

**Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)**  
**Evaluation of DFID’s Climate Change Programme in Bangladesh**  
**Inception report**

Contents

1. Introduction .....	2
2. Background .....	3
3. Purpose .....	4
4. Relationships to other evaluations/studies .....	5
5. Methodology .....	7
6. Roles and Responsibilities .....	13
7. Management and Reporting .....	15
8. Expected outputs and timeframe .....	15
9. Risks and Mitigation .....	16
10. How will this ICAI review make a difference?.....	17

## **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 wish to assess UK-funded support for the response to climate change in Bangladesh. The nature and purpose of this review, together with the main themes and questions it will address, were set out in the Terms of Reference. This report contains more precise evaluation questions, mapped against the sources of evidence that will be used to answer them. It sets out the methodology in more detail, identifies the team members and their roles and contains an indicative timeline. It is, however, intended that the methodology and work plan are flexible enough to allow the evaluation to explore new issues and questions emerging over the course of the study.

## 2. Background

- 2.1. 84% of the 162 million people living in Bangladesh survive on less than US\$2 a day.<sup>1</sup> They are particularly vulnerable to climate shocks. Two-thirds of Bangladesh is less than five metres above current mean sea level. The country, home of one of the world's largest delta systems, is susceptible to river and rainwater flooding, particularly during the monsoon. It is not uncommon for over a quarter of the land area to be submerged annually. Bangladesh is hit by a severe cyclone every three years on average, creating storm surges that are sometimes more than ten metres high. In addition, crops and the livelihoods of the rural poor in low-lying coastal areas are at risk from saline water ingress. The majority of the country's 50 million extreme poor are particularly vulnerable, since many live on marginal land such as river islands or along the coast.<sup>2</sup>
- 2.2. The Government of Bangladesh, with support from international development agencies, has invested over £6.5 billion since 1971 to make the country more resilient to climate change.

The **Bangladesh Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan**<sup>3</sup> was published in 2009. The Climate Change Action Plan has six pillars:

1. **Food security, social protection and health:** to ensure that the poorest and most vulnerable in society, including women and children, are protected;
2. **Comprehensive disaster management:** to strengthen further the country's disaster management systems;
3. **Infrastructure:** to ensure that existing assets (e.g. protective embankments) are fit for purpose and that needed infrastructure (e.g. cyclone shelters and urban drainage) is put in place to deal with the likely impacts of climate change;
4. **Research and knowledge management:** to predict the likely scale and timing of climate change impacts to inform investment strategy;
5. **Mitigation and low-carbon development:** to evolve low-carbon development options and implement these as the country's economy grows; and
6. **Capacity building and institutional strengthening:** to enhance the capacity of government ministries and agencies, civil society and the private sector to meet the challenge of climate change.

- 2.3. Bangladesh's response has been developed in the context of wider regional challenges and agreements. Governments in the Asia-Pacific region are committed to disaster risk reduction through the *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005–2015*,<sup>4</sup> a goal of which is 'the more effective integration of disaster risk

<sup>1</sup> Bangladesh, UNICEF, 2008, [www.unicef.org/bangladesh/cbg\\_\(18.10.08\).pdf](http://www.unicef.org/bangladesh/cbg_(18.10.08).pdf).

<sup>2</sup> The World Bank defines the 'extreme poor' as those earning less than US\$1.25 (around £0.80) per day.

<sup>3</sup> *Bangladesh Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan*, Government of Bangladesh, 2009, [http://www.moef.gov.bd/climate\\_change\\_strategy2009.pdf](http://www.moef.gov.bd/climate_change_strategy2009.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*, January 2005, [www.unisdr.org/files/1037\\_hyogoframeworkforactionenglish.pdf](http://www.unisdr.org/files/1037_hyogoframeworkforactionenglish.pdf). This ten-year plan to make the world safer from natural hazards was adopted by 168 Governments at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in Japan.

considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction'. Furthermore, Bangladesh is a key partner for the regional Disaster Management Centre of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC).

- 2.4. DFID's focus on climate change in Bangladesh is relatively recent. The last Country Programme Evaluation in 2006 had noted that 'the portfolio during 2000–5 does little to directly address environmental concerns'.<sup>5</sup> This is not now the case: DFID plans total spending of £1 billion in Bangladesh between 2011 and 2015. Of this, £123 million is for climate change, with the objective that the 'number of people with increased resilience to climate change and improved ability to respond to and recover from natural disasters' directly attributable to UK funding will be at least 15 million.<sup>6</sup>
- 2.5. The majority of the finance will be channelled through:
  - a multi-donor Trust Fund for Climate Change Adaptation administered by the World Bank on behalf of the Government of Bangladesh; and
  - the United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP's) Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme.
- 2.6. In addition to the challenges of the environment, the people of Bangladesh have experienced weak and fragile governance throughout the country's 40-year history. The Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index identifies Bangladesh as one of the weakest performers in the world (though slowly improving), with widespread grand and petty corruption. The country remains vulnerable to terrorist acts by extremists.
- 2.7. DFID's country operational plan recognises the governance challenges in the country. It also notes the difficulties in ensuring value for money given the context and is putting in place a value for money strategy.

### **3. Purpose**

- 3.1. To assess whether the DFID Bangladesh Climate Change Programme is effectively and efficiently responding to the needs of the people of Bangladesh.

---

<sup>5</sup> *Evaluation of DFID Country Programmes: Bangladesh, 2000-2005*, DFID, May 2006, [www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/evaluation/ev665.pdf](http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/evaluation/ev665.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> *DFID Bangladesh Operational Plan, 2011-2015*, April 2011, [www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/op/Bangladesh-2011.pdf](http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/op/Bangladesh-2011.pdf).

#### 4. Relationships to other evaluations/studies

- 4.1. This evaluation will take into account the International Development Committee's (IDC's) findings in its third report of session 2009-10.<sup>7</sup> This report made some general comments on DFID's operations in Dhaka, for example recommending that 'key DFID staff get out of Dhaka regularly to visit programmes and talk to those who benefit as well as those who do not'. It also made some specific recommendations relating to DFID's funding of climate change, for example that DFID should make clear when announcing climate change funding whether or not it represents new funding and that it should keep a commitment to limit to 10% the amount of Official Development Assistance (ODA) which can be used for climate change adaptation.
- 4.2. In addition, the IDC wished to make sure that the country response was part of a regional approach, for instance asking DFID to engage more fully with the possible challenges of climate-induced mass migration and requesting a further report from DFID on progress by February 2011.
- 4.3. More generally, the Environmental Audit Committee (EAC) of the House of Commons published a review of the impact of UK aid on environmental protection and climate change adaptation and mitigation in June 2011.<sup>8</sup> A notable finding was that 'the World Bank is not the most appropriate channel for future UK climate finance' globally (since it continued to support large-scale carbon projects). EAC also recommended that 'DFID funds should only be channelled through multilateral institutions where they are assessed to be the most advantageous and effective option, not as the default'.
- 4.4. The 2011 UK *Humanitarian Emergency Response Review* (HERR) chaired by Lord Ashdown<sup>9</sup> is a key reference. It noted the importance of investing in disaster risk reduction activities, in particular given the context of the increased risks that climate change will bring. This study will also make reference to the *Global Corruption Report: Climate Change* published by Transparency International in 2011.<sup>10</sup>
- 4.5. In November 2010, the World Bank published its study *Economics of adaptation to climate change: Bangladesh*.<sup>11</sup> Among other things, it tabulated the costs of the climate shocks experienced and the economic impact of the

---

<sup>7</sup> *DFID's Programme in Bangladesh*, International Development Committee, HC 95-1, March 2010, [www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmintdev/95/95i.pdf](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmintdev/95/95i.pdf).

<sup>8</sup> *The Impact of UK Overseas Aid on Environmental Protection and Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation*, Environmental Audit Committee, HC 710, June 2011, [www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmenvaud/710/710.pdf](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmenvaud/710/710.pdf).

<sup>9</sup> *Humanitarian Emergency Response Review*, 2011, [www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/HERR.pdf](http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/HERR.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> *Global Corruption Report: Climate Change*, Transparency International, 2011, [www.transparency.org/content/download/60586/970870/Global\\_Corruption\\_Report\\_Climate\\_Change\\_English.pdf](http://www.transparency.org/content/download/60586/970870/Global_Corruption_Report_Climate_Change_English.pdf).

<sup>11</sup> *Economics of adaptation to climate change: Bangladesh*, World Bank, November 2010, [http://climatechange.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/documents/EACC\\_Bangladesh.pdf](http://climatechange.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/documents/EACC_Bangladesh.pdf).

investments made to date on disaster reduction measures – both structural (polders, cyclone shelters, cyclone-resistant housing) and non-structural (early warning and awareness raising systems). This report notes that:

‘These investments have significantly reduced damages and losses from extreme climatic events over time, especially in terms of deaths and injuries. In addition, rural households have adapted their farming systems to the “normal floods” that typically inundate about a quarter of the country by switching from low yielding deep water rice to high-yielding rice crops. As a result, agricultural production has actually risen over the past few decades. Rising incomes have also enabled an increasing proportion of households to live in homes that are more resilient to cyclones, storm surges and floods... Existing investments, which have reduced the impacts of cyclone-induced storm surges, provide a solid foundation upon which to undertake additional measures to reduce potential damages now and in the future. However, these investments are not sufficient to address the existing risks, much less the future risk from climate change.’

- 4.6. Merylyn Hedger’s March 2011 *Climate Finance in Bangladesh: Lessons for Development Cooperation and Climate Finance at National Level*<sup>12</sup> noted, among other issues, that ‘there is no clear storyline on what has been done so far’ by donors on climate change. The report noted that there was a need ‘to define what is climate funding and what is development funding to create a clear baseline during 2011 over which future effort can be monitored. This will be challenging.’ The report went on to stress that ‘more capacities to develop robust programmes and spend money effectively are needed. There is already considerable experience with successful development effort in some sectors that is not necessarily being accessed’, with a need for ‘development partners and GoB [the Government of Bangladesh] to establish mechanisms for prioritisation ... efforts to embed climate change into the development planning process need to be considerably strengthened and given a higher profile’.
- 4.7. The findings echo those of an earlier work *Governing Climate Change Finance in Bangladesh* by Clifford Polycarp (September 2010).<sup>13</sup> Among other things, Polycarp recommended increased coherence of climate change and development activities, for instance that ‘the Ministry of Environment and Forests, the Ministry of Planning and the Ministry of Finance need to work together to ensure that the resources allocated by the various climate change funds, including the Climate Change Trust Fund, is integrated into medium-term budgetary framework and the Annual Development Planning processes’. He also noted that:

---

<sup>12</sup> Merylyn Hedger, *Climate Finance in Bangladesh: Lessons for Development Cooperation and Climate Finance at National Level*, Institute of Development Studies, March 2011, [www.ids.ac.uk/download.cfm?objectid=89BF04F0-2190-11E1-9933005056AA4739](http://www.ids.ac.uk/download.cfm?objectid=89BF04F0-2190-11E1-9933005056AA4739).

<sup>13</sup> Clifford Polycarp, *Governing Climate Change Finance in Bangladesh*, 2010.

'Both the government and donor agencies need to focus on strengthening institutions for financial accountability such as the Comptroller and Auditor General and the Anti-Corruption Commission to better implement and enforce rules. While this may be motivated in part by the need to improve the effectiveness of climate finance, it will have spin-off benefits for improving aid effectiveness more generally.'

- 4.8. He also made specific recommendations that the donors strengthen the monitoring and reporting of their activities.

## **5. Methodology**

- 5.1. This evaluation will address a programme of activity that has not yet been completed. Consequently it will focus on the demand and need for climate change assistance in Bangladesh, the choices made over the design of the programme and the likely impact and outcomes based on current and past comparative monitoring. It will in particular assess whether value for money is being achieved. Key interlocutors will be DFID's partners in the Government of Bangladesh, other donor partners (who are the implementing agents for much of the work), representatives of civil society and intended beneficiaries who are vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. Investigations will be undertaken across Bangladesh, as practicable.
- 5.2. Commissioners will be able to form a view on the likely impact and cost-effectiveness of the assistance, in the context of the challenges facing Bangladesh.

### ***Evaluation Framework***

- 5.3. The following table sets out the Commissioners' evaluation questions from the Terms of Reference (ToR).
- 5.4. Assessments will be made for each of the questions according to the evaluative criteria, focussing on the evidence available. The assessment of each question will be used to make a judgement on the 'traffic light score' (green, green-amber, amber-red or red) for each of ICAI's main criteria for assessing value for money and effectiveness. Scoring for each of these criteria will then be used to make a judgement that enables us to generate the overall summary assessment traffic light.

Evaluation questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of evidence
<p>1. Is this assistance demand-driven? If so, whose demand? (ToR 6.4.1)</p> <p>2. What is the level of local ownership? (ToR 6.2.9)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of expressed demand from partners (e.g. Government of Bangladesh) prior to design?</li> <li>• Evidence that partners are fully part of the design process (both scope and delivery)?</li> <li>• Evidence that partners are fully part of the decision-making process prior to approval by DFID?</li> <li>• Evidence that intended beneficiaries and partners see the assistance as needed now?</li> <li>• Evidence that intended beneficiaries and partners effectively participate in current decisions about the operation and allocation of the funding at all levels?</li> <li>• Evidence that intended beneficiary and partner interests are fully incorporated into the operation of all activities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings with intended beneficiaries</li> <li>• Meetings with Government of Bangladesh</li> <li>• Meetings with country team</li> <li>• Review of DFID plans and files</li> </ul>
<p>3. Does this assistance support local policies and plans?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that this assistance supports the local policies?</li> <li>• Evidence that funding is aligned with local budgets?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings with intended beneficiaries</li> <li>• Meetings with Government of Bangladesh</li> <li>• Meetings with country team</li> <li>• Review of DFID plans and files</li> </ul>
<p>4. Has DFID selected the best available approach?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear rationale?</li> <li>• Based on evidence?</li> <li>• Clear use of options?</li> <li>• Expertise consulted and knowledge incorporated?</li> <li>• Assessment of risk demonstrated and effective?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings with intended beneficiaries</li> <li>• Meetings with Government of Bangladesh</li> <li>• Meetings with country team</li> <li>• Review of DFID plans and files</li> </ul>
<p>5. What evaluations have been done in the past six years and what have their key recommendations been? (ToR 6.4.3)</p> <p>6. How have their recommendations influenced design and implementation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation recommendations clear?</li> <li>• Evidence that design incorporates previous recommendations?</li> <li>• If not, is there a clear rationale for not doing?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literature review and review of evaluation material</li> <li>• Review of DFID plans and files</li> <li>• Meetings with country team</li> <li>• Meetings with previous evaluators</li> </ul>
<p>7. How is DFID applying international lessons in its delivery? (ToR 6.4.6)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that global best practice lessons are incorporated into the design?</li> <li>• Evidence that international lessons are being applied into the delivery?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literature review</li> <li>• Review of DFID plans and files</li> <li>• Meetings with country team</li> <li>• Meetings with experts</li> </ul>



<p>8. Is DFID's programme complementary with that of other organisations (locally, nationally, internationally)? (ToR 6.2.2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of co-ordination and harmonisation with other deliverers and funders through design and implementation?</li> <li>• Evidence that this co-ordination is effective?</li> <li>• Evidence that options were considered?</li> <li>• Evidence of clear rationale for choice of approach given that of other funders?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of national and other donor plans</li> <li>• Meetings with other donors and national stakeholders</li> <li>• Meetings with country team</li> <li>• Meetings with Government of Bangladesh</li> </ul>
<p>9. How is the impact being measured? (ToR 6.3.1) 10. How effective are the arrangements for measuring impact? 11. Is the programme delivering against its objectives? Have amendments been made if required? (ToR 6.2.7)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of logical results chain with clear impact criteria?</li> <li>• Evidence of robust monitoring and evaluation system?</li> <li>• Evidence of verifiable results being collected?</li> <li>• Evidence of monitoring information being used to inform decision-making?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID monitoring reports</li> <li>• Reports from implementing partners</li> <li>• Meetings with country team</li> <li>• Previous impact reports and assessments</li> </ul>
<p>12. Are there identifiable impacts on recipient communities? (ToR 6.3.3) 13. How have funds invested through this programme reduced costs and impacts that would otherwise have been incurred (such as those from providing a humanitarian response) and increased benefits (such as improving productivity and economic growth)? (ToR 6.3.4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of benefits to communities and individuals clear from monitoring?</li> <li>• Evidence that communities and individuals identify the benefits?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings with intended beneficiaries</li> <li>• Meetings with country team</li> <li>• Meetings with other donors</li> <li>• Meetings with national stakeholders</li> </ul>
<p>14. Is there transparency and accountability to intended recipients? (ToR 6.3.6) 15. Are intended beneficiaries involved in the development, roll out and evaluation of the programme? If so, how? If not, why not? (ToR 6.2.1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that funding and expected outcomes are transparent at all levels of activities to all partners and intended beneficiaries?</li> <li>• Evidence of mechanisms of redress and remedy if failures identified?</li> <li>• Evidence that intended beneficiaries are involved?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings with intended beneficiaries</li> <li>• Meetings with country team</li> <li>• Meetings with other donors</li> <li>• Meetings with national stakeholders</li> </ul>

<p>16. Has there been sustainable policy change on the part of the Bangladeshi government? (ToR 6.3.2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of direct impact from funding on Government of Bangladesh policies for climate change, disaster risk reduction, planning, finance?</li> <li>• Evidence of legislative change?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings with country team</li> <li>• Memoranda of Understanding, policy documents</li> <li>• Meetings with Government of Bangladesh</li> <li>• Meetings with civil society</li> </ul>
<p>17. How will the long-term and sustainable impact of the programme be assured (in the context of global targets on development and aid effectiveness)? (ToR 6.3.5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of planning and budgeting for long-term management of investments funded by this programme?</li> <li>• Evidence of increasing transfer of oversight to Bangladesh planned and underway?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings with national stakeholders</li> <li>• Meetings with Government of Bangladesh</li> <li>• Meetings with civil society</li> </ul>
<p>18. What is the cost of delivery at each stage of the delivery process? (ToR 6.2.8)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed cost analysis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of partner and DFID information</li> <li>• Reports from implementing partners</li> <li>• DFID reporting</li> <li>• Review of files</li> </ul>
<p>19. Are resources being leveraged to maximise impact and provide value for money? (ToR 6.2.3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that UK money funds activities that otherwise would not have taken place?</li> <li>• Evidence that UK investment has leveraged other sources of funding to be provided from elsewhere (domestic or international)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of partner and DFID information</li> <li>• Reports from implementing partners</li> <li>• DFID reporting</li> <li>• Review of files</li> </ul>
<p>20. How is sound financial management maintained? (ToR 6.2.4) 21. Is there good governance at all levels and what are the steps being taken to avoid corruption? (ToR 6.2.6)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of appropriate governance arrangements at all levels that effectively provide oversight?</li> <li>• Evidence of robust and appropriate budgeting?</li> <li>• Evidence of robust financial control systems being in place?</li> <li>• Evidence of effective management of corruption?</li> <li>• Evidence of effective third-party audits?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fiduciary Risk Assessments</li> <li>• Statements of Progress</li> <li>• DFID reporting</li> <li>• Review of partner and DFID control systems</li> <li>• Meetings with programme managers in partner organisations</li> </ul>

<p>22. Has the intervention been managed in the most cost-effective way? (ToR 6.2.5)</p> <p>23. Are there actions that will improve the effectiveness and value for money of the programme? (ToR 6.4.7)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the planning process sought to minimise costs through detailed option appraisal?</li> <li>• Evidence of options being appraised in order to minimise costs during implementation?</li> <li>• Evidence of costs being monitored and driven down as part of management and oversight?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings with country team</li> <li>• Review of programme documents (particularly planning documents)</li> </ul>
<p>24. What is unique about this context that affects value for money? (ToR 6.4.2)</p> <p>25. How well has the unique context been taken into account when addressing value for money (e.g. what special or unusual measures compared to other programmes in the region)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of detailed and accurate assessment of contextual issues used to inform design choices?</li> <li>• Evidence of clear rationale for how context informs operation?</li> <li>• Evidence that it takes place?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings with country team</li> <li>• Literature review</li> <li>• Analysis of evaluations</li> <li>• Annual performance reviews</li> <li>• Meetings with other donors</li> </ul>
<p>26. How are risks managed and mitigated? (ToR 6.2.10)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of risk register being maintained from design into implementation?</li> <li>• Evidence of actions taken to minimise risks through implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID and partner documentation</li> <li>• Meetings with country team</li> <li>• Meetings with other donors</li> </ul>
<p>27. What are the lessons learned to date from this programme? (ToR 6.4.4)</p> <p>28. How is DFID sharing lessons from/into this programme across its activities globally? (ToR 6.4.5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of lessons being collected?</li> <li>• Evidence of dissemination?</li> <li>• Evidence of impact elsewhere?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings with senior management</li> <li>• Meetings with climate specialists in DFID</li> </ul>

5.5. The evaluation will principally be conducted over a two and a half week period in Bangladesh during September 2011, supported by preparatory review work.

5.6. It will consist of the following stages.

### ***Phase One. Preliminary Assessment***

- i) A preliminary review of literature, including:
    - previous evaluation reports (as above);
    - DFID programme documentation;
    - documentation from partners (World Bank and UNDP in particular);
    - third-party assessments of climate change activities in Bangladesh;
    - material such as the summary report of the *Fifth International Conference on Community-Based Adaptation to Climate Change* held in Bangladesh in March 2011;<sup>14</sup> and
    - a review of Bangladesh governance material to inform context.
  - ii) Meetings, either in person or by phone, with international and UK-based experts.
- 5.7. This phase will be used to refine the evaluation framework if necessary.

### ***Phase Two. Field Work***

- i) Series of semi-structured and informal meetings with:
  - intended beneficiaries;
  - partners in Government (Ministry of Finance, Planning, Ministry of Environment and Forest (MoEF));
  - civil society representatives;
  - donor partners (World Bank, UNDP, bilaterals);
  - DFID staff currently in-country;
  - previous DFID staff; and
  - others as required.

The full list of interviewees will be drawn up in discussion with DFID in Bangladesh and other key informants.

- ii) Further review of documentation in-country as required, specifically looking through DFID's operational files.
- iii) Evidence-gathering from local sources as practicable, specifically from the Government of Bangladesh and the World Bank on adaptation costing and the economics of climate change impacts, from key Bangladesh organisations dealing with disaster risk reduction such as CARE Bangladesh, UNICEF and BRAC.

---

<sup>14</sup> *Summary of the Fifth International Conference, on Community-Based Adaptation to Climate Change*, International Institute for Sustainable Development, April 2011, [www.iisd.ca/download/pdf/sd/yimbvol135num4e.pdf](http://www.iisd.ca/download/pdf/sd/yimbvol135num4e.pdf).

### **Phase Three. Final Analysis**

- 5.8. Presentation of analysis to Commissioners, then drafting of final report based on Commissioners' views and guidance.

### **Innovation**

- 5.9. This study could become the baseline for a longitudinal study over the next four years that looks at how DFID works with partners to build resilience to climate change. In this respect, the study could seek to evaluate how well DFID integrates and responds to the demands from partners and the needs of intended beneficiaries in its programming in Bangladesh and clearly identifies impact and value for money.

## **6. Roles and Responsibilities**

- 6.1. It is proposed that this evaluation is undertaken by a core team of five, with supplementary peer review. While lead responsibility for answering sections of the framework is shown, all will contribute to the analysis supporting the findings for each section.

### **Core team**

#### **Team leader**

He is a Director of Agulhas Applied Knowledge. He specialises in aid effectiveness, governance and institutional development, particularly in relation to climate change. He is a member of the core management team for ICAI's implementation. He has particular knowledge of DFID in Bangladesh having worked in the country office in the late 1990s. He is the author of several case studies and synthesis reports on aid effectiveness and climate change in Africa and Asia.<sup>15</sup>

He will have technical oversight of the Design, Impact and Value for Money Leads and will be the main contact at key meetings with ICAI and DFID.

#### **Design and impact lead**

He is a KPMG associate. He is a climate change specialist, with experience of assessing resilience and designing adaptation action plans throughout the world. He has recently supported the development of National Action Plans on Climate Change in India, funded by the Asian Development Bank. He has particular expertise in how to implement climate change adaptation activities in the agricultural sector, as well as for manufacturing, infrastructure and business.

---

<sup>15</sup> *Making the Most of Climate Change Financing in Asia and the Pacific*, CDDE, 2001, [http://www.aideffectiveness.org/images/stories/Making\\_the\\_Most\\_of\\_Climate\\_Change\\_Financing\\_in\\_Asia\\_and\\_the\\_Pacific\\_-\\_CDDE\\_Report\\_2010.pdf](http://www.aideffectiveness.org/images/stories/Making_the_Most_of_Climate_Change_Financing_in_Asia_and_the_Pacific_-_CDDE_Report_2010.pdf) & <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/23/56/48458021.pdf>

He will lead the design and impact work and assess the technical aspects of the climate change programme.

### **Value for money lead**

He is part of KPMG's International Development Services team. In addition to being a Chartered Accountant, he has a background in Human Rights Law and worked for eight years in KPMG's Climate Change and Sustainability team. He has extensively reviewed financial and impact performance of grants (not least for DFID), in particular working with philanthropic foundations.

### **Impact lead**

She is member of the Agulhas team. She was the co-author of research for the United Nations International Children's Fund (UNICEF) in 2010 on *Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia Pacific Region*<sup>16</sup> and in 2011 has undertaken research case studies on climate change financing in Kenya, Tanzania and Cameroon.<sup>17</sup> She has a background in governance and security and has worked with both the United Kingdom's Foreign Office and DFID, contributing to government policy and developing effective communication channels with the UK public.

She will lead the impact evaluation work and will be particularly involved with interviewing intended beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

### **Team assistant**

He works as an audit assistant in KPMG Bangladesh and has worked on a number of donor projects, including those funded by CDC, British Red Cross and Save the Children.

### **Peer Review Team**

Subject-matter experts will be used to undertake a peer review of analysis and findings.

---

<sup>16</sup> *Children and Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia and the Pacific: a way forward*, 2010, [http://www.unicef.org/eapro/AsiaPacific\\_DRR\\_final.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/eapro/AsiaPacific_DRR_final.pdf)

<sup>17</sup> *African Dialogue on Climate Change Finance and Development Effectiveness*, 2011, [http://www.oecd.org/document/34/0,3746,en\\_2649\\_34421\\_48456610\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/34/0,3746,en_2649_34421_48456610_1_1_1_1,00.html)

## 7. Management and Reporting

- 7.1. We will produce a first draft report for review by the ICAI Secretariat and Commissioners by 7 October 2011, with time for subsequent revision and review prior to completion and sign-off on 8 November 2011.

## 8. Expected outputs and timeframe

- 8.1 The following timetable is based on the assumption that the review will need to be signed off by 8 November 2011, to meet ICAI's requirements.

Phase	Timetable
<b>Planning</b> Finalising methodology Drafting and revising Inception Report	By 19 <sup>th</sup> August 2011
<b>Phase One: Preliminary assessment</b>	By 30 <sup>th</sup> August 2011
<b>Phase Two: Field Work</b>	5 – 20 <sup>th</sup> September 2011
<b>Phase Three: Analysis and write-up</b> Including consultations with Commissioners	Final product By 8 <sup>th</sup> November 2011

## 9. Risks and Mitigation

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

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Level of risk</b>	<b>Specific Issues</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Inability to access key information	Medium	<p>Unable to access partner files (World Bank, UNDP)</p> <p>Unable to have full access to partner systems</p> <p>Unable to have access to full financial information for costing</p>	<p>Ensure clear authorisation given at start-up</p> <p>DFID to assist with UNDP and World Bank contacts, if necessary through headquarters</p>
No impact data available	Low	<p>Programme too early in lifecycle to identify outputs or outcomes</p> <p>Impact data weak or incomplete</p>	<p>Use previous performance data as proxy</p> <p>Use third-party data sources in Bangladesh</p> <p>Ensure full spectrum of impact data is obtained (economic)</p>
Beneficiary voices not heard	Medium	<p>Inability to identify intended beneficiaries</p> <p>DFID/Government of Bangladesh/NGO "capture" of intended beneficiaries so real voice not heard</p>	<p>Time in field</p> <p>Seek to gain at least three different routes through partners to access contacts with intended beneficiaries</p> <p>Triangulation with Civil Society Organisation (CSO) voices in country</p>
Safety and Security	Medium/High	<p>Risk of terrorism</p> <p>Risk to the person</p>	<p>Operate within FCO guidance</p> <p>Use of experienced local guides and drivers</p>



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

- 10.1 Bangladesh is one of the UK's key overseas partners, historically the beneficiary of a significant proportion of UK bilateral aid (Bangladesh usually ranks in the top three or four for quantum of assistance) and one at most immediate risk from the impacts of climate change.
- 10.2 The 2006 *Stern Review* suggested the annual cost of climate change would be 1% of global GDP by the middle of the century (a figure Lord Stern now sees as conservative).<sup>18</sup> Figures presented to the G20 leaders in 2009 suggested the bill for the developing world alone would be US\$100 billion per year. The UK Government has committed to integrate a robust response to climate change within its activities. While there is a recommendation that no more than 10% of UK aid funds be used for activities that support the developing world to adapt to the impact of climate change, this limit was suggested in order to leverage new *additional* funding specifically for the task (as requested by the majority of the countries of the world). The UK's contribution to the global response will continue to be significant.
- 10.3 DFID is rapidly expanding the funding that it channels to enable increased resilience (through, for instance, disaster risk reduction), activities that enable effective adaptation to the impacts of climate change and enabling green growth. This review aims to assist DFID and the UK Government in ensuring value for money from these investments, not just in Bangladesh but across its portfolio.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Stern Review: The Economics of Climate Change*, 2006, [www.hm-treasury/stern\\_review\\_report.htm](http://www.hm-treasury/stern_review_report.htm).