

Core Component		
Product	No.	Candidate Subjects
Evaluation	1	Subject: <i>DFID's work on water and sanitation in Sudan</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Would consider the delivery of sustainable development activity in a fragile environment and where some local governance structures are immature • Clear recipient, Parliamentary and public interest • Would assess contribution to Millennium Development Goal 7C
Evaluation	2	Subject: <i>Tri-departmental climate change finance programme</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>materiality</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Novel programme with rapidly increasing funding • Known monitoring and evaluation challenges • Allows ICAI to examine two further Departments (Department for Energy and Climate Change and Department for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs) alongside DFID
Investigation	3	Subject: <i>Investigation into DFID's assurance of expenditure in another UN body</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>risk</u> and <u>materiality</u> elements of strategy • Could focus on a body assessed as performing poorly in the Multilateral Aid Review • Would provide further coverage of multilateral expenditure

Investigation	4	<p>Subject: <i>HMG assurance of EU development expenditure</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>materiality</u>, <u>interest</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Clear Select Committee interest – could follow up existing or future work • Considerable expenditure, with known concerns about effectiveness • Would allow assessment of one of the Government’s largest multilateral partners
Evaluation	5	<p>Subject: <i>DFID’s primary education work in Nigeria</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>materiality</u>, <u>interest</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Currently “off track” to meet Millennium Development Goals target • Difficult country to operate in, with increasing post Bilateral Aid Review expenditure • Could address enrolment, attendance and other factors in assessing outcomes
VFM Review	6	<p>Subject: <i>DFID’s rural livelihoods programme in Orissa State, India</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>materiality</u> and <u>interest</u> elements of strategy • £43m spent between 2000 and 2008 • Claimed impacts of 800,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide captured and \$1m revenue raised • Livelihoods work traditionally under-evaluated by DFID

Evaluation	7	Subject: <i>Programme Partnership Agreements with NGOs</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>materiality</u> elements of strategy • Allows us to examine how NGOs are monitoring and evaluating their results • Could take case study approach to cover range of NGOs by size, sector etc and show how NGOs are contributing to DFID's policy priorities
Evaluation	8	Subject: <i>DFID's peace and security programmes in Nepal</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>interest</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Clear interest within recipient community and among consultation respondents on expenditure within conflict-affected states • Budget likely to rise under Bilateral Aid Review • Opportunity to explore challenges in measuring impact in multi-donor governance efforts
Evaluation	9	Subject: <i>A DFID forestry programme</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Opportunity to address a sector with a lower public profile • Could be bilateral or multilateral programme • Would allow assessment of contribution to Millennium Development Goal 7
VFM Review	10	Subject: <i>Evaluation of Stabilisation Unit</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>interest</u> elements of strategy • Could focus on organisational effectiveness • Unit is a key enabler of increasing DFID expenditure in conflict and fragile states

Flex Component		
Product	No.	Candidate Subjects
	1	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	2	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	3	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	4	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	5	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	6	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	7	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	8	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	9	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	10	Subject: <i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:

Year 3

Core Component		
Product	No.	Candidate Subjects
VFM Review	1	Subject: <i>Monitoring and evaluation of other Government Departments' programmes</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Allows coverage of non-DFID Official Development Assistance (e.g. Home Office, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Business, Innovation & Skills) • Opportunity to address likely variance in performance and spread good practice • Test of how recipient voice is addressed in non-DFID programmes
Evaluation	2	Subject: <i>A DFID Caribbean programme</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Area traditionally under-evaluated by DFID • Gives us broader geographical coverage outside the Asia/Africa focus
Evaluation	3	Subject: <i>Work of a DFID country office (e.g. Pakistan)</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>risk</u>, <u>materiality</u> and <u>interest</u> elements of strategy • Would cover money disbursed locally through multilaterals, as well as bilaterally • If chosen, Pakistan has range of operating challenges, including physical security, governance and corruption problems and effects of conflict and natural disasters • Expenditure rising sharply under Bilateral Aid Review

Evaluation	4	<p>Subject: <i>DFID's programme exit strategies</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Could use case study approach across several sectors to test effectiveness of DFID's planning for exit strategies • Opportunity for lesson learning and wider recommendations • Addresses issues of sustainability and longer-term impact
VFM Review	5	<p>Subject: <i>DFID's maternal health programmes in Africa</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>interest</u> elements of strategy • Responds to consultation interest in health and Africa • Would allow us to measure progress in key Millennium Development Goal area
Evaluation	6	<p>Subject: <i>Education – the student pathway</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>interest</u> and <u>materiality</u> elements of strategy • Report would look at DFID and other multilateral donors' education interventions from the students' perspective • An innovative approach to evaluating an MDG priority area
Evaluation	7	<p>Subject: <i>DFID's governance programmes in Africa (e.g. Democratic Republic of Congo)</i></p> <p>Rationale & selection criteria covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u>, <u>risk</u> and <u>materiality</u> elements of strategy • Could examine a range of governance programmes – elections, support for legislation, public sector capacity-building and public financial management. • Increasing expenditure post Bilateral Aid Review

VFM Review	8	Subject: <i>DFID's work on economic growth in South Asian programme (e.g. India)</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>materiality</u> elements of strategy • New results framework should allow clearer view of inputs/outputs/outcomes • High public and parliamentary interest • This is an area of renewed policy emphasis for DFID
Investigation	9	Subject: <i>Investigation into DFID's Budget Support for Overseas Territories⁵</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • DFID have distinct responsibility for provision of services to UK citizens in the Overseas Territories • Budget support has particular challenges in this area and is different to budget support elsewhere
VFM Review	10	Subject: <i>Comparison of DFID's Anti-Corruption Programmes in West Africa</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses <u>coverage</u> and <u>risk</u> elements of strategy • Comparative approach allows for realistic lesson learning • Fiduciary risks to DFID programmes
Flex Component		
Product	No.	Candidate Subjects
	1	<i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	2	<i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:

⁵ The United Kingdom's Overseas Territories, which include Montserrat, St Helena and dependencies and Pitcairn Island.

	3	<i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	4	<i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	5	<i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	6	<i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	7	<i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	8	<i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	9	<i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:
	10	<i>To be selected</i>
		Rationale & selection criteria covered:

Annex B: Results of ICAI Public Consultation

Introduction

ICAI held a consultation to ask members of the public and stakeholders which countries and areas of activity they would like ICAI to review. This annex outlines the responses to the consultation. In line with Government guidelines on consultations, the ICAI consultation ran for twelve weeks from the 14th January to the 7th April 2011.

This consultation was based on the principle of a single response from any individual or organisation and was designed to capture the views of the general public as well as those of interested parties such as academics or NGOs. The consultation was open to respondents living overseas as well as residents of the United Kingdom.

In addition to setting out the quantified results from the survey, we have included a selection of respondents' written comments.

Timeline

14 January 2011	Launch of consultation
4 March 2011	NGO roundtable
7 April 2011	Consultation closed
4 May 2011	Hearing with International Development Committee
12 May 2011	Launch of ICAI, including publication of work plan and response to consultation

External engagement

As part of the consultation process ICAI held a roundtable meeting with 26 NGOs. The meeting enabled ICAI to hear detailed feedback on NGO priority areas for ICAI. As a result of this meeting BOND produced a response to the ICAI consultation endorsed by 26 of their members.

As part of our further external engagement on the subject of the work plan ICAI also met with:

- Officials from the Department for International Development
- Other Government Department officials including the Home Office, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Defence, the Department of Energy and Climate Change and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office
- National Audit Office officials
- Former members of the Independent Advisory Committee for Development Impact
- Staff from the Overseas Development Institute
- Staff from the Institute for Development Studies
- The Chair and an official of the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Agriculture and Food for Development

- Other stakeholders including staff from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and Oxfam
- Specialist evaluation staff from other donors through bilateral meetings and via the OECD Development Assistance Committee's Evaluation Network

Questions

Respondents

The total number of responses received to the public consultation was 310. In addition to this A4ID submitted a document with 35 of their members' responses to the consultation. *Please be aware when looking at statistics that not all respondents answered every question. Also, not all percentages add up to 100 because of rounding.*

Member of the public	49.6%
Academic or researcher	12.2%
Civil society/NGO	22.8%
Journalist	0.3%
Government employee	5.9%
Other	9.2%

Age of individual

18 and under	0.0%
19-29	16.7%
30-39	29.4%
40-49	17.1%
50-59	17.1%
60-69	14.0%
70 or over	4.8%
Not supplied	1.0%

Gender

Male	53.3%
Female	45.7%
Not supplied	1.0%

Residency

84.3% of those responding were resident in the UK

Of the 15.7% not in the UK, 55.1% were in Europe, 15.4% in Asia, 14.1% in Sub Saharan Africa, 5.1% in Middle East and North Africa, 7.7% in North America and 2.6% in South America.

Q1: Which regions should ICAI focus on?

Africa	71.7%
Asia	18.0%
Europe	4.0%
Latin America/Caribbean	4.0%
Pacific	2.2%

Q2: Which countries should ICAI focus on?

Afghanistan	10.6%
Ethiopia	7.2%
DRC	6.7%
India	5.4%
Pakistan	5.4%
Sudan	4.8%
Nigeria	4.3%
Zimbabwe	3.2%
Kenya	3.1%
Bangladesh	3.1%

Note: There are the top 10 countries.

Respondents' Comments

Investment and risk

ICAI should focus on countries where DFID has the a) biggest and b) riskiest aid programmes.

The volume of aid flowing into Africa means it is of high importance. Additionally, expenditure in Afghanistan means that focus should be on this country.

Sustainability

ICAI should choose countries not just on expenditure but on the lessons they offer in achieving sustainable development.

Needs based

ICAI should scrutinise areas where there is the greatest need.

Q3: Which sectors should ICAI focus on?

Governance, Government and Civil Society	18.8%
Education	15.7%
Economic	15.4%
Health	14.0%
Water Supply and sanitation	12.2%
Climate Change	8.9%
Social Service	6.0%
Environment Protection	4.4%
Other programmes	2.8%
Research	1.8%

Respondents' Comments

Interconnected issues

ICAI needs to understand the relationships between these sectors - they are interconnected. Focusing on one area must inevitably feed into other aspects of global well-being.

Systemic issues

The main issues to focus on are systemic - how is aid given in these areas affected by the wider global systems.

Corruption

Governance must include tackling corruption.

Q4: Which aid mechanism should ICAI focus on?

41.7% put bilateral first.

29.8% put multilateral first.

28.6% put humanitarian first

Respondents' Comments

Combination

A combination of all three areas is vital.

Multilateral

Multilateral aid receives by far the least scrutiny and it is the area of aid spending with the least accountability and greatest problems. There is more to do to bring NGOs and multilaterals under a similar level of scrutiny.

Multilateral aid has major problems in getting the design and funding agreed in short timelines to impact on development issues.

Multilateral aid is essential to leveraging other governments' and ensuring maximum impact of aid and DFID's ability to achieve change.

Bilateral

ICAI should cut its teeth on bilateral aid since this is something under direct UK control and can therefore be scrutinised most closely.

Bilateral aid has the best chance of success; therefore ICAI should concentrate on it.

Lack of transparency

Humanitarian assistance tends to be under good, external scrutiny. Multilateral and bilateral aid currently lack transparency and accountability.

Q5: Which multilateral bodies should ICAI focus on?

37.2% put United Nations agencies first
24.7% put European Union institutions first
22.3% put development banks first
15.8% put global funds first

Respondents' Comments

Duplication

ICAI should take account of other initiatives being taken elsewhere to evaluate multilateral aid programmes and cooperate rather than duplicate.

Collaboration

A focus on collaboration and partnership in development - especially where this is successful and unsuccessful.

United Nations

The UN agencies, funds and commissions are in critical need of reform.

EU institutions

European Union institutions absorb large amounts of money and are hard to scrutinise.

World Bank

A4ID members expressed strong feelings regarding the effectiveness of the World Bank; reform of which they felt was badly needed.

Q6: Which cross cutting issues should ICAI focus on?

Democracy and human rights	37.4%
Fraud and corruption	24.5%
Gender inequality	17.1%
Environmental sustainability	16.9%
Aids/HIV	4.2%

Respondents' Comments

Governance

Governance & institution building would have the biggest spill over effect to help improve other areas.

Despite years of work on governance, development professionals still do not really understand how best to have a positive impact.

Gender

Gender equality still has too low a profile.

Corruption

Fraud and corruption is endemic. Too few development projects recognise fraud and corruption as a problem to be faced up to and positively tackled.

Fraud and corruption are important issues for the UK public and policy makers yet have not often been comprehensively evaluated by DFID and other donors.

Private sector

A healthy and productive private sector is needed to ensure the other categories have success.

Environmental Sustainability

A4ID members see environmental sustainability is vital, with a fear that Africa may develop along a similar track to the developed economies in terms of consumption and energy usage with long term detrimental impacts.

Q7: Which type of report should ICAI focus on?

Evaluations	38.1%
Value for money reviews	23.3%
Reviews	21.8%
Investigations	16.9%

Respondents' Comments

Evaluations

Evaluations are the most helpful for NGOs - especially if they are drafted accessibly.

Evaluations need to be more robust, address tough questions and not be 'toned down' by DFID staff prior to publication.

Evaluations that consider the overall political-economy, governance environment, corruption and other factors and the ODA's impact within the overall context provide a much more valuable picture than a narrow evaluation of the direct impact of aid.

Follow up

ICAI should produce an initial report and then a follow up report after three years to see if benefits have been sustained.

Data

Quality of data will be important.

Monitoring

In addition to end of programme evaluations and value for money reviews, there should be tighter monitoring so failure to progress according to plans is identified early on and remedial action taken.

Further consultation comments from respondents - by theme

Recipients

Feedback from recipients currently does not drive effectiveness. ICAI should focus ruthlessly on benefits to the individual as the benchmark for effective aid spending.

Ensure ICAI works with people on the ground and collects feedback from collaborators and intended beneficiaries.

Local agencies/organisations

Identify and support local agencies addressing local problems

The value of local-led development programmes, or aspects of programmes, is often overlooked. Increase the local content of development programmes – locally led programmes are likely to be more cost-effective.

A significant way to increase the value for money of UK aid is through increasing the local content of development programmes, particularly in comparison to channelling aid through multilaterals.

Fraud and corruption

Corruption is seen by many as the single most important issue.

Investigations into corruption would be extremely valuable in assessing the value of UK aid relative to other factors.

Consultants

ICAI should look at the cost of consultants and the amount of profit they take in designing projects.

There is a too-cosy relationship between consulting companies hired to evaluate DFID's work and DFID itself.

Assess transparency in other bodies

DFID programmes are making good efforts to be more transparent, results focused and deliver value for money. The same cannot be said for

organizations which receive a lot of funding from DFID (multilateral and civil society organisations).

Sustainable impact

Light needs to be shed on DFID's effectiveness in achieving changes on the ground, not just in the disbursement of funds.

Sustainable outcomes are important. ICAI should focus on impacts achieved, both short-term and long-term.

Quality of DFID reviews

ICAI should look at the quality of DFID's annual and mid-term project reviews. The variation in quality and rigour of work, especially when conducted by DFID's own staff, is extremely variable.

Budget support

ICAI should evaluate DFID's programme of budget support to governments.

Private sector

It would be good for ICAI to examine the effectiveness of development with and through the private sector.

Expenditure on development awareness

A number of organisations (Cumbria Development Education Centre, UK Teacher Education Network for global citizenship, and Think Global) have called for ICAI to consider an evaluation of the effectiveness of development education awareness work in the UK.

They call for DFID to fund public education about the causes and consequences of poverty.⁶

Climate change

The impact of climate change on poor communities is of concern, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa where at least 50% of the population live in the rural areas.

Commissioner expertise

It is critical that the Commissioners build a solid understanding of evaluation and different approaches, their strengths and weaknesses and gather a wide perspective of views on different types of evaluations.

It will be important that the consortium has development expertise within it.

⁶ These kinds of programmes are unlikely to qualify as Official Development Assistance and would therefore fall outside our mandate.

Additional comments from specific stakeholders

In addition to our survey, some stakeholders submitted further evidence in the form of letters or memoranda. Below we have listed some of the principal points they raised.

A4ID members

Many development issues are multi-regional and inter-dependent, requiring an integrated approach. The Millennium Development Goals should be used as an overarching framework for ICAI's focus.

Adam Smith International

An interesting approach to multilaterals would be a comparative analysis of the length of time it takes from project/programme concept note to actual start of activities, with an analysis of processes and problems at each stage

In order to be able to evaluate multilateral development agencies effectively it will likely be necessary to change the terms on which DFID supplies funds to allow greater scrutiny.

Bond (endorsed by 26 Bond members)

The creation of ICAI is welcome and in particular the reporting line to Parliament and the IDC. There are some cross cutting issues that ICAI should focus on, namely: ownership by, empowerment of and accountability to recipients – ICAI should build on DFID's work and make recipient country civil society consultation a consistent part of all aid assessments; policy coherence – value for money cannot be achieved unless UK policies on climate change, tax, corruption and trade are consistent with development goals; and ICAI should undertake an assessment of technical assistance to explore how effectively it is being delivered.

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA)

CIPFA welcomes the establishment of ICAI and endorses its statement of values, especially the application of professional rigour to ensure reports are based on evaluated evidence.

It is important that the initial stages of ICAI's programme achieve the twin goals of establishing clarity about the way it intends to work (including the way it intends to interpret value for money and effectiveness), and a small number of carefully selected evaluation projects that are likely both to produce clear results and offer evidential support for improvement in the future.

Aiming for sustainable value for money makes it particularly important that support for recipients' infrastructure building should include building professional capacity in public financial management.

Cumbria Development Education Centre

Aid will not change the underlying structures that keep some people poor while others are rich, unless we spend it on educating people in the UK about the causes and consequences of poverty (development awareness) and on

changing those structures. Public support for development will drop substantially if the development awareness programmes are reduced. People in the UK need to understand the way their lives are connected with others and how their choices can contribute to poverty and inequality for others.

Fairtrade Foundation

Agriculture and processing of agricultural goods should be included as a category given its rising importance.

Before any studies are undertaken there should be a clear agreement on how 'value for money' will be defined and therefore how it will be assessed. Our belief is that value for money needs to encompass the wider impacts of an intervention in areas such as organisational development, governance etc and to be considered over a suitably extended timeframe to allow these types of impacts to be assessed.

Geographical focus should reflect the fact that the majority of poor people now live in middle income countries so reaching the poor is not necessarily dependent on working only in the poorest countries.

Fairwater Foundation

Most Governments and NGOs are not aware or do not recognise that they need to change their approach to long lasting and sustainable impact around using reliable water hand pumps. Most are very cheap and break easily.

Popular belief within many NGOs is that such facilities (hand pumps, latrines, etc.) should be very cheap. Studies show that this is often exactly the opposite, cheap solutions are often expensive to maintain.

Global Witness

Global Witness believes that the ICAI should ensure that the multilateral institutions are in line with the policies of the UK government and that they prioritise good governance, sound natural resource management and efforts to tackle corruption.

Evaluations that consider the overall political-economic, governance environment, corruption and other factors and the ODA's impact within the overall context provide a much more valuable picture than a narrow evaluation of the direct impact of aid.

The ICAI should measure aid-effectiveness in the broader governance and political-economy context, taking into consideration the management of non-aid revenue streams and natural resources and the government's effectiveness at providing services. The ICAI should measure aid in such a way that it promotes the sound management of natural resources and associated revenues, long term sustainable growth, good governance and accountability rather than short term, but reversible, gains.

International Rescue Committee UK

There are certain key areas of intervention that have proven particularly challenging to measure – including behavioural change and empowerment programmes (which are key to preventing violence against women) and governance. ICAI should ensure that these vital programmes do not suffer as a result of being hard to measure, by working closely with academics and NGOs such as IRC who are already working to develop innovative ways to assess the impact of these programmes.

Malaria No More

ICAI will want to focus on the countries receiving greatest aid from DFID, but in terms of impact in achieving the MDGs and long term work to lift people out of poverty, it would be important to focus at least regionally on Africa.

European Union institutions absorb large amounts of money and are hard to scrutinise. An in-depth assessment by the ICAI could be really helpful to ensure maximum return on investment.

Maternal and Child Healthcare Focused Initiative (MCHFI)

The human rights of mothers and children are crucial to the future of many countries in the world, as better health and protection of children would follow. In many countries these rights are not upheld and programmes that address this should be priorities. The Maternal and Child Healthcare Focused Initiative (MCHFI) is being drawn up with UNICEF

Peace Direct

A very significant way to increase the value for money of UK aid is through increasing the local content of development programmes, particularly in comparison to channelling aid through multilaterals. Locally led programmes are likely to be more cost-effective.

Save the Children

Save the Children welcome the creation of the Independent Commission on Aid Impact which, through external, independent scrutiny of aid, will help to ensure that DFID remains one of the most effective and impactful international development agencies. We would encourage ICAI to investigate DFID's sustained commitment to the Paris Declaration (2005) and Accra Agenda for Action (2008) to ensure that our aid is accountable to recipient countries and citizens, not only to the UK taxpayer.

We would recommend that the CDC Group also be considered within any investigation into DFID's performance within the 'economic' sector.

Seeds for development

Seeds and agriculture are a top priority. Water for agriculture should be included and of course education is paramount to the future of any country.

Sightsavers

We would like to propose disability as an additional sector to consider, or at the very least ensure that disability is well integrated in to all other sectors.

Survivors Fund (SURF)

The UN agencies, funds and commissions are in critical need of reform. The UK should be taking a lead in driving forward that process.

Ultimately ICAI should add value to the sector, complementing existing work which is already being undertaken. This consultation is a good start to ensure that the voice of the sector is incorporated into the development of the work. It would strengthen the ongoing work of the Commission if a representative body of small and large development charities were to be actively involved in the work going forward.

The UK Teacher Education network for sustainable development/global citizenship

We believe that ICAI should consider an evaluation of the effectiveness of development education investment at a time when DFID's investments are under scrutiny.

Think Global

We recommend that ICAI focus at least part of its work in the first three years on measuring the impact of development education and awareness work in the UK. This is a badly under-researched area. Think Global's initial research indicates a strong impact on public engagement with and support for international development. An independent review of work in this area would be invaluable.

Vision Aid Overseas

A focus on collaboration and partnership is important - especially where this is successful and unsuccessful. There is a need to ensure multilateral agency activity is complementary to national objectives.

VSO

ICAI should aim for a balance between programmes that focus on strengthening systems for delivery of basic services, and governance programmes that in the long term will bring about sustainable changes in systems and allocation of resources that will benefit the poorest and most excluded.

Two universal factors in exclusion are gender and disability and these should take priority as cross-cutting issues. Another cross-cutting issue is the role of human resources in effective aid programmes.

WaterAid

WaterAid believes that ICAI should conduct a review into how UK aid is spent in the water and sanitation sector through both bilateral and multilateral channels. WaterAid think this would be of particular value in Africa and South Asia regions where the challenges on the Millennium Development Goals are greatest.

Womankind Worldwide

The ICAI should focus on gender and women's rights and development. Women make up the vast majority of the poorest and most vulnerable people in the world. If real progress is to be made in poverty eradication we must improve how women's rights and development are addressed and how women can fully participate in the development process

Annex C: Summary of Synthesis Report

Below is the summary of a Synthesis Report that the Department for International Development commissioned for our information from an independent consultant. The full report will be available from our website – www.independent.gov.uk/ica .

Synthesis Report of DFID's Strategic Evaluations 2005 – 2010: A report produced for the Independent Commission for Aid Impact by Roger Drew

Summary

- S1. This report examined **central evaluations of DFID's work** published from 2006 to 2010. This included:
- 41 reports of the International Development Committee (IDC)
 - Two Development Assistance Committee (DAC) peer reviews
 - 10 National Audit Office (NAO) reports
 - 63 reports of evaluations from DFID's Evaluation Department (EVD).
- S2. These evaluations consisted of **various types**:
- Studies of DFID's work overall (16%)
 - Studies with a geographic focus (46%)
 - Studies of themes or sectors (19%)
 - Studies of how aid is delivered (19%).
- S3. During this period, DFID's business model involved allocating funds through divisional programmes. **Analysis of these evaluation studies according to this business model** shows that:
- Across regional divisions, the amount of money covered per study varied from £63 million in Europe and Central Asia to £427 million in East and Central Africa
 - Across non-regional divisions, the amount of money covered per study varied from £84 million in Policy Division to £5,305 million in Europe and Donor Relations.
- S4. Part of the explanation of these differences is that **the evaluations studied form only part of the overall scrutiny of DFID's work**. In particular, its policy on evaluation commits DFID to rely on the evaluation systems of partner multilateral organisations for assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of multilateral aid. No central reviews of data generated through those systems were included in the documents reviewed for this study. The impact of DFID's Bilateral and Multilateral

Aid Reviews was not considered, as the Reviews had not been completed by the time this study was undertaken.

- S5. The evaluations reviewed had a **strong focus on DFID's bilateral aid programmes at country level**. There was a good match overall between the frequency of studying countries and the amount of DFID bilateral aid received. Despite the growing focus on fragile states, such countries were still less likely to be studied than non-fragile countries. Countries that received large amounts of DFID bilateral aid not evaluated in the last five years included Tanzania, Iraq and Somalia. Regional programmes in Africa also received large amounts of DFID bilateral aid but were not centrally evaluated. Country programme evaluations did not consider DFID's multilateral aid specifically. None of the evaluations reviewed considered why the distribution of DFID's multilateral aid by country differs so significantly from its bilateral aid. For example, Turkey is the single largest recipient of DFID multilateral aid but receives almost nothing bilaterally.
- S6. The evaluations reviewed covered a **wide range of thematic, sectoral and policy issues**. These evaluations were, however, largely stand-alone exercises rather than drawing either retrospectively on data gathered in other evaluations or prospectively including questions into proposed evaluations. More use could have been made of syntheses of country programme evaluations for this purpose.
- S7. The evaluations explored in detail **the delivery of DFID's bilateral aid and issues of how aid could be delivered more effectively**. The evaluations covered the provision of multilateral aid in much less detail. One area not covered in the evaluations is the increasing use of multilateral organisations to deliver bilateral aid programmes. This more than trebled from £389 million in 2005/6 to £1.3 billion in 2009/10 and, by 2009/10, was more than double the amount being provided as financial aid through both general and sectoral budget support combined.