

Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)
Evaluation of DFID's Support for Health and Education in India
Inception Report

Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Background	2
3. Purpose	3
4. Relationships to other evaluations/studies.....	3
5. Methodology	6
6. Roles and Responsibilities	16
7. Management and Reporting.....	16
8. Expected outputs and timeframe.....	17
9. Risk and mitigation.....	17
10. How will this ICAI review make a difference?.....	18

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 the impact and value for money of UK-funded health and education programmes in India.

2. Background

2.1 India's 1.16 billion people and the 28 States and 7 Union territories they live in are diverse. Whilst overall income per person remains low at US\$1,180 per year (one fortieth of that for the UK), the country is in the process of rapid economic and social development. India has seen economic growth rates over 8% for much of the last decade and the percentage of the population living in extreme poverty fell from 60% in 1981 to 42% in 2005. Yet, as overall wealth has increased, huge inequalities remain; 456 million people (equivalent to the combined populations of Russia, Germany, Turkey, France, the UK and Poland) still lived on less than US\$1.25 a day in 2005.¹ There are also considerable regional inequalities; most of the extreme poor are concentrated in the northern states. At current rates, India will only achieve its Millennium Development Goal (MDG) poverty targets by 2043. One fifth of all child deaths in the world are of Indian children. Girls are particularly at risk. As Save the Children has noted, 'if India fails to achieve the MDGs so does the world'.²

2.2 India has always been a key partner for the UK aid programme. It receives the largest annual amount in bilateral assistance: £295 million in 2009-10. In 2011-12, health and education together will represent 65% of annual expenditure, with the remaining 35% largely taken up with spending on growth, governance, rural livelihoods and urban management. The current Operational Plan for 2011-15³ shows that health and education will make up a declining share of the Department for International Development (DFID) budget for India. DFID reports that it is 'moving away from large financial transfers to the centrally-sponsored schemes of the national government, to a tighter focus on India's poorest states'. By 2014-15, the share of the total DFID India programme accounted for by health, nutrition and education will be 32% (12% on health, 7% on nutrition and 13% on education).

2.3 In the past, DFID India has operated under an overall Country Strategy and then, for each of its partner states, a State Strategy. DFID has generally supported national programmes run by the Government of India to improve health and education, which then are applied at State level. It is these national programmes that have accounted for the majority of DFID India expenditure. In the future, DFID will target its support at the level of the priority states.

2.4 Assistance to India is, however, controversial. There is some scepticism in the UK about the appropriateness of providing aid to a country that has seen such strong recent economic growth. The wider policy issue of whether to provide assistance to one of the most rapidly growing middle-income countries in the world is not a matter for ICAI. We wish to assess whether the assistance provided is having the desired impact and providing the optimum

¹ *The developing world is poorer than we thought, but no less successful in the fight against poverty*, World Bank Development Research Group, Policy Research Working Paper 4703, August 2008, http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/IW3P/IB/2010/01/21/000158349_20100121133109/Rendere d/PDF/WPS4703.pdf.

² *Written evidence submitted by Save the Children to the International Development Committee report 'The Future of DFID's Programme in India'*, March 2011,

www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmselect/cmintdev/writev/616/m15.htm.

³ *DFID India Operational Plan 2011-15*, DFID, October 2010, www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/op/india-2011.pdf.

value for money: is DFID providing the best forms of aid given the rapidly changing context and is there an appropriate balance in the programme between financial support, technical assistance and knowledge transfer?

2.5 This study will consider DFID's health and education programmes in the context of DFID's commitment 'to move from an aid-based relationship [with India] to one based on shared contributions to global development goals, such as climate change'.⁴

2.6 The four programmes to be reviewed are summarised below.

Programme	Purpose	Amount	Duration	Partner/recipient
Sector-Wide Approach to Strengthening Health (SWASTH) in Bihar	Increased use of quality, essential health, nutrition, water and sanitation services, especially by poor people and excluded groups	£120 million financial aid £25 million technical assistance	April 2010 – March 2016	Health department Public Health Engineering Department and Social Welfare Department, Bihar Government
Reproductive and Child Health Programme (RCH) II	Expand the use of essential reproductive and child health services of adequate quality and reduce geographical disparities in access to health	£242.5 million financial aid £9.5 million technical assistance	December 2006 - March 2012	Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India
<i>Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan</i> (Basic Education for All)	To increase significantly the number of 6-14 year old children, especially from special focus groups, enrolled, regularly attending and completing elementary education and demonstrating basic learning levels	£140 million financial aid £9 million technical assistance	March 2011 – March 2013 (in a third phase of support)	Ministry of Human Resources Development, Government of India
<i>Gyan Shala</i> , low fee private schools	Provide affordable, quality primary education to children of the poorest urban communities in Patna and Bihar Shariff	£881,627	October 2011 - March 2013	Education Support Organization (NGO implementer)

3. Purpose

3.1 To assess whether DFID is achieving impact and value for money in India through an evaluation of its health and education programmes in the state of Bihar.

4. Relationships to other evaluations/studies

4.1 The review will take place in the context of the International Development Committee's (IDC's) June 2011 report *The Future of DFID's Programme in India*.⁵ IDC concluded that the

⁴ *The Future of DFID's Programme in India: Government Response to the Committee's Eighth Report of Session 2010–12*, International Development Committee, September 2011, www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmintdev/1486/1486.pdf.

UK should continue to support India until 2015 but noted the need for DFID assistance to add value:

'Given current high levels of poverty in India we agree with the Government's decision to maintain an aid programme in India until 2015 provided it can make a difference. Not every DFID project currently does this and DFID must be more rigorous in its choices over the next four years, funding only projects which have a clear development benefit and which national or state governments would not otherwise fund. DFID rightly focuses on catalytic, demonstration projects that can be replicated and scaled up. This approach should continue.'

4.2 Witnesses to IDC commented that DFID could improve how it targeted activities, indeed some implied that the amount of assistance meant that a focus on value was reduced: 'Dr Eyben, from the Institute of Development Studies, thought that if DFID had a smaller budget it might be less concerned with spending the money and more with ensuring that the funding and the relationships it built would support far reaching change.'

4.3 IDC made a series of specific recommendations about aspects of the programme, among them calling for strengthened approaches to private sector and civil society engagement. Its overall conclusion, however, was positive. The Committee recognised that the relationship between the two countries was changing through, as the Secretary of State for International Development made clear in evidence, a new phase of mutual engagement. It concluded:

'...we support the UK's continued development assistance to India for the period up to 2015. However after this the development relationship must change fundamentally to one based on mutual learning and technical assistance where requested.'

4.4 IDC made a particular recommendation for ICAI:

'We recommend that the newly created Independent Consortium [sic] on Aid Impact (ICAI) undertake a study of the opportunity cost of DFID continuing to provide £280 million per year to India, or to other countries with a lower GDP per person or slower progress towards the Millennium Development Goals, as a means of demonstrating to us and the British public whether investing in India represents value for money.'

4.5 The assessment of the opportunity cost of providing such assistance includes wider policy considerations and lies outside our remit. By considering in more detail, however, the issues of impact and value for money, using examples from significant areas of DFID's programme, we can provide important information that others may use if they wish to make such an assessment.

4.6 DFID's country programme was evaluated in 2006, covering the period 2000-05.⁶ A key element of our evaluation will be to see what the response to the recommendations of that earlier evaluation has been. In particular, the 2006 evaluation recommended more rigorous use of impact evaluation, ensuring stronger monitoring of progress and improving lesson learning. These elements will be a focus for our evaluation, as well as recommendations that are relevant to the programme in Bihar.

4.7 The programme in West Bengal was evaluated in 2007 using DFID's methodology for a country programme evaluation.⁷ The evaluation particularly considered health and education activities:

'The Health Sector Development Initiative (HSDI) – sector budget support to the health sector ... was the first such sector programme in India, and a highly relevant response. It had a long design period – slowed by political, technical and bureaucratic factors

⁵ *The Future of DFID's Programme in India Volume 1*, International Development Committee, June 2011, HC 616, www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmintdev/616/616.pdf.

⁶ *An Evaluation of DFID's India Programme 2000-2005*, DFID, EV670, August 2006, www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/evaluation/ev670.pdf.

⁷ *Evaluation of DFID country programmes: West Bengal State Programme, Final Report*, DFID, EV681, October 2007, www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/evaluation/ev681.pdf.

from DFID and the Government of West Bengal (GoWB). Progress has been made towards the majority of milestones – these are process-oriented in the first two years, with the aim of leading to successful outcomes for service delivery and health status and positive impacts on poverty towards the end of the programme....

In the education sector, a number of District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) 1 and 2 outcomes were successfully achieved: enrolment increased to 95%, virtual equity with respect to gender reached, a significant increase in the numbers of Scheduled Caste (SC) and Scheduled Tribe (ST) children studying in school, and strong community demand for education engendered. However, progress was affected by institutional and policy constraints that resulted in slow implementation and led to DPEP being placed under 'special watch' status by the Government of India (GoI). Lessons learnt from DPEP 1 led to improved performance in DPEP 2....'

4.8 Among its conclusions, it found that:

'In the education sector, and more widely, state and national programmes would benefit from more interaction. The state programme in running lean and 'hands-off' programmes, and the national programmes in using state level knowledge, relationships and experience to gain traction in slow moving state-level issues. It is recommended that ways of working that better facilitate synergy between state and national teams are sought.

Performance assessment needs to be improved across the programme. One option is to follow the new CAP Guidance, and develop a new style CAP Performance Framework and Delivery Plan for the state. Producing this document would be a useful reflective exercise for the final year of the current SAP.'

4.9 These findings will provide useful background for us to consider performance in Bihar.

4.10 India scored 3.1 in Transparency International's *Corruption Perceptions Index 2011*, where the index ranges from 0 ('highly corrupt') to 10 ('very clean').⁸ An active media in both the UK and India pursues allegations of corruption. In June 2010, an article in the News of the World suggested that there had been substantial corruption in a key part of the UK programme. Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan II (SSA II) is the second phase of a countrywide Government of India primary education programme. 90% of the programme funding comes from the Government of India. DFID, the World Bank and the European Commission provide the balance. UK expenditure was £210 million in the first phase of SSA (2003-07) and it has disbursed £137 million so far in the second phase (2008-10), 2% of SSA's total funding. It was, however, the Government of India's own audit processes that had identified the irregularities that had been reported in the British press. A subsequent audit inquiry by DFID noted that there was adequate scrutiny by Indian oversight bodies such as the Comptroller and Auditor General and that effective assurance measures were in place (in the Government of India and DFID). A public statement from DFID noted that:

'In conclusion, it is impossible to ensure that every rupee will be spent properly and effectively within a project as large and complex as SSA. However, the risk to UK funds has been adequately managed by DFID making payment only on the basis of valid externally audited expenditure. DFID also gains direct assurance on the programme's financial and operational performance through its participation in the Joint Review Missions and through exercises such as independent procurement reviews and external evaluations. Where audits and reviews have detected weaknesses in SSA's financial management, there is evidence that the Government of India has taken or is taking action to address these, and action to strengthen tracking of SSA's overall exposure to fraud and corruption will provide greater comfort that all irregularities and allegations of fraud and other abuse are being dealt with effectively.'⁹

⁸ *Corruption Perceptions Index 2011*, Transparency International, 2011, www.transparency.org/content/download/64426/1030807.

⁹ *Inquiry regarding UK funding for SSA II*, DFID Internal Audit Department, August 2010, www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications/1/India-SSA-Inquiry-Final-report.pdf.

4.11 Our evaluation will aim to establish whether this approach is in place and working effectively. It will take account of our previous study on DFID's approach to anti-corruption and, given the nature of the subject matter in this evaluation, the team will pay particular attention to professional scepticism in making its assessment.¹⁰

5. Methodology

5.1 The overall evaluation will seek to identify impact and value for money, using the key questions set out below.

5.2 Comparative assessments will be undertaken of the results and approaches of the two education and two health programmes set out at paragraph 2.6. For each of the key questions in the evaluation framework, comparisons will be made between the programmes, highlighting key differences in inputs, outputs and outcomes.

5.3 This approach will result in findings that are specifically applicable to Bihar, which may have wider applicability. It should be noted that, since DFID is only one funder out of many and provides a small proportion of overall expenditure on health and education in Bihar, there will also be issues of attribution that may be hard to assess. The concerns over corruption set out above will be specifically addressed.

5.4 The evaluation will comprise the following elements:

- a) a review of DFID and third-party literature;
- b) a review of DFID financial information;
- c) meetings with DFID office staff in Delhi;
- d) meetings with officials from the national and Bihar state governments in India, held in Delhi and Patna;
- e) meetings with co-funding donors in India, held in Delhi;
- f) reviews of the financial management systems of DFID's implementing partners;
- g) reviews of DFID and partner monitoring systems and data capture methods;
- h) field visits to sites where programmes are delivered in Bihar;
- i) meetings with intended beneficiaries;
- j) meetings with civil society representatives in Bihar; and
- k) collection of expert third-party views of impact from technical experts such as academics and non-governmental organisations.

5.5 The work will take place in five phases:

1. preparation, document compilation and literature review;
2. introductory meetings in Delhi for all the team;
3. field work in Delhi and Bihar;
4. analysis; and
5. presentation of findings and report drafting.

Evaluation Framework

5.6 The evaluation framework for this review is set out in the table below. This has as its basis the standard ICAI guiding criteria and evaluation framework, which are focussed on four areas: objectives, delivery, impact and learning. It also incorporates other pertinent questions we want to investigate in this review. We indicate where questions come from the Terms of Reference (ToR) for this review and the questions which are highlighted in bold are those on which we will focus in particular. In this review, we will focus particularly on the impact and governance aspects of the ICAI framework.

5.7 The questions will be answered for each of the health and education programmes. As this is a comparative evaluation, the differences and similarities between the responses will be used to assess the critical factors that have resulted in different outcomes (if indeed there are differences).

¹⁰ *The Department for International Development's Approach to Anti-Corruption*, Independent Commission for Aid Impact, November 2011, <http://icai.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/DFIDs-Approach-to-Anti-Corruption.pdf>.

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Objectives: what is the programme trying to achieve?			
Does the programme have clear, relevant and realistic objectives that focus on the desired impact? (1.1)	Does the programme have clear, relevant and realistic objectives that focus on the desired impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of clear and relevant objectives being set at programme, project and intervention levels • Evidence of objectives being specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time-bound • Evidence of objectives being informed by country context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID and Government of India project planning and implementation documentation • Project reviews
Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work? (1.2)	Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work? (ToR 6.3.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a theory of change from documentation (analysis of problem, options, solution generation, implementation model) • Evidence of design detail for each intervention • Evidence of comprehensive approaches for each intervention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID and Government of India project planning and implementation documentation • Project reviews • DFID interviews • Government of India interviews • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with civil society
Does the programme complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (1.3)	Does the programme complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of design detail for each intervention • Evidence of approaches that include other partners in design for each intervention • Evidence of protocols for engagement • Evidence of dialogue taking place • Evidence of lack of duplication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID and Government of India project planning and implementation documentation • Project reviews • Interviews with DFID • Government of India interviews • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with civil society • Interviews with DFID and Government of India partners • Third-party reporting

<p>Are the programme's objectives appropriate to the political, economic, social and environmental context? (1.4)</p>	<p>Is the assistance based on a strategic, realistic and well evidenced assessment of local needs? If not, why not? (ToR 6.3.2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of contextual analysis being undertaken • Evidence of needs assessments • Evidence of planning and implementation using contextual analysis and needs assessments to inform decisions • Evidence of coherent country strategy for health and education at all levels (DFID and Government of India) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Government and DFID strategic information • DFID and Government of India project planning and implementation documentation • Project reviews • Interviews with DFID • Government of India interviews • Other donor interviews and documentation • Interviews with civil society • Risk assessment
<p>Delivery: is the delivery chain designed and managed so as to be fit for purpose?</p>			
<p>Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? (2.1)</p>	<p>Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of options appraisal • Evidence of capacity assessment of partners • Evidence from implementation (reporting, achievements) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID and Government of India documentation • Interviews with DFID, partners, civil society and intended beneficiaries
<p>Does programme design and roll-out take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries? (2.2)</p>	<p>Do programme design and roll-out involve and take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries? (ToR 6.4.4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of consultation with intended beneficiaries and civil society • Evidence of participation in design, governance, implementation and monitoring • Evidence of satisfaction of civil society in these processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with intended beneficiaries and civil society • Third-party reporting • Programme reports
<p>Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption? (2.3)</p>	<p>Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption? (ToR 6.4.1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of sound financial management • Evidence of anti-corruption activity • Evidence that good practice and recommendations in ICAI's anti-corruption report are being acted upon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with DFID and partners • Country reporting • Technical review of systems

<p>Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact? (2.4)</p>	<p>Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact? (ToR 6.4.3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of options available • Evidence from implementation • Evidence from opinion of partners • Evidence of other finance sources • Evidence of active engagement to identify and utilise other funding sources • Evidence of other funding sources being tracked • Evidence of all funds being managed holistically 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID and Government of India project planning and implementation documentation • Project reviews • Interviews with DFID • Government of India interviews • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with civil society • DFID and Government of India financial documentation • Interviews with Government partners
	<p>Does DFID (India) have a credible approach to combating systemic corruption through its planning and programming choices?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate control environment • Effective risk assessment • Appropriate choice of aid modality • Appropriate mitigation measures within programme design • Effective monitoring of corruption risk • Effective response to changes in risk level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walk-through and examination of corporate systems and procedures • Country programme records • Interviews with country office staff • Interviews with implementing agencies • Interviews with intended beneficiaries
	<p>Does DFID India make appropriate choices as to aid modalities and safeguards within its programmes, so as to minimise corruption risk and maximise development impact?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of anti-fraud policies and procedures • Adequacy of investigation of and response to corruption incidents • DFID India support for international action against money laundering 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walk-through and examination of corporate policies and procedures • Interviews with Internal Audit and Counter-Fraud Unit • Review of a sample of anti-fraud investigations

	Does DFID India respond effectively when it uncovers incidents of corruption? How does this response affect the overall country programme?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of anti-fraud policies and procedures • Adequacy of investigation of and response to corruption incidents • DFID India support for international action against money laundering 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walk-through and examination of corporate policies and procedures • Interviews with Internal Audit and Counter-Fraud Unit • Review of a sample of anti-fraud investigations
Do managers ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery chain? (2.5)	How do managers ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery chain? (ToR 6.4.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of cost review and management • Evidence of options analysis in procurement • Evidence of appropriate changes to budgets, design and delivery to improve cost-effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial reporting • Management minutes • Evaluation reviews • Project documentation • Third-party assessments • Interviews with DFID
Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain? (2.6)	Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of cost appraisals • Evidence of financial reporting • Evidence of assessments being provided by all partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial reporting • Project documentation
Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively? (2.7)	Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of risk appraisal at strategic level prior to design • Evidence of each element of delivery having a risk appraisal • Evidence of risk registers throughout the delivery chain • Evidence of appropriate management of identified risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk appraisals • Risk registers • Interviews with DFID and implementing agencies
Is the programme delivering against its agreed objectives? (2.8)	Is the programme delivering against its agreed objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of delivery • Evidence of a link between DFID funding and its key targets related to health and education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project reports • Third-party reporting • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with other parties, including intended beneficiaries

<p>Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances? (2.9)</p>	<p>Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances?</p> <p>How is current expenditure affected by DFID's commitment to move from an aid-based relationship with India to a partnership approach? (ToR 6.4.5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of analysis • Evidence of decision-making based on analysis • Appropriate changes in delivery taken place <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of changes in scale of assistance • Evidence of changes in channels • Evidence of changes in implementation • Evidence of change in priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • Management minutes • Evaluation reviews • Third-party assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • Partner assessments • Third-party assessments • Project reviews • DFID interviews • Government of India interviews • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with civil society
<p>Impact: what is the impact on intended beneficiaries?</p>			
<p>Is the programme delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries? (3.1)</p>	<p>Is the programme delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries? (ToR 6.5.1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of delivery to intended beneficiaries • Evidence of short-term benefits • Evidence of longitudinal benefits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID and Government of India reporting • Evaluation and monitoring reports • Observation • Interviews with civil society • Third-party reporting • Programme reports • Interviews with intended beneficiaries
<p>Is the programme working holistically alongside other programmes? (3.2)</p>	<p>Is the aid working holistically alongside other programmes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of joint design • Evidence of joint management with other bilateral donors and multilateral organisations in the delivery of programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • Partner assessments • Third-party assessments • Project reviews • DFID interviews • Government of India interviews • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with civil society

Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the programme? (3.3)	Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the programme?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of systemic change • Evidence of improvement in both quality and coverage of programmes • Evidence of social impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • Evaluations • Partner assessments • Third-party assessments • Project reviews • Interviews with DFID • Government of India interviews • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with civil society
	How are the programme impacts being measured? What is the basis of the attribution of UK funds? (ToR 6.5.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of measurement • Evidence of tracking of attribution • Evidence of identification of potential impacts throughout the programme cycle (design, monitoring, evaluation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • Monitoring and evaluation reports • DFID systems • Partner assessments • Third-party assessments • Project reviews • DFID interviews • Government of India interviews
Is there an appropriate exit strategy involving effective transfer of ownership of the programme? (3.4)	What mechanisms are in place to assure sustainable local ownership and sustainability after 2015? (ToR 6.6.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of targets to build sustainable capacity • Evidence of achievement of sustainable capacity being in place • Evidence of increasing leadership and capacity from partner government • Evidence of exit strategy for external support in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • Partner assessments • Third-party assessments • Project reviews • DFID interviews • Government of India interviews • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with civil society

Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers? (3.5)	Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers? (ToR 6.5.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of details of assistance being publicly available in formats that are accessible to stakeholders in the UK, internationally and in-country • Evidence of involvement of local community and civil society organisations in providing feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publicly available reports (online, media, other) • Interviews with civil society and intended beneficiaries • Interviews with donors • Public information • Evaluation and reporting
	Is DFID providing additional value that could not otherwise be achieved? Is DFID acting as a magnet and catalyst for other money? (ToR 6.5.5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of additional finance from other donors • Evidence of Government of India contributions • Evidence of DFID adding particular technical value 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with partners • DFID interviews • Government of India interviews • Project interviews • Interviews with donors • Programme documentation
Learning: what works and what needs improvement?			
Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact? (4.1)	Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of monitoring systems throughout the delivery chain • Evidence of schedules for monitoring and reporting • Evidence of reports being compiled and used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID and Government of India project planning and implementation documentation • Government of India evaluation process • Project reviews • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with Government of India officials • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with civil society

Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice? (4.2)	Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of lesson-learning incorporated in design and implementation of the programme and constituent projects • Evidence of innovation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID and Government of India project planning and implementation documentation • Project reviews • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with Government of India officials • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with civil society
Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken? (4.3)	Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison with best practice • Comparison with recommendations from evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID and Government of India project planning and implementation documentation • Project evaluations and monitoring reports • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with Government of India officials • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with civil society
Have lessons about the objectives, design and delivery of the programme been learned and shared effectively? (4.4)	Have lessons about the objectives, design and delivery of the programme been learned and shared effectively?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of lesson-learning from previous and comparable exercises incorporated in design and implementation of the programme and constituent projects • Evidence of recommendations from annual monitoring incorporated into operations • Evidence of lesson-learning being shared effectively with other similar programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID and Government of India evaluations • DFID operational plans • Interviews with DFID • Interviews with Government of India officials • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with civil society
	To what extent are DFID personnel seeing the impact of the programme first hand? (ToR 6.5.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of DFID staff visiting the field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID documentation • Interviews with intended beneficiaries • Interviews with implementers • Interviews with DFID

	What mechanisms are in place to assure knowledge transfer? (ToR 6.6.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence of knowledge capture• Evidence of dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• DFID and Government of India project planning and implementation documentation• Project evaluations and monitoring reports• Interviews with DFID• Interviews with Government of India officials
--	---	---	--

6. Roles and Responsibilities

6.1 Due to the scope of this review, it has been necessary to balance the team in favour of more senior team members, specifically to address the large scale of the programme, the region of the case study and the need for some team members to have experience in Bihar and the anti-corruption element of the review.

6.2 The team will consist of the following members:

Team Leader

A development evaluation expert, he specialises in aid effectiveness, governance and institutional development. He was originally a health service manager in the UK and has worked on health service reform projects throughout Africa and Asia. He has particular knowledge of the Indian subcontinent, having in the past been a governance adviser for DFID in Bangladesh in the late 1990s. He supported the implementation of over £1 billion of assistance for education in Bangladesh. He will lead the team and will focus on governance and oversight issues.

Team member 1

He is an experienced former Chief Police Officer with both a local and national police background. He has led significant national criminal policy issues for the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and delivered national multi-agency initiatives in organised crime and criminal asset recovery. In achieving this, he worked alongside colleagues from other national law enforcement agencies and with Government. He is one of the few ACPO officers with experience of both national organised crime investigation and local police force operations. He is now a Director at KPMG Forensic developing their services in support of law enforcement agencies. He will lead on issues relating to corruption.

Team member 2

He is a public health specialist based in New Delhi. He is a principal consultant in KPMG's India practice, with specialist knowledge of women's and children's health and nutrition. He advises government, corporates and NGOs. He has experience of planning and implementing community programmes in elementary education as well as health. At the same time, he is experienced in undertaking fiduciary reviews and institutional assessments. He has worked with DFID India in the past. He will lead on service delivery at the sub-state level and has travelled in Bihar previously.

Team member 3

She is an advisor in KPMG's Management Consulting Public Sector group, focussing on organisational financial management. She has over ten years' experience in auditing and advising public sector and government clients. While UK-based, her family is originally from Bihar. Her main role will be to analyse data sources and figures to support the findings of the report. She spent her childhood in Bihar, has extended family members in Patna and has travelled in the region.

Team member 4

He is a postdoctoral researcher from the University of Berkeley. Having studied previously in the UK at Cambridge, he has undertaken a range of studies in India. These have primarily been local level econometrics and have included topics as varied as the impacts of health care provision, microfinance and banking. He is currently based in India. He will lead on impacts.

Team member 5

He is an Associate Director in KPMG India. He is an accountant with forensic experience of working with governments, the private sector and NGOs. He will lead on the financial analysis of the programmes and support the work on corruption. He is a native of Patna, Bihar – his parents and extended family still live there – and is versed in the local dialect.

7. Management and Reporting

7.1 We will produce a first draft report for review by the ICAI Secretariat and Commissioners by 9 March 2012, with time for subsequent revision and review prior to completion and sign off in April 2012.

8. Expected outputs and timeframe

Phase	Timetable
Planning Finalising methodology Drafting Inception Report	November 2011 to w/c 16 January 2012
Phase 1: Field Work UK fieldwork India in-country case study	w/c 16 January to w/c 6 February 2012
Phase 2: Analysis and write-up Roundtable with Commissioners Draft main report Report to DFID	w/c 13 February to w/c 2 April 2012

9. Risk and mitigation

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

Risk	Level of risk	Specific Issues	Mitigation
Inability to access key information	Medium	Unable to access partner information (including Government of India) Unable to see all relevant DFID files	Ensure clear authorisation given at start-up DFID to assist with access to Government of India Team sampling to assess whether DFID India has provided sufficient information from Quest DFID India to provide hard copies where possible, if not easily available in electronic form
No impact data available	Low	Impact data weak or incomplete	Use performance data of the same programmes from outside the period under review to inform findings if applicable Use third-party data sources in India
Intended beneficiary voices not heard	Medium	Inability to identify intended beneficiaries DFID/Government of India influences intended beneficiaries so real voice not heard	Time in field Seek to gain at least three different routes through partners to access contact with intended beneficiaries Triangulation with Civil Society Organisation (CSO) voices in-country
Safety and Security	Medium/High	Risk to the person	Operate within FCO guidance Use of experienced local guides and drivers Operate under guidance of DFID and specialist security advice (ICAI Consortium external security advisers are Control Risks Ltd)

10. How will this ICAI review make a difference?

10.1 In spite of India's middle-income status and growing wealth per capita, the absolute numbers of its population who are poor mean that development challenges in health, education and other areas will remain for some time.

10.2 This review will contribute to improving how DFID assesses impact and delivers assistance in the areas of health and education in India. It will also contribute to improving how other partners and the Government of India operate and achieve outcomes. By looking at different programmes in the same location, this review will seek to identify discriminating factors that affect performance. There is also the potential for lessons from this review to have wider applicability, both to other countries in which DFID provides assistance and in sectors other than health and education.