

## ANNEX 6: ANALYSIS OF EXAMPLES<sup>277</sup> OF PROGRAMME MEMORANDA

Country	Myanmar	Zimbabwe	Uganda	Nepal-India	Ghana
Title	Three Diseases Humanitarian Fund	Behaviour Change Communication Programme	HIV/AIDS Umbrella Programme Phase 2	HIV Prevention, Care and Treatment for Nepali Migrants	Multi-Sectoral HIV/AIDS Project (M-SHAP)
Document Type	Project Concept Note and Project Document (EC Description of the Action)	Project Memorandum (DFID Zimbabwe)	Project Memorandum (DFID Uganda)	Proposal (FHI)	Project Appraisal Document (World Bank)
Criteria					
Assessment of epidemiology, needs and barriers to progress	YES - Discusses HIV context, drivers of epidemic, need for scale up and reaching at risk groups, challenges to be addressed, including health system weaknesses, fit with strategies. Refers to difficult operating environment and lessons learned from termination of Global Fund grants	YES - Discusses HIV and behavioural context, fit with national AIDS and behaviour change strategies, scope to strengthen HIV prevention activities. Refers to political constraints in current Zimbabwe context	YES - Discusses HIV context, fit with national plans and strategies and Uganda Joint Assistance Strategy, and specific problems to be addressed by the programme e.g. weaknesses in health system, resource allocation and coordination of the response	YES - Good analysis of HIV, migration and policy context	YES - Good analysis of HIV context, fit with national plans and strategies
Assessment of UK comparative advantage and actions of other actors	NOT EXPLICITLY - States that consistent with DFID Burma Country Plan, but no analysis of DFID comparative advantage, although this programme is primarily a pooled funding mechanism Consistent with European	PARTLY - States that consistent with draft Zimbabwe CAP and how programme will complement other DFID programmes, but no analysis of DFID comparative advantage Discussion of actions of	PARTLY - Describes prior emphasis of DFID support for HIV and AIDS in Uganda, DFID technical and financial support for delivery of effective strategic multisectoral response, and specific areas of DFID focus, although	N/A - Discusses FHI experience and comparative advantage, and actions of other actors	N/A -Discusses briefly World Bank comparative advantage and rationale for Bank involvement Pooled funding arrangement with DFID; DFID role therefore as joint funder through MOU between IDA,

<sup>277</sup> These five were selected from the ten projects/programmes reviewed (see section 5.35 p52) to illustrate experience in a selection of countries.

	Common Position on Burma. Refers to consultation with stakeholders and roles of donor and implementing partners	other actors	not explicitly stated in terms of comparative advantage. Discussion of actions of other actors		DFID and Government of Ghana
Assessment of sustainability of actions	NOT EXPLICITLY - Programme will strengthen management systems and institutional capacity e.g. of NGOs; Discussion of risks	PARTLY - Programme includes building capacity of local public and private organizations, transferring skills and expertise. Ongoing donor support for commodities.	NOT EXPLICITLY - Programme will strengthen management and coordination of the HIV/AIDS response	NO	YES - Discusses financial and institutional sustainability
Assessment of performance of potential partners	NO - Joint programme with AusAID, EC, Netherlands, Norway, SIDA; DFID is lead partner. Implementing partners will be UN agencies, local civilian authorities, INGOs and local NGOs, but no analysis of potential performance	YES - Joint funding with USAID; DFID and USAID have prior experience of joint funding in Zimbabwe Identifies principal implementing partners, and provides evidence of previous performance	PARTLY - Discussion of challenges and weaknesses of government institutions and civil society but no explicit analysis of performance of potential partners	PARTLY - Proposal describes track record and performance of FHI and that of other two main partners, but lists potential CSO implementing partners without detailed analysis of their performance	YES - Rates past performance of Ghana AIDS Response Fund and Ghana AIDS Commission
Assessment of cost effectiveness and opportunity cost	PARTLY - Refers to need for effective prioritization and for choice of most cost-effective interventions, but no analysis indicating consideration of alternatives or opportunity cost	PARTLY - Describes economic case for supporting HIV prevention and role of social marketing and private sector in context of deteriorating public services, but no analysis indicating consideration of alternatives or opportunity cost	PARTLY - Discusses risks of not undertaking this programme, economic impact of HIV/AIDS, and the need to balance addressing immediate needs e.g. treatment scale up and longer term issues, but no analysis indicating consideration of alternatives or opportunity cost	NO - Identifies outputs for two levels of funding, largely difference in geographical and programmatic scale, but no analysis indicating consideration of alternatives or opportunity cost	YES - Proposed intervention areas reflect the seven areas that comprise the national response. Proposal explicitly discusses alternatives considered and reasons for rejection