

Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)
Evaluation of DFID's work through the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
Inception Report

Contents

1	Introduction.....	2
2	Background.....	2
3	Purpose of the evaluation.....	6
4	Relationship to other evaluations and studies	6
5	Methodology	8
6	Roles and responsibilities.....	25
7	Management and reporting	26
8	Expected outputs and timeframe	27
9	Risk assessment.....	27
10	How will this ICAI review make a difference?	28

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 evaluate DFID's work through and relationship with the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). In particular, we propose to evaluate the relationship with UNICEF as a delivery partner through a review of programmes that UNICEF is managing on behalf of DFID. We will concentrate on UNICEF's work on the ground, delivering services on behalf of DFID. As part of the review we will briefly consider the management relationship between DFID and UNICEF headquarters.
- 1.3 This inception report sets out the methodology, a work plan for the evaluation and a detailed evaluation framework. It is, however, intended that the methodology and work plan are flexible enough to allow for new issues and questions that emerge over the course of the evaluation.

2 Background

UNICEF's mandate and organisation

- 2.1 The mandate of UNICEF (given to it by the General Assembly of the United Nations) is 'to advocate for the protection of children's rights, to help meet their basic needs and to expand their opportunities to reach their full potential'.¹ UNICEF's work is guided by the 1990 Convention on the Rights of the Child.² It currently has five focus areas;
 - i. child survival and development;
 - ii. basic education and gender equality;
 - iii. HIV/AIDS and children;
 - iv. child protection; and
 - v. policy advocacy and partnerships.³
- 2.2 UNICEF's global headquarters is in New York. 36 National Committees, mostly located in OECD countries, undertake UNICEF's principal fundraising. These National Committees (such as the UK National Committee) are formally independent non-governmental organisations (NGOs) that support the work of UNICEF through fundraising and advocacy. UNICEF also has a supply division based in Copenhagen⁴ and the Innocenti Research Centre⁵ in Florence. Offices in over 100 developing countries manage the delivery of global and country-based programmes. In 2011, UNICEF spent US\$3.8 billion (an increase of 4.5% over 2010) and worked in more than 150 countries.⁶

UK contributions to UNICEF

- 2.3 This section of the inception report describes DFID's contributions to UNICEF. It shows the scale of DFID contributions compared to other donors, the trend in contributions since 2005 and how the contributions are targeted by recipient country and theme. In summary, the UK was the second-largest contributor to UNICEF in 2011 (£195 million) and the trend is that total

¹ For further details of UNICEF's mission see: http://www.unicef.org/about/who/index_mission.html.

² *Convention of the Rights of the Child, Resolution 44/25 of 20 November 1989*, General Assembly of the United Nations, <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/crc.htm>.

³ See <http://www.unicef.org/whatwedo/index.html>.

⁴ See <http://www.unicef.org/supply/>.

⁵ See <http://www.unicef-irc.org/>.

⁶ *Annual Report 2011*, UNICEF, 2012, http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/UNICEF_Annual_Report_2011_EN_060112.pdf.

contributions have been rising since 2006. Over the period 2008-11, UNICEF expenditure covered 32 countries, mainly on health, humanitarian and education programmes.

- 2.4 UNICEF's total income in 2011 was US\$3.71 billion, of which 61% (US\$2.26 billion) came from governments. Figure 1 shows that, after the United States, the United Kingdom was the largest governmental donor to UNICEF in 2010, with its \$291 million representing 13% of all governmental contributions.

Figure 1: Top 10 Government and intergovernmental donors to UNICEF, 2011

Donor	Contributions (US\$ million)			
	Regular Resources	Other Resources		Total
		Regular	Emergency	
United States	132	115	98	345
United Kingdom	68	152	71	291
Norway	76	133	17	226
European Commission	-	90	127	217
Japan	18	77	98	193
Sweden	75	59	42	176
Netherlands	48	90	5	143
Australia	35	69	34	138
Canada	19	103	10	132
Denmark	29	12	16	57

Source: UNICEF Annual Report 2011, (excluding contributions from UNICEF national committees)

- 2.5 23% of the UK contribution in 2011 was classified as 'Regular Resources' (where there is no restriction on their use and they support programmes implemented by country and regional offices – DFID calls this 'core' funding). The balance was 'Other Resources', which represents contributions that are ear-marked by donors for specific pre-determined purposes such as a particular country, theme or humanitarian emergency (DFID calls this 'non-core' funding). There are two categories of 'Other Resources'. 'Other Resources – Regular' are used for specific, non-emergency programme purposes and strategic priorities; 'Other Resources – Emergency' are funds provided specifically for UNICEF's humanitarian action and post-crisis recovery activities.
- 2.6 The UK contribution in 2011 was 13% more than in 2010 (a contribution of \$258 million⁷). There were increases in each category of contribution shown in Figure 1, with the greatest increase being in Regular Resources (an increase of US\$35 million or 106%). There has been a steady increase in DFID's total contributions to UNICEF since 2006. DFID's International Relations Division provided UNICEF with what DFID terms *core* funding totalling £165 million in the period 2005-11. Considerably more, £713 million, was channelled through DFID's geographical divisions over the same period (shown below as *non-core* funding). After the results of DFID's MAR were published in 2011, DFID chose almost to double its core funding to UNICEF.⁸ See Figure 2 on page 4.⁹

⁷ UNICEF Annual Report 2010, UNICEF, June 2011, http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/UNICEF_Annual_Report_2010_EN_052711.pdf.

⁸ Multilateral Aid Review, DFID, November 2011, http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/mar/multilateral_aid_review.pdf.

⁹ Note that Figure 2 uses data from DFID, rather than UNICEF, and will reflect differences in exchange rates. The UNICEF data are expressed in US dollars.

Figure 2: Summary of DFID funding through UNICEF 2005-2011¹⁰

Calendar Year	DFID core funding (£ million) (UNICEF 'regular resources')	DFID non-core funding (£ million) (UNICEF 'other resources')	Total DFID funding (£ million)
2005	19	82	101
2006	19	70	89
2007	21	71	92
2008	21	86	107
2009	21	114	135
2010	24	135	159
2011	40	155	195
Total	165	713	878

Source: DFID.

Note: DFID core funding is the same as UNICEF 'regular resources'; DFID non-core funding is the same as UNICEF 'other resources'. These figures exclude contributions provided to UNICEF through the UK National Committee, which raises voluntary income to support UNICEF's worldwide activities.

- 2.7 DFID has provisionally allocated £160 million of core funding to UNICEF over a four-year period from 2011-12 to 2014-15 in order for the organisation to continue to deliver results for poor people on the ground and to make progress against the key reform priorities identified through the MAR, including UNICEF's delivery in humanitarian emergencies and results reporting. DFID will pay £40 million in each of the first two years. Then, following a mid-point review in 2013-14, it will decide whether to maintain the same level of funding or to increase or decrease the amount given. The business case states that this core funding will support UNICEF to improve its leadership and delivery in rapid-onset humanitarian emergencies and protracted crises, strengthen its monitoring and reporting of results at the organisational level, maintain its performance in areas that are currently satisfactory (particularly its programme delivery at country level) and demonstrate how it is driving down costs, achieving value for money and increasing transparency.¹¹
- 2.8 UNICEF offices in developing countries also receive funds from DFID directly (defined as non-core funding most commonly channelled through DFID's bilateral country programme). Figure 3 on page 5 summarises the 32 countries where 'geographical' funding was provided to UNICEF over the period 2008-11. 12 recipient countries (nine of which are in Africa) received more than £10 million each and together represented 85% of DFID country expenditure.

¹⁰ Information in this table was provided by DFID.

¹¹ See DFID web site, <http://projects.dfid.gov.uk/project.aspx?Project=202714>.

Figure 3: DFID non-core country spending through UNICEF, 2008-2011

Country	£ (000)	Country	£ (000)
Zimbabwe	84,345	Africa (West and Central)	5,000
Somalia	54,137	Iraq	4,300
India	44,500	Liberia	2,800
Nigeria	36,526	Africa (Sahel)	2,500
Sierra Leone	36,041	Madagascar	2,091
DRC	33,777	Burma	1,900
Bangladesh	27,170	Ethiopia	1,650
Kenya	18,320	Indonesia	1,300
Sudan	16,192	Angola	1,000
Malawi	13,671	Niger	901
Ghana	11,807	Burundi	850
Pakistan	11,252	Tajikistan & Kyrgyzstan	467
Yemen	9,490	Cambodia	270
Africa (Southern)	8,700	Mozambique	203
Eritrea	7,575	Nepal	80
Zambia	7,342	Total	455,615
Uganda	7,059		

Source: from data provided by DFID, which is indicative as not all spending has been categorised by DFID and the table may not be fully comprehensive.

2.9 This spending covers a range of activities. As Figure 4 shows, through its non-core country spending, DFID funds UNICEF's principal activities of responding to humanitarian emergencies, supporting health, education, water and sanitation and nutrition improvements for children, mothers and families. It also uses UNICEF to channel funding for other purposes, for instance supporting justice, democracy and conflict programmes.

Figure 4: DFID non-core funding by theme, 2008-11

Theme	£ (000)
Health (including Malaria, Polio, HIV/AIDS)	133,317
Integrated Programmes (country level, cross theme)	109,774
Humanitarian	83,220
Education	67,242
Water and Sanitation	42,711
Nutrition (including emergency)	34,659
Justice, Democracy and Conflict	3,176
Other	942
Total	475,041

Source: Identified from data provided by DFID, which is indicative as not all spending has been categorised by DFID and the table may not be fully comprehensive.

2.10 In the UK, UNICEF is represented by the UK National Committee (UNICEF UK) which raises funds, mainly from the public, in support of UNICEF. UNICEF received US\$41 million from UNICEF UK in 2011, making it the tenth-largest donor out of 36 national committees.¹² In 2011, UNICEF UK, according to its accounts, made available £75.7 million to UNICEF, of which £62.4 million was allocated for six specific programmes (including £48.9 million committed to

¹² See: http://www.unicef.org.uk/Documents/Publication-pdfs/TrusteesReport2010_web.pdf.

Children in Emergencies). In addition, £8.5 million was committed to core UNICEF activities and £4.8 million was committed to advocacy programmes.¹³

DFID's oversight of UNICEF

- 2.11 DFID manages its relationship with UNICEF at country level through its country offices. The UN and Commonwealth Department of DFID manages the corporate relationship with UNICEF, working through the UK Mission to the UN in New York, where the UNICEF relationship is led by a Counsellor (Development and Human Rights). The UK was a member of the UNICEF governing board (from 2010-12), which meets three times a year to set policy direction and provide oversight. UNICEF is preparing a new medium-term strategic plan that will be implemented from January 2014, which will include a new results framework.

3 Purpose of the evaluation

- 3.1 To assess the impact and effectiveness of DFID's work with UNICEF.
- 3.2 The review will concentrate on the ways in which UNICEF delivers programmatic, non-core funding from DFID in specific countries. It will also consider, briefly, the way in which DFID's core funding of UNICEF is determined and the funds are used.

4 Relationship to other evaluations and studies

- 4.1 UNICEF programmes funded by DFID are subject to regular monitoring and evaluation. DFID funds are often combined with funds from other sources to support UNICEF's work. Consequently, evaluations may be undertaken either by DFID or by UNICEF, which has its own Evaluation Office. UNICEF also commissions independent evaluations and the Office of the Executive Director (of UNICEF) may commission evaluations directly.¹⁴ Some UNICEF evaluations of DFID-funded programmes have been co-ordinated with DFID in the past. UNICEF evaluations are published online.¹⁵ DFID also commissions its own independent evaluations of programmes which they are delivering through UNICEF. We will consider all relevant reports, paying particular attention to evaluations undertaken since 2008.
- 4.2 DFID gave UNICEF a positive rating in the 2011 MAR but it should be noted that the purpose of the MAR was to assess the value for money for UK aid of funding through a number of multilateral organisations, to inform decisions about the future UK aid programme. It did not systemically consider the impact of specific programmes on the ground. It noted that, while its role in meeting international and UK development objectives was 'strong' and cost consciousness, financial resources and results management were 'satisfactory', weaknesses existed in strategic management, concern for climate change and transparency and accountability.¹⁶ The review's main conclusions are quoted in Figure 5 on page 7.

¹³ Advocacy activities are mainly in the UK and fund the promotion of the work of UNICEF with the public and decision-makers as well as supporting campaigning for specific activities. See *Trustees' Report and Consolidated Financial Statements for the year ended 31 December 2011*, The United Kingdom Committee for UNICEF, 2012, http://www.unicef.org.uk/Documents/Publications/UNICEFUKTrusteesReport2011_2.pdf.

¹⁴ For instance, the Independent Review of UNICEF's Operational Response to the January 2010 Earthquake in Haiti, see http://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index_60396.html.

¹⁵ See here <http://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index.html>.

¹⁶ *Multilateral Aid Review: Assessment of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)*, DFID, 2011, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/mar/unicef.pdf>.

Figure 5: Main conclusions of the MAR about UNICEF

Factor	Comment	
Contribution to UK development objectives (assessed as 'strong')	+	<i>'UNICEF has a strong poverty focus and plays a critical role in delivering MDGs, particularly 3, 4, 5 and 6. It works well in all countries the UK considers fragile.'</i>
	+	<i>It has improved delivery at country level and demonstrates results on the ground.</i>
	+	<i>UNICEF does demonstrate delivery in fragile situations.</i>
	+	<i>Good progress on gender, including its significant advocacy role for girls' education and promoting sex-disaggregated data.</i>
	-	<i>It struggles to show aggregate results at an organisational level.</i>
	-	<i>Its response in acute emergency situations, where it has a critical role, is a concern.</i>
	-	<i>It does not have a climate specific policy and we found no evidence that UNICEF measures climate or environment impact.</i>
Organisational strengths (assessed as 'satisfactory')	+	<i>Taking positive steps to improve cost control and has reduced its administration to programme cost ratio.</i>
	+	<i>It works well with partner governments and other development partners and has a strong emphasis on building the capacity of local partners.</i>
	+	<i>It has clear criteria for allocating core resources and good processes in place for audit, risk and accountability.</i>
	+	<i>UNICEF has a financial disclosure policy.</i>
	-	<i>Inconsistent approach to collaborating with other UN agencies and also working with civil society in humanitarian situations.</i>
	-	<i>Has an organisational-level results framework but this is weak at output level.</i>
	-	<i>There are concerns about its ability to deploy the right staff at the right time to humanitarian emergencies.</i>
	-	<i>There is a concern over its level of cash balances and it lacks a portfolio quality system to manage project performance.</i>
	-	<i>UNICEF does not have a transparency policy and full information on all projects is not disclosed.</i>
Capacity for positive change (assessed as 'uncertain')	+	<i>There is public commitment to reform at the top.</i>
	-	<i>Given past performance it is too early to predict whether this commitment will lead to substantive change.'</i>

Source: Multilateral Aid Review, DFID, 2011 (page 164)¹⁷

4.3 We will draw on the conclusions and recommendations of the published ICAI report on DFID's health programmes in Zimbabwe¹⁸ and our current review of DFID's education programmes in Nigeria, where UNICEF is an important delivery partner (due to be published by the end of 2012).

4.4 We will also consider the progress made by UNICEF in addressing the areas for improvement identified in a review by MOPAN, carried out in 2009. This evaluation commented positively on UNICEF's clear and precise mandate, its focus on country results, its delegated decision-making and its contributions to policy dialogue; the delegation to country offices was seen as its greatest strength. The evaluation was more concerned about UNICEF's limited use of country systems in areas such as financial reporting, audit, procurement and budget execution - whilst recognising that UNICEF is frequently working in emergency situations in fragile states where

¹⁷ Multilateral Aid Review, DFID, March 2011, http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/mar/multilateral_aid_review.pdf.

¹⁸ DFID's Support for the Health Sector in Zimbabwe, ICAI, November 2011, <http://icai.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/DFIDs-Support-to-the-Health-Sector-in-Zimbabwe.pdf>.

government systems may not be effective. Donors at country level were consulted during the MOPAN review and they identified specific weaknesses; they believed that UNICEF performed 'inadequately' in adjusting the implementation of its projects or the overall country portfolio in response to changing circumstances and also performed 'poorly' in terms of the efficiency of its procedures.¹⁹

5 Methodology

Analytical approach

5.1 Our evaluation will focus on DFID's engagement with UNICEF to deliver UK-financed development programmes, including:

- evidence of impact on the ground;
- how results are managed;
- whether there is evidence of clear and effective participation of intended beneficiaries in setting objectives, designing the programmes and delivering results;
- whether the choice of delivery options and partners in particular projects delivers good value for money (with a focus in particular on relative management costs and procurement). This will cover both DFID's decision to use UNICEF as a delivery partner and UNICEF's selection of any sub-contractors; and
- whether DFID is providing effective management and oversight of individual UNICEF programmes and the wider partnership between the two organisations.

5.2 Given that the focus of this review is on UNICEF's work on the ground, delivering services on behalf of DFID, we have decided to compare programmes in three countries which exhibit different characteristics of the roles and activities undertaken by UNICEF on behalf of DFID.

5.3 As illustrated by Figure 4 on page 5, almost 30% of the DFID non-core funding through UNICEF in 2008-11 was in the area of health (including malaria, polio and HIV/AIDS). Given the overall weight of funding for this theme, this evaluation will include programmes that have a significant health component.

Detailed work programme

5.4 Our evaluation will have the following elements:

1. a mapping of DFID funding provided through UNICEF since 2008 and a review of available documentation on the general impact and effectiveness of DFID-funded activity with UNICEF over the same period;
2. a review of the effectiveness of major programmes in three countries, involving three country visits; and
3. a review of the co-ordination and management of DFID's relationship with UNICEF in the UK, in New York and in country offices.

5.5 Details of each element are given below.

Mapping and assessment of DFID funding

5.6 We will identify and validate all sources of funding from DFID to UNICEF, including core and non-core resources, over the period April 2008 to March 2012. We will pay particular attention to the ways in which non-core funds are used for specific programmes.

¹⁹ MOPAN Common Approach, UNICEF 2009, MOPAN, February 2010, http://www.mopanonline.org/upload/documents/UNICEF_Final_February_19_issued.pdf.

- 5.7 As part of this we will confirm the level of management charges made by UNICEF to specific programmes and compare these to other multilateral agencies (such as the World Bank and Asian Development Bank).
- 5.8 We will identify from UNICEF sources, such as its results framework, the main results achieved by UNICEF over the same period and any possible attribution to DFID support. We will consult DFID and UNICEF on the question of attribution. We will also assess the findings of previous UNICEF and DFID evaluations and monitoring reports that consider the effectiveness of DFID funding. As part of this, we will interview the Evaluation Department of DFID and the Evaluation Office of UNICEF.

Review of country programmes

- 5.9 Following a review of options, we have decided to concentrate the majority of our effort in this study on reviewing the major DFID-funded programmes in three countries (Sierra Leone, Ghana and The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)). We have selected these countries because, although other country programmes have received more money, DFID uses UNICEF in interesting ways in these three countries, none of which have been substantively reviewed in previous ICAI reports. The main programmes which are currently active in these countries are shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6: DFID-funded programmes being managed by UNICEF in our three case study countries

a. Sierra Leone

Programme	UK expenditure (£000) 2008-11	Comment
Support to the Government of Sierra Leone's national maternal, reproductive and child health strategies	14,691	<p>DFID's support for maternal, reproductive and child health in Sierra Leone seeks to increase supported births, improve vaccination and contraception coverage, widen the use of bed nets for children and increase usage of anti-malarial drugs by children. The programme is due for completion in 2013. The budget has been disbursed in full by DFID.</p> <p>The programme to improve reproductive, maternal and newborn health started in March 2012.</p> <p>These programmes are complemented by other DFID-funded interventions through UNICEF, such as the provision of medicines and medical supplies, bed nets and improved sanitation.</p>
Medicines and medical supplies for free health care 2011	8,500	
Programme to support water supply, sanitation and hygiene in Sierra Leone	5,000	
Support to the Government of Sierra Leone's malaria prevention programme: supply of long-lasting treated bed nets	4,875	
Water supply, sanitation and hygiene in rural schools, clinics and communities in six districts of Sierra Leone	3,000	
Improving reproductive, maternal and newborn health in Sierra Leone	1,600	
Support to basic education in Sierra Leone	775	
Total	38,441	

Source: Data provided by DFID

b. The Democratic Republic of Congo

Programme	UK expenditure (£000) 2008-11	Comment
Grant to UNICEF for healthy villages and schools	25,000	The village and schools programme focusses on the provision of basic drinking water supply, sanitation and hygiene education to communities. This project was extended in September 2012 for 12 months with additional funding of £11.57 million and will now be completed by October 2013. There is one payment left to make of £3.57 million. All funding had been disbursed at the time of the extension in September 2012. A second phase is planned until 2019.
UNICEF nutrition and vouchers 2011	4,555	
Access to primary education	2,667	
Urgent response to the outbreak of polio in the DRC	940	
Contribution to UNICEF for urgent measles control vaccination response in Maniema (DRC)	615	
Total	33,777	

Source: Data provided by DFID

c. Ghana

Programme	UK expenditure (£000) 2008-11	Comment
Support for malaria programme	10,000	DFID has supported a range of activities that seek to reduce malaria in Ghana. Most of this support has been channelled through UNICEF, which co-ordinates and manages national campaigns to improve coverage and usage of bed nets in Ghana.
Prevention of malaria through the procurement and distribution of insecticide-treated bed nets	1,517	
Institutional strengthening of the Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare	290	Support for the malaria programme focusses on two regions. The programme is due for completion in 2012. The budget has been disbursed in full by DFID. The bed net programme is focussed in one region; it is due for completion in 2013 and has a total budget of £6.82 million, of which £6.34 million has been disbursed (this includes the cost of procuring 2 million bed nets, £5.1 million).
Total	11,807	

Source: Data provided by DFID.

5.10 We propose to review the largest programme in each of these three countries. We will also consider smaller but related programmes, where they are complementary with the main programme, in order to gain a broader perspective on the local relationship with UNICEF. The following programmes will be reviewed:

Sierra Leone – focus on reproductive and child health:

- Support to the National Maternal, Reproductive and Child Health Strategies (due to finish in 2013, all disbursed);
- Support to the Malaria Prevention Programme (finished in 2011, all disbursed); and

- Improving Reproductive, Maternal and Newborn Health (started in March 2012).

Democratic Republic of Congo – focus on water and sanitation:

- Grant for Healthy Villages and Schools (due to end in September 2013, 90% of budget disbursed);

Ghana – focus on malaria prevention:

- Support for the Malaria Programme (due to finish in 2012, all disbursed); and
- Procurement and Distribution of Insecticide-treated Bed Nets (due to finish in 2013, almost 80% of budget disbursed).

- 5.11 In Sierra Leone, the inclusion of the malaria prevention programme (including supply of bed nets) will allow comparison with the bed net programme in Ghana. Given that the reproductive, maternal and newborn health programme was only launched in March 2012, we will concentrate on the planned impact, outcomes, inputs and outputs, as well as progress to date.
- 5.12 These selected programmes represent total spending of £57.7 million, or 12% of DFID's non-core country office expenditure for the period 2008-11, summarised in Figure 3.
- 5.13 We are aware that the focus of our study may overlap with a forthcoming National Audit Office (NAO) review and are liaising with NAO to manage this. We are therefore planning a joint visit to Sierra Leone to reduce the burden on DFID and maximise the use of our resources.
- 5.14 We will review background documents about each programme, in particular the business case and log frame, any DFID, UNICEF or independent evaluations, routine management information and expenditure information. We will also interview DFID country office staff and UNICEF country office staff involved in the management of the selected programmes and the wider DFID/ UNICEF relationship locally to build up a full picture. In each country, we will spend at least a half of the time visiting sites outside the national capital to understand the programmes on the ground.
- 5.15 Through our evidence gathering, we will seek to understand:

Objectives:

- the underlying rationale and objectives for the choice of UNICEF as partner in these programmes;
- the approval processes followed by DFID and UNICEF;
- the approach to coordination with government and other donors to avoid duplication (including other UN agencies);

Delivery:

- the funding structures and disbursements of the selected programmes to date;
- the extent to which government and intended beneficiaries were consulted during design;
- the project management and governance approach used by UNICEF;
- DFID's approach to oversight of UNICEF;
- UNICEF's approach to the selection of any sub-contractors and to procurement;
- DFID and UNICEF staff resource commitments to the programme and issues arising;
- approaches to managing fiduciary risk by DFID and UNICEF;
- approaches to cost control by DFID and UNICEF;
- achievement of value for money for the UK taxpayer;

Impact:

- delivery of benefits to intended beneficiaries in the solutions;
- performance to date in terms of both outputs and outcomes;
- long-term sustainability of the programmes (including trying to create employment by manufacturing bed nets locally);

Learning:

- approaches to monitoring and evaluation;

- approaches to sharing experience and know-how;
 - capacity to respond to changing circumstances (see MOPAN);
 - examples of innovation and learning from wider experience.
- 5.16 A specific issue in relation to UNICEF is the approach to procurement. We will consider this in each country and will use malaria bed nets as an example of the issues involved in choosing between local or regional suppliers and international suppliers.
- 5.17 We will support this evidence-gathering with interviews with key stakeholders in each country about the rationale and objectives of the programmes, the working relationships with DFID and UNICEF and the benefits being delivered by the programmes. We propose to interview:
- government officials, e.g. the Ministry of Health, centrally and at the local level;
 - other key multilateral and bilateral donors with an interest in the relevant sectors (health, water and sanitation), e.g. the World Bank or USAID; and
 - national NGOs, e.g. Oxfam International, Save the Children, Concern Worldwide and Action Aid. We will also consult local NGOs.
- 5.18 We have asked to meet politicians in each country. DFID have advised us that this will be difficult in two of the countries due to the sensitivities surrounding imminent elections, which are taking place in Sierra Leone on 17th November and in Ghana in early December.
- 5.19 We will carry out field visits in each country to meet government health officials, NGO representatives, local CSOs and beneficiaries at the local level. This will give us a perspective on whether the intended results are being delivered on the ground and provide an opportunity to cross-check the local experience with what we are told centrally. We expect to be accompanied by UNICEF on these visits. In DRC, a DFID adviser will accompany the review team.
- 5.20 Because of the extent of the work programme in each country, we are planning on the basis that we will need a minimum of seven working days in each country. We are allowing nine working days for DRC because of the difficulties of travelling outside Kinshasa.

Management of the DFID/ UNICEF relationship

- 5.21 We will examine the co-ordination and management of the relationship between DFID and UNICEF through a series of interviews. Those people in the UK will be interviewed face-to-face; those outside the UK will be interviewed by telephone. We propose to interview:
- key members of DFID's United Nations and Commonwealth Department (involving a visit to East Kilbride);
 - representatives of international NGOs in the UK with experience of DFID's relationship with UNICEF (e.g. Oxfam International, Save the Children, Concern Worldwide and Action Aid);
 - those members of the UK Mission to the UN in New York dealing with UNICEF, including the Counsellor (Development and Human Rights) and the lead on UNICEF; and
 - key UNICEF stakeholders, probably in New York, including leads on health, water and sanitation and evaluation.
- 5.22 We will consider the way in which the level of core funding for UNICEF is determined by DFID, the results that the UK Government expects as a consequence of this funding and the ways in which the outputs and impacts are assessed. A key source will be the DFID business case for providing core funding to UNICEF (the most recent covers the period 2011-15). We will also consider the extent of UK involvement in UNICEF's strategic planning and priority-setting, for example by understanding DFID's contribution to the development of UNICEF's medium term strategic plans.

Analysis and presentation

- 5.23 We will present our initial findings to the Commissioners, before preparing a draft report based on the evidence gathered and the Commissioners' views and guidance. The final draft report will be submitted to DFID for fact-checking before publication.

5.24 ICAI Evaluation Framework

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. The review questions which are highlighted in bold are those from our Terms of Reference (ToR), on which we will focus in particular.

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)	<p>Does the engagement with UNICEF have clear, relevant and realistic objectives that focus on the desired impact? (ToR 6.2.1)</p> <p>Were the objectives agreed through consensus at all levels and based upon a clear appreciation of the on-ground situation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of written memorandum of understanding between DFID and UNICEF • Evidence of clear and realistic objectives being set at partnership and programme levels • Evidence that objectives were derived from consensus between DFID and UNICEF • Evidence of objectives being specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time-bound • Evidence of consistency with DFID's and UNICEF's overall country and/or sector strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF and UNICEF delivery partners • DFID and UNICEF partnership agreement documents (global and local) • Programme planning and implementation documentation (e.g. log frames, business cases) • Programme reviews • MoUs and contracts with UNICEF and UNICEF delivery partners
Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work? (1.2)	<p>Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the engagement with UNICEF will work? (ToR 6.2.2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the reasons why DFID chose to work with UNICEF, rather than any alternative • Evidence of the underlying logic (or log frame) to the design of the programmes • Evidence of a milestone or outcome-based programme action plan and adherence to this • Evidence of formal commitment by DFID and UNICEF to the delivery of the plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID-UNICEF partnership agreement documents (global and national) • Programme planning and implementation documentation (e.g. log frames, business cases) • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Does the programme complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (1.3)	Do the UNICEF programmes complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (ToR 6.2.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of active engagement by DFID and UNICEF with government and other aid providers to align or converge design or implementation of programmes • Evidence of outcomes of engagement • Evidence of any non-alignment or non-convergence and reasons for this • Evidence of any duplication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government plan, policy and programme documents • Sector monitoring and evaluation reports • Other aid provider sector and programme documents (e.g. co-ordination strategy) • Relevant programme reviews by other donors • Interviews with government • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF, delivery partners • Interviews with other development partners (e.g. other donors, NGOs)
Are the programme's objectives appropriate to the political, economic, social and environmental context? (1.4)	<p>Is each programme's theory of change based on a strategic, realistic and well-evidenced assessment of local conditions? If not, why not?</p> <p>Are the programme objectives and timeframes appropriate to the local contexts and risks identified, also bearing in mind such factors as current capacity of delivery partners?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of contextual analyses, for example of political economy • Evidence of participatory needs assessments, enabling wide participation from key stakeholders • Evidence of a clear theory of change • Evidence of planning and implementation using contextual analyses and needs assessments to inform decisions • Evidence of coherent country strategy for target sectors (by DFID, UNICEF and government) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Government and DFID strategic information • Programme planning and implementation documentation (e.g. log frames) • Programme reviews • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF, delivery partners • Interviews with government • Interviews with civil society • Risk assessment

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Delivery: is the delivery chain designed and managed so as to be fit for purpose?			
Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? (2.1)	<p>Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? (ToR 6.3.1)</p> <p>What was the range of funding and delivery options considered by DFID? Is DFID confident that the current partnership and programmes represent the best way forward to achieve the desired outcomes at a country level, on the basis of the available evidence?</p> <p>What was the range of funding and delivery options considered by UNICEF? How does UNICEF select efficient and effective delivery partners?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of options appraisal by DFID • Evidence of capacity assessment of UNICEF locally • Evidence of rationale for selection of options for implementation (including procurement) • Evidence of options appraisal by UNICEF • Evidence of capacity assessment of UNICEF delivery partners • Evidence of the extent to which the rationale has been confirmed in the delivery • Evidence from implementation (reporting, achievements) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme planning and implementation documents, including business case • Delivery partner capacity assessment process and appraisal documents • Programme reviews • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF
Does programme design and roll-out take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries? (2.2)	<p>Does programme design and roll-out take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries? (ToR 6.3.2)</p> <p>Was there beneficiary involvement in the design process and in the monitoring and evaluation process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that DFID and UNICEF identified beneficiary groups and programmed their involvement • Extent of beneficiary participation in design, implementation, governance and monitoring • Evidence of feedback mechanisms for communities • Evidence of satisfaction of beneficiary communities in these processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme planning and implementation documents • Programme reviews • Interviews with intended beneficiaries • Field visits • Interviews with civil society

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption? (2.3)	<p>Is there good governance at all levels?</p> <p>Is DFID providing sufficient oversight to assure sound financial management and to avoid corruption?</p> <p>Does UNICEF make appropriate choices of aid modalities and safeguards within its programmes, so as to minimise corruption risk and maximise development impact?</p> <p>Does UNICEF respond effectively when it uncovers incidents of corruption?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a clear governance structure at all levels • Evidence of completed fiduciary risk assessments • Evidence of financial controls being in place • Evidence of clear management processes to prevent, identify and act on allegations of corruption • Evidence of appropriate mitigation measures within programme design • Evidence of effective monitoring of corruption risk • Evidence of adequate investigation of and response to any corruption incidents by UNICEF and DFID • Evidence of effective risk assessment • Evidence of effective oversight by UNICEF and DFID • Evidence of arrangements for oversight and audit of partner organisations and of UN audit process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial and audit reports and documentation • Fiduciary risk assessments • Walk-through review of systems and procedures • Review of any incidents of corruption • Programme reviews • Public reporting (media) • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF, delivery partners • DFID national anti-corruption strategies • Data from DFID Counter Fraud Unit • Partnership agreement governing UK government relations with UN agencies • UNICEF anti-corruption strategies • Delivery partner anti-corruption strategies

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact? (2.4)	<p>Do the UNICEF programmes complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (ToR 6.2.3)</p> <p>Has DFID or UNICEF been able to influence the level and use of other funding to maximise impact?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of active engagement by DFID and UNICEF to identify and utilise other resources (financial and non-financial resources) • Evidence of formal and non-formal programme partnerships with government and other aid providers • Evidence of funds being managed holistically • Evidence of delivery partners sharing costs • Evidence of reviews and evaluations focussing on value for money 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID and UNICEF programme planning and implementation documentation • Programme reviews • DFID and UNICEF financial documentation • MoUs and similar with other partners • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF, delivery partners • Interviews with government • Interviews with other donors • Interviews with civil society
Do managers ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery chain? (2.5)	<p>How do managers ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery chain?</p> <p>How does UNICEF ensure efficiency and effectiveness in its procurement procedures?</p> <p>What options have been considered for procuring bed nets? What issues are there?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of options analysis by UNICEF in delivery partner selection • Evidence of options analysis by UNICEF in procurement decisions • Evidence of cost review and management • Evidence of appropriate changes to design, delivery or budget to improve cost efficiency and effectiveness • Evidence of reviews and evaluations focussing on value for money • Evidence of a strategy to procure bed nets cost effectively, including consideration of local/regional procurement (including any impacts on the local economy) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance and procurement policies, guidelines and reports • Programme business cases (e.g. options analysis) • Interviews with DFID and UNICEF • Interviews with delivery partners • MoUs/contracts • Sample equipment procurement reviews • Programme reviews

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain? (2.6)	<p>Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain? (ToR 6.3.3)</p> <p>Does UNICEF ensure efficiency and effectiveness in its delivery partners?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of cost appraisals assessments • Evidence of appropriate financial reporting • Evidence of assessments being provided by all partners • Evidence of delivery partners managing costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial reports • Programme reviews • MoUs/contracts with delivery partners
Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively? (2.7)	<p>Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively? (ToR 6.3.5)</p> <p>Have risks been agreed upon in consensus by DFID, UNICEF and delivery partners?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of risk appraisal at strategic level prior to design • Evidence that programme design took adequate care over risk assessment (e.g. political or security context) • Evidence of each element of delivery having a risk appraisal • Evidence of risk registers throughout the delivery chain • Evidence of continual review and appropriate management of identified risks (including mid-course design adjustments) • Evidence of adequate communication between DFID, UNICEF and delivery partners on risks and change in risk status 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk appraisals • Risk registers • Programme reviews • DFID/UNICEF/delivery partner written communication • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF, delivery partners

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is the programme delivering against its agreed objectives? (2.8)	<p>Is the programme delivering against its agreed objectives? (ToR 6.3.4)</p> <p>Have these agreed objectives changed over the programme period and if so, why?</p> <p>Is the engagement with UNICEF delivering against its agreed objectives? (ToR 6.3.6)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of progress of delivery against objectives for the programmes • Evidence of delivery against the objectives for the wider relationship with UNICEF • Evidence of agreement amongst delivery partners about achievement of results • Evidence of design or planning changes to the programmes to reflect changing circumstances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme reviews (e.g. annual reports, independent project completion reviews) • Programme MOUs, and global MOU, with UNICEF • Field visits • Interviews with intended beneficiaries and wider community • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF, delivery partners • Interviews with government • Interviews with civil society
Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances? (2.9)	Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of appropriate design or planning changes to the programmes • Evidence of appropriate changes in delivery taking place • Evidence of agreement by DFID to any changes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme reviews • Programme log frames

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Impact: what is the impact on intended beneficiaries?			
Is the programme delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries? (3.1)	<p>Is the engagement with UNICEF delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries? (ToR 6.4.1)</p> <p>Do the design and outcomes meet the self-defined needs of the intended beneficiaries? Which groups within communities are not being reached and what are the factors contributing to this?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of planned and actual delivery to beneficiaries • Evidence of short-term benefits • Evidence of indications of long-term benefits • Evidence of any unintended consequences or benefits of the programmes • Evidence of definition, measurement and tracking of attribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews, focus groups, informal discussions with intended beneficiaries and wider community • Field visits • Interviews with civil society • Interviews with delivery partners • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF • Interviews with local government • DFID and UNICEF assessments • Third party assessments
Is the programme working holistically alongside other programmes? (3.2)	<p>Are UNICEF programmes working holistically alongside other programmes? (ToR 6.4.2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of joint design within DFID, UNICEF, government and other donors • Evidence of joint management with other bilateral agencies and multilateral organisations in delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme planning and implementation documentation • Partner assessments • Third party assessments • Programme reviews • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF • Interviews with government • Interviews with other donors

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the programme? (3.3)	<p>Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the engagement with UNICEF? (ToR 6.4.3)</p> <p>How are the programme impacts being measured? What is the basis of the attribution of programme outcomes and benefits to UK funds?</p> <p>What plans do DFID, UNICEF and national government have to ensure the long-term sustainability of the programmes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of identification of potential impacts at the design phase • Evidence of indications of long-term, sustainable benefits for intended beneficiaries • Evidence of government counterpart funding commitments and release • Evidence of measurement of outcome-impact chain • Evidence of tracking of attribution • Evidence of reasonable assumptions being made about attribution of benefits to the programmes • Evidence of clear plans and commitment to them by government, to ensure sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business cases • Programme annual reports • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF • Interviews with government • Programme reviews • Interviews, focus groups, informal discussions with intended beneficiaries and wider community • Interviews with civil society • Third party assessments
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 the programmes' end?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that a documented exit strategy is in place that is practical and appropriate • Evidence that the exit strategy has been agreed between UNICEF, DFID and government • Evidence of UNICEF securing further funding from other donors to continue the programme • Evidence of continued government financial and other support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme documents • Agreed MoUs with delivery partners • Meetings with communities • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF • Interviews with government

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers? (3.5)	Is there transparency and accountability of spending, activities and results to the intended beneficiaries, UK taxpayers and other stakeholders?	<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 programme details being proactively shared with intended beneficiaries and civil society • Evidence of transparent publication of programme information by UNICEF and DFID 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publicly available information and reports (online, media, other) • Field visits • Interviews with civil society • Interviews with other donors • Evaluation and reporting • DFID and UNICEF web sites
Learning: what works and what needs improvement?			
Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact? (4.1)	<p>Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs results and impact? (ToR 6.5.1)</p> <p>Do these monitoring arrangements include an effective monitoring system that is based on the programme's theory of change and appropriate resources to manage it?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of effective monitoring by UNICEF of the delivery and by DFID of the programmes • Evidence of schedules for monitoring and reporting • Evidence of actual reports being generated as planned • Evidence of action (corrective or otherwise) being taken based on reports • Evidence of experienced monitoring and evaluation personnel at all levels to monitor the programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID and UNICEF programme planning and implementation documentation (including management reports) • Programme reviews • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF • Interviews with delivery partners
Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice? (4.2)	Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice? (ToR 6.5.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of "innovative" approaches used by DFID or UNICEF in the case study programmes • Evidence of a system to acquire, disseminate and incorporate robust internal and external evidence into local programming • Evidence of lesson-learning being incorporated in design and implementation of the programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme documents (including business cases) • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF • Interviews with other donors • Literature search

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken? (4.3)	Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the engagement with UNICEF that should be undertaken? (ToR 6.5.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of any programme weaknesses and possible approaches to addressing these • Evidence of opportunities for programme enhancement • Evidence from similar DFID-UNICEF partnership programmes elsewhere 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with DFID, UNICEF • Interviews with other donors and NGOs • Programme reviews • Literature search
Have lessons about the objectives, design and delivery of the programme been learned and shared effectively? (4.4)	<p>What lessons have been learned, including ways of improving delivery?</p> <p>What systems are in place to incorporate learning into the existing or future DFID-UNICEF partnership programmes in the case study countries?</p> <p>What are the main improvements to the programmes which have been generated through the learning process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of lesson-learning from previous and comparable exercises incorporated in design and implementation of the programmes • Evidence of recommendations from annual monitoring incorporated into operations • Evidence of clear linkages between the recommendations from evaluations and future actions • Evidence of documented lessons being learned and put into practice in-country or elsewhere 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings with DFID and UNICEF programme teams • Reviews, evaluations and action plans

6 Roles and responsibilities

- 6.1 KPMG will provide oversight of this review under the overall leadership of the ICAI Project Director. Supplementary analysis and peer review will be provided by KPMG and Agulhas consulting staff. The team will consist of the following members:

Team member	Organisation	Role
Team Leader	Independent	Team Leader
Team member 1	Independent	Lead consultant
Team member 2	KPMG – Ghana	Fieldwork consultant (Ghana case study)
Team member 3	KPMG – DRC	Fieldwork consultant (DRC case study)
Team member 4	KPMG – UK	Consultant (funds mapping, research)
Team member 5	Agulhas	Peer reviewer and technical adviser

Team Leader

He is a senior management consultant with wide-ranging experience of the public, private and civil society sectors. He has particular experience of helping organisations to design and implement business change and performance improvement programmes, including projects to develop new approaches to public service delivery. He began his career in policy evaluation and he has extensive experience in the area of employment and skills. He is an experienced team leader of large and complex consultancy projects. He has gained international experience through consultancy projects in Africa, the Middle East and Eastern Europe for agencies including the Overseas Development Administration, the European Commission and the World Bank. He led the KPMG teams in recent ICAI reviews of DFID's engagement with the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, as well as a review of DFID's education programmes in Nigeria.

He is a former consulting partner in KPMG (1990-97).

Team member 1

She is an experienced international consultant with 12 years' development sector experience in India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Palestine, Indonesia, Malawi and Zambia. She has lived and worked in India since 2001 and her Indian experience includes over three years working at the grassroots level for Indian NGOs and then with KPMG in India. Her main sectoral experience is in rural livelihoods, water and sanitation, health and corporate social responsibility, having worked for a range of clients including government bodies, donor agencies, corporate foundations and NGOs. Her technical skills include monitoring and evaluation, as well as work with non-profit organisations on institutional strengthening, strategy development and programme design. She has specific experience of working with UNICEF, including evaluating several of their programmes. She is now an independent consultant and is in the process of relocating from India to the UK.

Team member 2

She is a project advisor in the KPMG office in Ghana. She holds a BA (Hons) degree in Accounting and French Business Studies from the University of Kent, UK, a Licence (BA Hons) and a Masters in Business Studies from the Université de Lyons III, France. She will have responsibility for co-ordinating the Ghana field trip with DFID and the London-based ICAI review team. She will give technical inputs on the Ghanaian context to UNICEF draft.

Team member 3

He is an experienced international development consultant in DR Congo, with experience in managing large and complex aid programmes in-country and in providing detailed technical advice on aid programmes to policy-makers. He will have responsibility for coordinating the DR Congo field-trip with DFID and the London-based ICAI review team. He will give technical inputs on the DR Congo context to UNICEF draft.

Team member 4

She is a consultant at KPMG LLP. She has carried out a variety of research projects with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and economic analysis with a think tank, as well as supporting an organisation to submit bids for World Bank projects. At KPMG, she has focussed on public sector and central government; she was a part of the ICAI Afghanistan review. She will focus on the fieldwork in the UK, and will have responsibility for research and UNICEF funds mapping exercise.

Team member 5

He is a Director of Agulhas Applied Knowledge. 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 is a member of the core management team for ICAI's implementation and has led three reviews: DFID's climate change programme in Bangladesh, DFID's electoral support through UNDP and DFID's support for health and education in India. He was also closely involved in the review of DFID's management of UK budget support operations.

7 Management and reporting

- 7.1 A first draft report will be produced for review by the Secretariat and Commissioners by 25 January 2013, followed by revision and review prior to completion and sign off by the end of April 2013. A more detailed timetable is provided in paragraph 8.1.

8 Expected outputs and timeframe

- 8.1 The following timetable is indicative. The phases are not strictly sequential, so a degree of overlap is possible:

Phase	Timetable
Planning Finalising methodology Drafting Inception Report	August 2012 By 14 September 2012
Phase 1: Initial review UK field work	September to October 2012
Phase 2: International Fieldwork Case study 1 – Sierra Leone (country visit) Case study 2 – DRC (country visit) Case Study 3 – Ghana (country visit) Consultation with donor partners Consultation with UK stakeholders	Provisionally, during: 20-28 September 2012 1-12 October 2012 22 October – 31 October By 16 November 2012 By 16 November 2012
Phase 3: Analysis and write-up Analysis of findings Roundtable with Commissioners Further analysis and first draft report to ICAI Report quality assurance and review by Secretariat and Commissioners Report to DFID for fact checking Report finalisation	By 30 November 2012 w/c 3 December 2012 By w/c 21 January 2013 w/c 28 January - w/c 11 March 2013 w/c 18 March 2013 w/c 8 April 2013

9 Risk assessment

Risk	Level of risk	Specific Issues	Mitigation
Inability to carry out successful, timely collaboration with UNICEF	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology dependent on high level of co-operation from UNICEF UNICEF may not be able to meet our very tight timescales for the country visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular contact with DFID and UNICEF DFID country offices have indicated their willingness to participate to agreed timescales
No impact data available to assess programmes	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited availability of baseline or impact data ICAI report may be seen as lacking evidence or failing to add value 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assemble evidence from a range of sources Make a judgement as to whether DFID's approach rests on a solid evidence base

Risk	Level of risk	Specific Issues	Mitigation
Logistics for local working	High - DRC Medium – Sierra Leone and Ghana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty of local travel outside the capitals, particularly in DRC for security reasons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use knowledgeable nationals for short inputs (from KPMG local offices), to support logistics and to suggest further contacts • UN flights will be used for travel within DRC • We will use experienced local drivers
Safety and security of team members	High – DRC Medium – Sierra Leone and Ghana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of violence or kidnapping • Risk to the person is significant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core UK team members will undertake HET training in advance. • The work programme and visits will be planned carefully, in line with guidance from the FCO and Control Risks Security Services (locally-based security advisers) and with security approval from KPMG in the UK or the country office (as applicable to their staff members).

10 How will this ICAI review make a difference?

- 10.1 UNICEF is an important partner of DFID and is likely to continue to be so. This evaluation will contribute to the wider debate on how DFID engages with UNICEF. This is an area of interest for DFID, in the light of the recommendations of its Multilateral Aid Review.
- 10.2 The review should have wider implications for DFID's management of in-country programmes through development partners. It should help DFID to make any necessary changes to its ways of working with UNICEF that will enable higher levels of effectiveness to be achieved and development impact to be better sustained.
- 10.3 DRC is a fragile state and Sierra Leone is a post-conflict state. With the increasing focus of UK interest in fragile and post-conflict states, this work will also contribute to improving the delivery and impact of UK assistance in difficult environments.