



Department  
for International  
Development



# Evaluation Annual Report

## 2017/18



January 2019

# Contents

List of Acronyms	2
1.Foreword	4
2.Evaluation in Numbers	6
3.DFID's evaluation architecture	7
4.Driving quality and use in global evaluation	9
5.The year ahead	15
6.Sharing evaluation findings and lessons learnt	17
Annex – Evaluations published (2017/18)	43
References	44

# List of Acronyms

ASWA	Accelerating Sanitation and Water for All
BCC	Behaviour Change Campaigns
CDGP	Child Development Grant Programme
CEDIL	The Centre of Excellence for Development Impact and Learning
CMAM	Community-Based Management of Acute Malnutrition
CPC	Country Programme Cabinet
CPD	Continued Professional Development
DFID	Department for International Development
EnDev	Energising Development Program
EQUALS	Evaluation Quality Assurance and Learning Service
EvU	Evaluation Unit
FCO	Foreign and Commonwealth Office
GEC	Girls' Education Challenge
GEFA	Global Evaluation Framework Agreement
GLAM	Global Learning on Adaptive Management
GREAT	Growth in Rural Economy and Agriculture in Tajikistan
IMEP	Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Programme
IW	Innovation Window
IYCF	Infant and Young Child Feeding
KNOWFOR	International Forestry Knowledge Program
LEAD	Livelihood Enhancement Through Agricultural Development
LGA	Local Government Area
M4P	Making Markets Work for The Poor
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
MI	Management Information
MNCHW	Maternal New-born and Child Health Weeks
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-Operation Development
OGDs	Other Government Departments
OPM	Oxford Policy Management
ORIE	Operations Research and Impact Evaluation
PER	Process Evaluation Rating
RCT	Randomized Controlled Trial
RED	Research and Evidence Division
SCW	Step Change Window
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SIEF	Strategic Impact Evaluation Fund
SLP	State Level Programme

SPW	Strategic Partnership Window
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
VfM	Value for Money
WCDRM	Wealth Creation Development of Rural Markets
WINNN	Working to Improve Nutrition in Northern Nigeria

# 1. Foreword

Welcome to the new look Evaluation Annual Report, which covers the Department for International Development's (DFID's) evaluation activities between April 2017 and March 2018. At DFID, we recognise the importance of using evaluation evidence to help us improve the quality and value for money (VfM) of our programming. We also encourage the use of evaluation evidence across other aid spending UK government departments to underpin efforts to reduce poverty in developing countries. As part of our commitment to learning what works, where and why, 2017/18 has seen DFID raise our ambition on evaluation. We have focused on three main areas:

1. **How we work:** DFID has invested in making sure our organisation has the right evaluative tools, we can use at the right time to help manage risk and support evidence informed decisions. The Evaluation Unit (EvU) is working to improve funding and support to evaluation approaches that enable evidence-based decision-making in the rapidly changing contexts that we operate in. A new funding window has been launched through the Strategic Impact Evaluation Fund (SIEF), to create a portfolio of rapid, low-cost 'nimble' evaluations that will provide gold standard evidence on whether to scale-up, adapt, or stop an intervention. In addition, the newly launched Global Learning on Adaptive Management (GLAM) programme will provide support to DFID on monitoring and evaluation of adaptive programming, helping DFID to use evaluative evidence to improve programmes.
2. **Who we work with:** DFID has continued to work closely with international partners and other UK Government Departments. We have expanded our offer of support to Other Government Departments (OGDs), building their capacity on evaluation of Official Development Assistance (ODA), supporting some key high priority cross-Government funds and opening up our Global Evaluation Framework Agreement (GEFA) and Evaluation Quality Assurance and Learning Service (EQUALS) to OGDs.
3. **What we do:** The Head of Evaluation Profession, EvU and Country Programme Cabinet (CPC) (see chapter 3 for more details on the role of these functions) have been examining options for how to best support DFID's de-centralised evaluation model. As part of this work, the EvU has undertaken a scoping exercise to map out priorities for key thematic areas for evaluations, refocusing attention on new opportunities with digital for greater use of real time monitoring of outcome data, support for adaptive programming approaches, and prepared a concept note to support a new initiative on randomised control trials of DFID programmes. The aim of this work is to incentivise and support DFID's decentralised evaluation model to undertake trials in areas considered to be of central importance to DFID. This work is intended to improve how DFID centrally assesses the effectiveness, VfM and long-term sustainability of programming in key DFID countries, and sectors. The CPC has formed a working group to develop an approach to strategic decision-making, prioritising and delivering evaluations at the Africa regional level.

Efforts to strengthen and build on our existing evaluation structure are now well under way with the creation of the new Evidence Department within DFID's Research and Evidence Division (RED). The EvU, as one component of the new Evidence Department, is

committed to driving better delivery of UK ODA by using evaluation to learn what works and what does not, where and why.

The Evaluation Annual Report has been written by the EvU with contributions from others working to support evaluation across DFID, in line with the DFID Evaluation Policy (2013) and Strategy (2014-19). Notably, the achievements outlined in this report for 2017/18 document the progress made towards the key outcomes in the DFID 2014-19 Evaluation Strategy. The Evaluation Strategy and Policy will be reviewed and refreshed during 2018/19.

Finally, I am delighted to highlight a new addition to DFID's Evaluation Annual Reports: the two-page summaries, known as 'digests'. These are produced for each DFID published evaluation and provide an accessible summary of DFID's exciting and varied evaluation portfolio and what we have learned from these evaluations.

*Sian Rasdale, Head of Evidence Department, Research and Evidence Division*

## 2. Evaluation in Numbers

DFID subscribes to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation Development's (OECD) definition of evaluation as a “systematic and objective assessment of an on-going and completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results in relation to specified evaluation criteria” (DFID, 2013). Under DFID's decentralised evaluation model, decisions on whether to evaluate programmes and interventions lie with individual policy and programme spending units within DFID. The number of evaluations and spending on evaluations are therefore variable across DFID and will change year on year.

### Evaluations published

DFID has committed to publish all completed evaluations in line with the UK government's transparency commitments. DFID evaluations are published on DFID's [open data site](#)<sup>1</sup> and on the UK government external [website](#)<sup>2</sup>. For 2017/18, a total of 13 completed evaluation reports were published, with management responses published for 10 (at the time of writing).

### Ongoing evaluations

Based on DFID's management information systems, there were 199 evaluations ongoing in DFID in 2017/18 (Table 1). The number of evaluations ongoing in DFID, and the proportion of DFID funds and programmes being evaluated, have all increased over the past year. DFID evaluations concentrated on DFID's bilateral expenditure, i.e. programmes delivered directly by DFID, rather than core funds provided to other development agencies and organisations. Core funds provided to other development agencies are evaluated according to those agencies policies, and are not typically commissioned by DFID.

Table 1: Statistics on Evaluations of DFID programmes<sup>3</sup>.

	2016/17	2017/18
Number of ongoing evaluations	187	199
% of DFID programmes being evaluated	12%	15%
% of DFID total spend being evaluated	18%	22%
% of DFID bilateral spend being evaluated	27%	31%

Source: DFID Management Information April 2018.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/>

<sup>2</sup> [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk)

<sup>3</sup> Last year's Evaluation Annual Report (2016/17) reported the number of evaluations ongoing in DFID in 2016/17 as 244; percentage of DFID programmes being evaluated as 16%; percentage of DFID total spend being evaluated as 21%; and percentage of DFID bilateral spend being evaluated as 33%. These figures were revised based on the data available at the time of writing. The revised figures reported in Table 1 reflect updated data on DFID Management Information (MI) systems (April 2018) and at least partly reflect efforts over the past year to improve the quality of evaluation data on DFID Management Information (MI) systems.

# 3. DFID's evaluation architecture

DFID operates a decentralised evaluation model. This means that the decision about commissioning an independent evaluation lies with individual policy and programme spending unit. Ensuring our internal processes are clear and joined up across the organisation ensures that we maximise VfM from our aid spend. The main groups working on evaluation in DFID are outlined below.

## Evaluation Unit

In 2017/18 a new Evidence Department was formed within RED. The EvU is part of the Evidence Department, and this shift in structure helps to embed evaluation into the wider work to support evidence use across DFID. The EvU works to oversee and support the evaluation system across DFID to drive better delivery of ODA by using evaluation to learn what works and what does not, where and why. EvU has three strategic objectives:

- Ensure quality of UK ODA evaluations;
- Improve the use and influence of evaluations;
- Meet DFID evidence priorities through evaluations.

In line with the remit on leading evaluation policy for DFID, EvU coordinates and reviews the internal processes in place for ensuring quality and transparency across DFID's evaluation portfolio and undertakes a stocktaking of DFID's evaluation publications.

## Evaluation Cadre and Head of Profession

DFID has a dynamic and active evaluation cadre comprising evaluation specialists as well as generalists with varied experience and training in evaluation. The Evaluation Cadre is one of 13 professional cadres in DFID, led by the Head of Evaluation Profession and supported by a cadre manager. The Head of Evaluation Profession focuses on:

- shaping and influencing DFID's evaluation thinking and approach;
- building and ensuring the professional development of the cadre;
- ensuring DFID has technical expertise and influence to tackle global strategic development challenges.

Evaluation specialists working across DFID are based in the EvU or embedded in policy or programme spending units (both in the UK and overseas). At the time of writing, DFID had a full time equivalent of 31 Evaluation Advisers working across the organisation.

## Country Programme Cabinet

CPC Evaluation Advisers support the improved coverage, quality and use of programme evaluations across DFID's full country evaluation portfolio. In addition, the team provides advice to support the commissioning and management of evaluations in a number of



country offices including DFID Afghanistan, DFID Pakistan and DFID Sudan. This dual role enables CPC Evaluation Advisers to ensure that the development of central strategic planning, guidance, and training materials takes account of the challenges of managing country level evaluation portfolios. In addition, CPC Evaluation Advisers conduct specific analyses of the portfolio using MI to identify thematic evaluation trends and evidence gaps, monitor evaluation products, and provide feedback to senior stakeholders. The team also supports EvU's work to increase the uptake and use of evaluation findings across DFID.

## **Country offices and UK-based policy and programme spending units**

Embedded Evaluation Advisers ensure strategic evaluation planning at policy and programme spending unit level, support and assure programme monitoring, lead on evidence and learning across their department, help to develop evaluation capacity of staff, and lead on country evaluation capacity building programmes. For country offices and central teams without embedded Evaluation Advisers light touch support for evaluation is available from EvU and CPC via the helpdesk function.

# 4. Driving quality and use in global evaluation

## Driving quality in DFID

DFID remains committed to driving the quality and maximising the utility of its evaluation portfolio. In addition to our continued focus on developing the skills of DFID's cadre of Evaluation Advisers, building evaluation capacity and embedding evaluation expertise across DFID, numerous other mechanisms exist to drive the quality of DFID evaluations.

## Building Capacity

Building capacity on evaluation in DFID and across OGDs helps ensure quality of evaluations. DFID's evaluation accreditation model and evaluation competencies are designed to ensure professional standards are maintained and staff skills are aligned with the requirements to strengthen the quality of DFID evaluations. This year, two accreditation rounds were administered resulting in a further 27 staff successfully achieving accreditation including evaluation specialists working in OGDs. Evaluation cadre members are supported through tailored learning and a professional development curriculum. The Continued Professional Development (CPD) strategy for the evaluation cadre sets out the delivery of a range and mix of methods including learning on the job, mentoring and line management, peer learning, formal training, workshops, and immersion opportunities. Key evaluation cadre CPD activities this year included:

- June 2017 – Masterclass in Experimental Evaluation - The two-day course was attended by 14 DFID and OGDs' staff and aimed to develop participants' skills in designing, commissioning and managing experimental evaluations;
- January 2018 – Advanced Experimental Methods in Evaluation – The one-day course aimed to improve 32 DFID and OGDs' staff's ability to be critical commissioners of complex experimental evaluations;
- January 2018 – Joint Evaluation and Statistics Cadre Professional Development Conference – The three-day “Connect, Exchange, Inspire” event delivered over 30 sessions to more than 100 DFID and OGDs' staff. The conference showcased some of DFID's flagship work (such as adaptive programming, monitoring and evaluation in fragile states, capturing the voices of marginalised people, migration and modern slavery) and used innovative live polling to engage participants in lively and discursive Q&A sessions.

## Capacity building in DFID country offices

A short summary version of the DFID 'Principles of Evaluation' training course, aimed at all staff, was developed by CPC and recently piloted with DFID Afghanistan. Findings were fed back to the Head of Evaluation Profession and material is being further revised to convert the course into stand-alone modules to better fit a range of different customer needs.

## The Evaluation Quality Assurance and Learning Service

EQUALS provides independent quality assurance and technical support services for evaluations of ODA funded programmes implemented by DFID or other UK government departments. The process ensures that evaluation products meet a range of standardised quality criteria. The quality assurance reviews contain written feedback and ratings that provide DFID and OGDs' managers with advice on how to use the evaluation products or whether improvements are required. The reviews also help identify those products that are of poor quality and require major changes before they can be published.

EQUALS data contains details about evaluation methodologies used and is collected at the point of evaluation design and implementation, so it provides the best insight to and understanding of our current evaluation portfolio.

EQUALS processed a total of 153 requests in 2017/18 out of which over 85% were for quality assurance of various evaluation products such as terms of reference (28%), inception reports (21%), baseline reports (3%) and evaluation reports (33%). Technical assistance comprised 14% of the total requests. A total of 90 reports were quality assured in 2017/18:

- A third of the cases were aimed at evaluating impact (33%), while the majority were meant to evaluate performance more generally (57%);
- Process evaluations constituted only 11% of the cases;
- 40% of the cases applied only qualitative while 13% used only quantitative research approaches<sup>4</sup>;
- The majority of the reports (46%) applied mixed approaches – a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches.

## Thematic Evaluations

To complement the decentralised evaluation model, the EvU and CPC have been undertaking work to ensure evaluation evidence and learning is generated at the thematic and portfolio level as well as the individual policy and programme level. EvU has undertaken a scoping exercise, mapping out priority evidence needs across the organisation, which the unit will seek to support through a number of synthesis and influencing activities over the coming year.

*Africa regions education evaluation portfolio*: DFID's CPC has generated a detailed thematic picture of current and planned education evaluations across DFID's Africa country offices. Key evaluation questions were mapped to identify common lines of enquiry across the education sector, with the aim of increasing awareness of upcoming evidence to promote the uptake of evaluation findings, and to support better management of the

---

<sup>4</sup> Quantitative research can be defined as a formal, objective, systematic process in which numerical data are utilised to obtain information about the world. Qualitative research methods, on the other hand, attempt to present the social world, and perspectives on that world, in terms of the concepts, behaviours, perceptions and accounts of the people who inhabit it.

regional distribution of evaluations and evidence. The next stage is to learn from this exercise with a view to replicating it for other thematic areas.

Whilst the decentralised evaluation model helps increase programme team ownership of the evaluation findings and helps facilitate the learning being applied to improve programme implementation, it has meant that thematic evaluation coverage is patchy. This trialling and thematic work will complement DFID's decentralised evaluation model, helping to ensure that high priority thematic areas for DFID are evaluated to generate learning on what works, what does not and why. There will be a particular focus in the trialling work to assess VfM of the priority interventions being trialled and long-term sustainability of effects. Using key evaluation questions across the same thematic area and synthesising evaluations will help DFID to capitalise on the learning from our portfolio beyond individual programmes.

### **Supporting Trials in DFID**

EvU has proposed a new initiative, to support the strategic use of randomised control trials, and other rigorous impact evaluations of DFID programmes. The aim is to collect in a more strategic way, highly rigorous evidence on the effectiveness of selected DFID programmes in areas where this evidence will provide major global good, and also to help improve the design of future programmes. The proposed offer includes a strong focus on assessing the VfM of DFID aid, and the sustainability of the results it achieves.

To complement this and as part of our commitment to broadening our evaluation toolbox, EvU is also increasing investment in and support for rapid programming approaches such as Measure-Learn Adapt and the SIEF Nimble window.

### **Broadening our evaluation toolbox**

Traditional development programmes assume that problems are sufficiently well understood that we can define a best solution at the outset. However, this is often not the case, particularly in some of the challenging contexts where DFID works: programmes need to learn about their context and the best ways of addressing a problem, and then adapt to that learning. Moreover, digital technologies are now making it easier for us to work adaptively, by making data cheaper and more easily usable. To deliver such “adaptive” programmes, we need to build effective and responsive monitoring, evaluation and learning systems to suit their needs.

### **Measure-Learn-Adapt: Evaluative Behaviour for Better Delivery in Complex Environments.**

The EvU is driving a series of new initiatives to help programmes and policy move beyond a static understanding of context and linear theories of change to help programmes better adapt to complexity, uncertainty and dynamic environments. Adaptive programmes draw on systematic and deliberative learning from monitoring, evaluation and operational research to guide decision-making on approaches and interventions.

Jointly funded and managed with USAID, the Global Learning for Adaptive Management (GLAM) initiative was launched in early 2018 and will enable evidence-based adaptive management through access to, use of, and learning from better and faster monitoring and evaluation evidence. The core of GLAM's work is to:

- support the design and use of monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) systems for adaptive management;
- provide training, guidance and support about MEL for adaptive management;
- conduct research and learning about MEL for adaptive management and develop and share standards and research products with the development community.

### **Strategic Impact Evaluation Fund Nimble window**

One of the evaluation tools that is well-suited to flexible and adaptive programming is 'nimble evaluation'. This is the use of rapid, low-cost, experimental or quasi-experimental methodologies<sup>5</sup> to deliver robust and actionable evidence on an intervention or policy. The nimble approach uses existing administrative data or low-cost data collection methods, and focuses on getting programming right in the early stages, or testing methods to overcome challenges in a programme that is struggling to achieve anticipated outcomes.

The nimble evaluation approach has been used successfully in the past, but we believe it is an underutilised tool. Therefore, DFID is funding a portfolio of nimble evaluations through the SIEF at the World Bank. The competitive funding window, launched in March 2018, will not only benefit DFID, World Bank, or Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) programmes that they are focusing on, but also generate valuable portfolio-level learning on the process of implementing this approach in low and middle-income country contexts.

### **Driving quality across government and beyond**

DFID strives to ensure that any global evaluation programmes receiving UK aid, produce evidence-based solutions that help to reduce global poverty and improve VfM in the global aid system. In 2017/18, DFID continued to manage and support numerous initiatives to drive quality in evaluations across government and beyond.

### **Sharing learning and raising evaluation standards across government**

DFID's is committed to working collaboratively across government to drive forward robust, relevant, and timely monitoring and evaluation practices that support organisational learning and accountability. DFID has offered a range of support to OGDs delivering ODA in the form of access to formal accreditation, invitations to learning and training opportunities, and opening up our GEFA and EQUALS to them.

One example of our collaboration is highlighted by the cross-government monitoring and evaluating ODA group led by the EvU. This group includes representatives from all of the major ODA spending departments including the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) and Department of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy. At these meetings, staff working as Monitoring and Evaluation advisers in OGDs share learning and work together to ensure their work is aligned with international best practice. Over the past twelve months, participants have discussed topics including designing and delivering successful theory-

---

<sup>5</sup> Experimental evaluations use the random allocation of subjects between the treatment group (receiving the program) and the control group (serving as counterfactual) to estimate the impact of the programme as the difference in outcomes between the two groups. Quasi-experimental designs do not use explicit randomisation, but seek to address potential differences between the group of people who received the programme and people that did not in other ways, including the use of statistical techniques for the creation of comparison groups e.g. propensity score matching, regression discontinuity, and other regression approaches.

based evaluations and how to develop monitoring and evaluation strategies for large and complex portfolios. Participants have provided a range of positive feedbacks about the group, noting the value of the group in sharing good practice, supporting collective problem solving, and enabling monitoring and evaluation plans to be tailored to inform policy and programme decisions. Over the past 12 months, the EvU has provided long-term technical advice to two evaluations of ODA funded programmes that are being delivered by OGDs: the Fleming Fund (managed by the Department of Health) and the Prosperity Fund (managed by the FCO). The technical assistance has supported these evaluations to develop robust and relevant evaluation plans.

In addition, the EvU is providing independent quality assurance and technical support services to ODA spending government entities through EQUALS and the feedbacks so far have been positive. In future, the EvU expects greater demand for EQUALS services, and mechanisms are being put in place to enable OGDs to more easily access EQUALS services.

### **Sharing good practice about disability inclusive evaluation**

Although more than fifteen percent of the world's population has a disability ([WHO, 2011](#)), there are few resources that support evaluators and commissioners of evaluation to understand what constitutes good practice around disability inclusive evaluation. It is within this context that DFID commissioned a scoping study to support evaluation practitioners and commissioners to work in ways that are disability inclusive. The study provides practical and useful recommendations to support evaluators and commissioners to design, manage and deliver evaluations in ways that apply a rights-based and disability inclusive perspective. The EvU has worked closely with the contractor that delivered this work to design and deliver training to DFID's Evaluation and Statistics Advisers to ensure that DFID is able to commission, manage and deliver disability inclusive evaluations.

### **The Centre of Excellence for Development Impact and Learning**

[The Centre of Excellence for Development Impact and Learning](#) (CEDIL) is a new high quality, multi-disciplinary, academic centre which will drive forward the field of impact evaluation and synthesis. It brings together an international team of experts who, in 2017, have been working on methodological and good practice papers. These will lead onto the commissioning of a challenging set of studies, to be focused on DFID's priority sectors and contexts within which robust impact evaluation evidence is in short supply. Thereby, CEDIL will strengthen both the evidence base for what does or does not work in international development and, also, the methods and capacity available to undertake rigorous evaluations in challenging contexts. In 2017, the CEDIL website was launched as a platform for sharing papers, publicising events and advertising funding opportunities. At the time of writing, four initial papers are already available on the site:

- Gaps in Evaluation Methods for Addressing Challenging Contexts in Development ([Davey, et al., 2017](#));
- Approaches to evidence synthesis in international development ([Oliver, Gough, and Copestake, 2017](#));
- Complements and Alternatives to RCTs in evaluation in development ([Attanasio and Cavatorta, 2017](#));

- A map of evidence maps relating to lower-and middle-income countries ([Phillips, et al. 2017](#)).

A more substantial set of 15 further inception outputs will be finalised in the first half of 2018. In addition to these outputs, CEDIL is also currently working on an evidence gap map on disability which will inform DFID practice in this area, with key lessons and learning presented at the Disability Summit in July 2018.

## **Strengthening the use and influence of DFID’s evaluation portfolio**

Maximising the utility and strengthening the influence of DFID evaluations remains a central focus for the EvU. As part of our commitment to driving greater use and influence of DFID’s evaluation portfolio the following key activities were undertaken in 2017/18:

- The Evaluation Use and Influence Strategy and Action Plan was developed, circulated and operationalised internally. Both documents will be incorporated in the [DFID Evaluation Policy \(2013\)](#) and [Strategy \(2014-19\)](#) refresh due to take place in 2018/19;
- A pilot study to measure the use and influence of a sample of evaluations from DFID’s 2016 portfolio was completed. Findings will be used from this pilot work to inform and refine the methodology and approach to measuring the use and influence of DFID’s 2017/18 evaluation portfolio in 2018/19;
- EvU produced an internal Annual Digest of all evaluations published in 2016/17. This was circulated internally across DFID. For all evaluations published in 2017/18, digests have been produced and included in this year’s Evaluation Annual Report (Chapter6). The digests provide a brief, accessible summary of DFID’s published evaluations with links to full reports that enable findings to be disseminated to a larger audience and improve the utility of findings;
- Work has been underway to develop a standalone “Evaluation Use and Influence Training Module”. This module, which will be finalised in 2018/19, has been designed to help support staff working in evaluation to consider how best to maximise the use and influence of current and future evaluations. Content from the module will be incorporated in the refresh of DFID’s ‘Principles of Evaluation Training’.

# 5. The year ahead

Over the last year, we have invested heavily in thinking how we can continue to raise the level of ambition on evaluation in DFID to ensure even greater impact. The following are key priorities for 2018/19:

## **Strengthen learning from across DFID's portfolio**

- For priority thematic areas we will develop common indicators, linked to the Sustainable Development Goals, and put in place standard questions for future monitoring and evaluations to ensure that evaluations generate consistent and comparable evidence, suitable to be synthesised and to generate learning. This approach will be piloted in two thematic areas;
- A Business Case for a pooled Evidence Department fund is being developed. EvU will use this to commission thematic and portfolio evaluations of priority areas for DFID. Evidence from these evaluations will feed into portfolio level decision making and learning will be shared widely across DFID and beyond;
- Progress work on syntheses of evaluations in two thematic areas to draw out what DFID has learned and feed this into future programme design and portfolio level decisions;
- A trialling programme will be established to generate robust evidence in priority areas, with a focus on evaluating VfM and sustainability of effects;
- At an organisational level, shift from a decentralised evaluation model to a mixed model of evaluation.

## **Drive quicker, focused, evaluative activities across DFID to deliver timely and digestible evidence**

- The EvU will promote and use a wider range of evaluative activities across DFID to ensure programmes have relevant and robust evaluative evidence at the right times to inform decisions. This will be achieved on one hand by conducting nimble RCTs through SIEF, and on the other hand by driving forward best practice in DFID and internationally on using monitoring and evaluation for adaptive programming through GLAM. Close collaboration with other parts of DFID (e.g. Better Delivery Department) will help ensure evaluations align better with programme design and adaptive programming work;
- CEDIL will develop and adapt evaluation methods to help broaden DFID's evaluation toolbox and ensure DFID has the right tool to address complex evaluation challenges (e.g. evaluating programmes in Fragile and Conflict Affected States, generalisability challenges);
- We will work to improve the use of real time monitoring of outcome data to support adaptive programming approaches.

## **Continue to build capacity across DFID and other ODA spending Government Departments**

- CPC will work with DFID's South Asia Research Hub to deliver regionally focussed Organisational Learning and Knowledge Management training (July 2018); This



training aims to develop a broader understanding of DFID's approach to better learning across country offices, through sharing good practices and examples where effective lesson learning from evaluations and reviews has led to improvements in portfolio and programme management;

- As part of the commitment to building evaluation capacity across DFID, the Head of Profession for Evaluation will update and adapt DFID's 'Principles of Evaluation Training'. The revised structure and content will aim to, in modular format, maximise the accessibility of the training for DFID and OGD staff and complement the revisions to DFID's existing evidence learning offer;
- Improve communications on the evaluation support services and resources that exist, as part of the wider communications on evidence support services;
- Pilot an expanded support offer to OGDs including access to EQUALS, and continue to provide technical support to high priority evaluations of cross-Government funds.

### **Continue to improve the use and influence of DFID evaluations and increase learning**

- EvU will refine the methodology and approach for measuring the use and influence of DFID's 2017/18 evaluation portfolio in 2018/19;
- Improve DFID systems and processes to ensure that strengthening the use and influence of DFID evaluations are a key consideration across the lifespan of evaluations;
- Embed the 'Evaluation Use and Influence Training Module' in the refresh of DFID's 'Principles of Evaluation Training';
- Continue our commitment to DFID wide learning by promoting the uptake of evaluation digests and encouraging attendance and lesson sharing at 'What did we learn' evaluation learning seminars.

### **Ensure a clear, coherent, integrated strategy to deliver appropriate evidence at right level**

- EvU will provide a more directive role in DFID evaluation practice to ensure priority areas are evaluated and that fewer, but higher quality evaluations are conducted. It will do this by providing decision-tools for i) when to evaluate and ii) which methods to use, incentivising evaluations of key programmes by providing a combination of technical and financial support, and feeding into the Evidence Department's work to increase understanding of the wider sources of evidence;
- Explore piloting a mixed centralised/decentralised, delivery model within a specific region;
- A refresh of DFID's [Evaluation Policy \(2013\)](#) and [Strategy \(2014-19\)](#) will take place in 2018/19 and will capture the new strategic vision on evaluation.

## 6. Sharing evaluation findings and lessons learnt

Each evaluation produces two-page, digestible summaries (digests). These digests provide an excellent flavour of DFID's exciting and varied evaluation portfolio. The purpose of the digests is to share evaluation findings and lessons learnt in a readily accessible format. The digests were produced for evaluations published in 2017/18 and are included in the remainder of this report. Further detailed information and full reports are available for each evaluation online.

Each digest summarises the programme or intervention under evaluation, how the evaluation was conducted, the findings and lessons learned from the evaluations.

### Independent Evaluation of “Wealth Creation Development of Rural Markets in Zambia” Programme

#### What

Between 2012 and 2016, DFID provided £4,600,000 of funding under the [Wealth Creation Development of Rural Markets Programme in Zambia](#) (WCDRM), which aimed to facilitate rural market development. The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), also provided finance to the programme.

The Zambian not-for-profit Musika implemented the programme, providing grants and advice to private sector organisations working in agricultural input, output, finance, service, and environmental markets. Through the integration of farm households and better functioning agricultural markets, WCDRM aimed to reduce rural poverty and increase smallholder’s income. The programme aimed to contribute to building the human and physical capacity of private sector companies as well as developing their strategic alliances and networks. These companies could improve their outreach to farmers regarding the products and services they offer. It was envisaged that this would in turn improve agricultural practices (to increase productivity) as farmers accessed better knowledge and locally available markets. It was anticipated that other firms would ‘crowd-in’, and farmers more broadly would ‘copy’ and adopt these practices.

This evaluation assessed WCDRM’s performance. Specifically, its objectives were to inform and contribute to the effective implementation of the programme, contribute to the evidence-base on what works in Zambia, inform the international debate on the value of the Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) approach, now more commonly referred to as Market Systems Development, and inform DFID, as well as the Government of Zambia and other stakeholders of sustainable approaches to developing market systems and the interventions that have the greatest impact.

#### How

The approach to the evaluation was theory-based, testing the cause and effect mechanism outlined in the WCDRM’s theory of change, to assess whether the programme’s interventions had produced their intended results. To this end, contribution analysis was used to explore the validity of causal links in the result-chains underlining the programme’s individual interventions. These were assessed through a case study approach, in which six case studies (from the twenty-four supported interventions) were selected during the inception phase.

The evaluation primarily utilised qualitative methods, including key informant interviews and focus-group discussions, with supplementary quantitative data used where available and applicable.

#### Findings

Overall the evaluation evidenced some systemic change, especially in the supply and/or demand-side market growth, which saw moderate improvements from the WCDRM programme. Nonetheless, there was variable effectiveness across all the interventions (The Weather Index Insurance and ATS Agrochemicals were most effective, whereas Zammilk and GroAfrica, were less effective, for example). There was less evidence of success regarding the systemic change in ‘crowding in’ and / or ‘copying’, which proved more challenging. It is worth noting that markets are dynamic and their growth depends on a number of factors that require ‘unlocking’ with further changes being possible after the evaluation had been completed.

The evaluation results identify as key to the success of the interventions favourable market conditions, the implementing partner giving priority to the intervention, having a critical mass of support in the same market system, success in the facilitation of change amongst support providers, the viability of the business model.

There is evidence that the sustainability of interventions is mixed, and is dependent on factors generally unique to each. The availability of market-related financial data would help strengthen sustainability arguments overall.

Results were mixed on gender: results suggest that men are more likely to enjoy the results of intervention benefits due to their role in cash crops. Musika is increasing interventions that specifically targets women.

### **Lessons Learned**

This evaluation outlines ten key lessons learned, of benefit to DFID and SIDA regarding their programming, as well as to Musika, and the development community in the region:

In-depth market-systems analysis benefits the development of market systems by articulating restraints and developing appropriate interventions. Significant investment by private sector partners is required to serve the smallholder farmer. Successful interventions are more likely if the intervention is part of the private partner's business strategy. Broader impact and scale-up benefits greatly from collaboration between market actors. Demonstration effects are unlikely to occur organically but should be promoted explicitly through complementary intervention strategies. There should be intervention strategies to promote gender impacts, as these are unlikely to occur organically. There is potential for significant synergies between ongoing development programmes in the region. It is crucial that farmers are provided with extension services in addition to any technical assistance. To achieve success, it is important that all parties are committed to the intervention, and a flexible, adaptable coordinated approach is followed.

### **Publication Information**

- [GDSI UK \(2017\)](#), Independent Evaluation of Wealth Creation Development of Rural Markets in Zambia.
- [Management Response \(2017\)](#).

# Africa >>> Governance

## The Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Project for the DFID Nigeria State Level Programme

### What

The purpose of the [Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Programme \(IMEP\)](#) for

State Level Programmes (SLPs) was to support, and contribute to Nigeria being able to achieve the [Millennium Development Goals](#).

SLPs were designed as a comprehensive suite of programmes that aimed to strengthen the delivery and management of basic services, including access to health care and education through a combination of sector support and State governance interventions. In addition, SLPs aimed to support Nigerians to have a voice and to demand accountability from duty bearers. This evaluation specifically looked at the performance of SLPs from 2011 onwards (the programmes began in 2008).



Image credit: Lindsay Mgbor, Department for International Development.

### How

All SLPs were evaluated using mid-term, annual, and project completion reviews, and incorporated third party data sets (for example the Citizens' perceptions survey, and other studies undertaken through this evaluation and through the SLPs themselves). Therefore, the data under review was largely secondary in nature.

It should be noted that there were several constraints to this evaluation, namely data paucity particularly at national and state level, for example data pertaining to education enrolment and retention, and child and maternal health.

### Findings

The evaluation identified both strengths and weaknesses of the SLPs. The strengths were that the SLPs had contributed across the five states to improvements in capacity and systems, and demonstrations of approaches to improving service delivery. Specifically, SLPs were aligned with the development needs of Nigeria and included:

- a noticeable increase in education and health care spending in the states where the project was implemented;
- school based management, and health facility committees acting as agents of change and facilitating advocacy initiatives;
- a body of well-documented lessons and experiences.

In addition to evident gains and noticeable changes, there are also significant limitations. In particular, there is limited evidence that improvements in sector management, capacity or accountability have led to improved service delivery or citizen outcomes. There have been significant differences across states, and there are clear concerns about state spending to sustain improvements brought about by SLPs. The role of local governments as service providers was only addressed to a very limited extent.

In conclusion the type of improvements delivered by the SLPs may be necessary, but were not sufficient to lead to improved system performance and service delivery.

### **Lessons Learned**

Key Lessons have been identified as follows:

- If DFID is to continue to work in Nigeria, a comprehensive long-term engagement plan is needed;
- There should be more flexibility in how resources are allocated across the states depending on political will and ability to support reforms;
- For service delivery to be enhanced at state level, more transparency is needed, as are more conducive working relationships between Central and State governments. Furthermore, issues of capacity need to be monitored, especially in the changing political landscape;
- There is a significant step from improving the use of public resources and building sector capacity to improvements in development indicators and citizen's lives. This needs to be better understood and considered in order to deliver outcomes and impact;
- For Nigeria stakeholders, there are challenges with accessing strong federal leadership combined with uneven and often inadequate service delivery of key public resources. Development assistance is most effective when there strong and transparent leadership.

### **Publication Information**

- [Oxford Policy Management, ECORYS, The Policy Practice, and Phillips Consulting \(2017\).](#) The Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Project for the DFID Nigeria State Level Programmes (IMEP).
- [Management Response \(2017\).](#)

### Integrated Evaluation Report of the “Working to Improve Nutrition in Northern Nigeria” programme

#### What

The [Working to Improve Nutrition in Northern Nigeria \(WINNN\) Programme](#) was a 6-year (2011 - March 2019) programme funded by DFID. The programme's objective was to raise political awareness about malnutrition in Nigeria and help to build government systems and capacity and to advocate for funding. Interventions were limited to five states; Katsina, Kebbi, Zamfara, Jigawa and Yobe who functioned as pilot states to test evidence-based nutrition-specific interventions to tackle malnutrition. These included integration of micro-nutrient supplementation interventions into routine primary health services at state level, treatment of severe acute malnutrition through community-based management of acute malnutrition (CMAM), supporting biannual Maternal Newborn and Child Health Weeks (MNCHW), and delivery of effective infant and young child feeding (IYCF) interventions.

The evaluation conducted over five years was to summarise WINNN's impact and formulate recommendations to support the institutionalisation of interventions within routine primary healthcare services.

#### How

The programme was assessed through the Operations Research and Impact Evaluation (ORIE) conducted by a consortium of research institutions, led by Oxford Policy Management (OPM). ORIE draws on four types of methodologies: operations research, mixed-methods impact evaluation, economic evaluation, and gender analysis.

ORIE was only contracted a year after the WINNN programme had already started and as a result baseline data was collected a year late. Also, endline data was collected about 18 months before the WINNN programme finished in order to disseminate findings before the closure, so further changes might have happened within the last year which were not captured.

#### Findings

Overall, the evaluation found that WINNN has made significant achievements in raising political awareness and in increasing capacity to implement nutrition services into the primary healthcare system. This has led to a significant increase in funding from other donors and government which together with the increased attention from civil society, community and media will support WINNN's sustainability. Two of the WINNN programme's pilots (CMAM and IYCF) were found to be very cost-effective with progress being made in political uptake. However, there is still insufficient funding to scale up the interventions and shortages of adequately trained staff at primary health care



Image credit: Melkamnesh Alemu, Department for International Development.

facilities. There is also a need for large investments in Primary Health Care delivery and the required infrastructure and equipment.

The programme was found effective as mothers' attendance at MNCHW events and IYCF counselling increased significantly in Local Government Areas (LGAs). However, coverage of WINNN's key interventions remained low since the programme was designed to test Nutrition service delivery through public health systems in only three LGAs per state.

Positive changes were observed in behaviour such as exclusive breastfeeding and father's attitudes and knowledge about child feeding and nutrition. A gender-sensitive and inclusive approach was adopted by reaching out to remote areas targeting women.

Even though not all improvements could be attributed to WINNN, the programme has had a significant effect on mother's knowledge of IYCF. However, there were no significant changes in the prevalence of child stunting, wasting, and underweight. This was not an unexpected result, given the programme was not delivering interventions that increase access to adequate nutritious food, water, sanitation services and given the overall short timeframe that the programme was in implementation.

A key finding was the fact that it is critical to implement nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions concurrently.

Overall, WINNN was found to be relevant to national requirements and it helped to integrate nutrition into wider national policies including the National Policy on Food and Nutrition security.

### **Lessons Learned**

Lessons learned can be synthesized as follows:

- Concurrent implementation of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions is paramount to tackling the underlying causes of child malnutrition. The limited progress towards this, suggests the need for a more integrated response;
- WINNN has successfully increased political awareness and support for addressing malnutrition and women and child health, building government capacity to improve nutrition services. However, in order to scale up the programme and achieve sustainable, effective outcomes, public funding needs to be increased significantly to cover human resources, infrastructure and equipment.

### **Publication Information**

The evaluation was conducted by the ORIE consortium, which included: OPM, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Institute of Development Studies, and Save the Children International in the UK; and University of Ibadan and Food Basket Foundation International in Nigeria.

- [Hansford et al. \(2017\)](#). Integrated Evaluation Report of the WINNN Programme.
- [Management Response \(2017\)](#).



## Independent Evaluation of the Health Transition Fund Programme in Zimbabwe

### What

The Health Transition Fund (HTF) was a four-year programme that ran from 2012-2015 as a response to increasing rates of maternal and child mortality in Zimbabwe ([Maternal and New Born Child Health, Zimbabwe](#)). It was designed to support the government combat these undesirable trends by strengthening health systems and scaling up the implementation of high impact interventions through the health sector, targeting women of reproductive age, mothers and children under five. The programme's key components included maternal, maternal, new born and child health care (MNCH); medical products, vaccines and commodities; Human Resources for health; health policy, planning and finance. These were addressed through interventions including capacity building of primary care health workers, a retention scheme for key workers, procurement and distribution of essential medicines and supplies, introduction of a results –based facility financing mechanism, support to monitoring and planning at district level and training and deployment of village health workers.

This final evaluation of the HTF programme commenced after completion of the HTF programme activities. It aimed to assess the extent to which HTF strategies, approaches and the overall intervention logic contributed to changing the health situation of maternal and child health, and to determine how efficiently resources had been used. In addition to identifying whether intended results by the end of 2015 had been achieved, it aimed to document lessons learnt and identify success factors and areas to be improved. It was the final evaluation following a baseline study, midterm review and annual reviews that were conducted throughout the duration of the programme.

### How

The evaluation used a mixed methods approach utilising both quantitative and qualitative methods and both primary and secondary sources of data. Data collection took place across Zimbabwe in March 2016. The HTF's logframe was used as a guiding tool throughout the evaluation to assist the evaluation team in reviewing progress of the programme and its final achievements.

Primary data sources included a health services assessment, key informant interviews and focus groups. The former of these was conducted nationwide through a modular survey administered at three levels of the health system to assess the availability of health services at primary care and district level. Thirty key informant interviews and twenty focus group discussions were conducted with a view to collecting perspectives of stakeholders at various levels in the health system.

Purposive sampling was used to identify and recruit participants who came from districts varying in terms of socio-economic and health characteristics. Thematic analysis and coding was used to qualitatively analyse transcribed material from these interviews.

Secondary data sources included reports and data sets obtained through Ministry of Health and Child Care, Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys and Demographic and Health Surveys, HTF partners and a broad literature search by the evaluation team. The criteria for their use was that they must be relevant (i.e. relate to the health sector in Zimbabwe), be of quality and from reliable sources and be useful for addressing the evaluation questions and elements from the HTF logframe. A systematic approach was taken to review these documents, to triangulate information and validate key findings.

### Findings

Findings for each of the evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness/efficiency, impact and sustainability) were generally positive:

- Relevance: The HTF programme was found to be fully consistent with global health policies, strategies and targets, and it was aligned to national health and nutrition policies

and strategies, and complementary to other initiatives implemented in Zimbabwe. The HTF was also found to be relevant to key identified priorities of target groups for maternal and child care however, barriers to accessing health care persist, as do bottlenecks in accessing quality care. The HTF has been catalytic for enhancing governance and coordination at national level, and local level through Health Care Committees. Overall, governance mechanisms at national and local level had scope for further improvement but both internal and external accountability mechanisms have been partially improved at local level;

- **Effectiveness:** The evaluation has shown there to be consistent progress since 2012 in achieving the intended results, although targets were only partially achieved. Regarding maternal, new born and child health, the availability of essential services has been restored and maintained at high level across the country, but a systemic approach to community health was lacking and Village Health Workers encounter operational challenges in performing their duties; targets in expanding community health services were not met. Regarding medicines and supplies, availability was secured across the country at primary level and the provision of blood coupons supported improving availability of blood transfusion services. Immunization supplies were also guaranteed across the country. In terms of human resources for health, availability of health care workers improved however, constraints remained due to recruitment freezes. Pre-service training capacity of the health system improved as did in-service training and the health retention scheme for retaining health workers has proved effective. Regarding health policy, planning and financing, the HTF significantly contributed to the design and operationalization of national policies: District Health Executives developed annual plans and held management meetings. There was evidence to suggest charging user fees was a reduced practice, and that a results-based financing scheme could yield positive results;
- **Efficiency:** The HTF was largely implemented as per defined and approved plans and budget and donors were found to be effective in fulfilling their commitments to the HTF. More than 80% of the HTF expenditure focused on key strategies identified to support the health system and evidence was found of flexibility in adjusting plans and budgets to emerging priorities and needs. With regards to good use of resources, it was found that relevant stakeholders perceived investment in a pooled funding mechanism to be a comparatively efficient aid mechanism. UNICEF was found to have offered good value for money in managing the HTF, but there was evidence of some operational challenges in implementing the Results Based Financing mechanism, and there was a potential to improve efficiency of the health retention scheme part of the programmes. That aside, procurement and distribution of medicines and supplies was highly efficient;
- **Impact:** Overall, impact and outcome level targets set by the HTF were not fully achieved; none of the impact level indicators and only three out of fifteen outcome indicators were fully achieved, although there was significant progress in key areas such as maternal and infant mortality, stunting and immunisation rates. The HTF has demonstrated improvements in coverage of essential maternal and new-born health care interventions though and this was consistent across provinces but demonstrating inequities;
- **Sustainability:** The results achieved through the HTF and strategies set in place were found to be fully owned by the government, however ownership was at risk of being undermined by uncertainty, inefficiencies and information asymmetry. It was also found that results would not be sustained in the short term without additional external assistance, and they would not be sustained in the medium term without a transition strategy aimed at strengthening local capacity and systems.

### **Lessons Learned**

Lessons learnt from the programme, expressed as recommendations, include:

- The potential benefits of creating a leaner and strategic steering committee supported by dedicated technical experts, and that a simplified and more focused monitoring and

evaluation mechanism could be used to assess progress at both national and local level focusing on core desired outcomes and key performance indicators;

- Harmonising and simplifying financing mechanisms to enhance efficiency and effectiveness, ultimately saving resources and continued support should be given to procurement and supply of health products for the programme;
- The link between staffing shortages, heavy workloads and health worker demotivation should be addressed. Supporting retention efforts and a broader strategic approach to human resource planning and management is also important. Acceleration was required regarding investment in village health workers, and a realistic longer-term disengagement or exit strategy and action plan should be put into place to promote sustainability.

### **Publication Information**

[Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine \(2018\)](#). Independent Evaluation of the Health Transition Fund in Zimbabwe.

# Africa >>> Livelihoods

## Midterm Evaluation of the “Livelihood Enhancement Through Agricultural Development” Programme

### What

The [Livelihood Enhancement through Agricultural Development \(LEAD\) Programme](#) is a four-year programme being undertaken in Tanzania aiming to increase the income of Tanzanian smallholder farmers who produce Tanzania's staple crop; maize, as well as assist poultry farmers. Though poultry farming is mainly for household food consumption and not mass production, it is a vital source of income, especially for women and for families when there are school fees that need to be paid as well as unforeseen expenses. Though the demand for maize is high, smallholder farmers are known to have market access issues and many farmers are unable to withstand stresses and shocks. The programme uses the Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) approach which aims to establish lasting and sustainable links between farmers and facilitate farmers' access to agricultural markets. Improved farming skills and access to new technologies is also a key component of the programme. The programme aims to improve the lives of 105,000 households across 15 regions. The outputs of the project are to: i) improve local, regional and national markets access, ii) improve the quality and availability of farming inputs and technologies, iii) support farmers to have increased access to agri-finance, and iv) identify the gaps in the value chain for maize and poultry.



Image credit: Russell Watkins, Department for International Development.

### How

The midterm evaluation was guided by the overall programme's Theory of Change and used the Adapt-Respond-Expand conceptual framework to explore systemic change and to consider the programme's progress to date. Both primary and secondary data were employed during the evaluation using a mixed methods approach. The methods of inquiry used were focus groups, interviews, and a household quantitative survey.

### Findings

- **Relevance:** The project was considered relevant as it addresses the needs of the target communities. It also facilitates and complements the agricultural development objectives of the Tanzanian Government, the African Union, and DFID. There is a distinct link between the micro and the macro scales of relevance. Women account for 51% of the projects beneficiaries, therefore demonstrating a strong element of gender equity;

- **Impact:** Poultry farmers have seen an increase in their income and their livestock are of a higher quality. Loan usage has increased, and strategies pertaining to market access have improved. Maize production has increased, however the maize that is being produced has not generated increased cash incomes as it is being used for household food consumption. An important unanticipated impact is that there has been an emergence of the importance of group membership amongst small-scale farmers;
- **Effectiveness:** Farmers who have been introduced to agrovets and agrodealers reported high interactions as well as high levels of trust. However, the uptake of new technologies has been hindered due to financial barriers, this is even if agrifinance loans have surpassed their initial targets. An important concern is the loan repayment terms;
- **Efficiency:** There has been a significant increase in the income of many of the farmers, especially poultry farmers. Market linkages have been developed, and there are effective communication channels. The biggest challenge is high staff turnover as well as an uncertainty of who will continue to initiate after the programme has finished. As the programme has the role of both a service provider as well as a market facilitator the M4P approach may not be the most suitable one;
- **Sustainability:** Workshops are an important tool for LEAD and farmers find workshops useful. However, although farmers are keen to attend workshops due to the perceived benefits, it is unclear if the farmers themselves will be able to run workshops without the help of LEAD staff once the programme has finished;
- **Crosscutting issues:** The programme has involved a high number of women; however, women have less knowledge with regards to maize production and selling compared to their male counterparts. It is unclear how a gender analysis lens has informed programme programming.

### Lessons Learned

Key lessons learned included:

- Although the M4P approach has some weaknesses, the programme's Theory of Change was found to mainly hold true. This is mainly due to the service provision role that is undertaken by LEAD;
- Groups have been developed, though it is unclear if they will evolve once the project has finished. This is something that could be addressed in future programmes. Groups should be encouraged to discuss their learning experience;
- Information sharing is important, however implementing models need to be more culturally relative;
- Though successes have been achieved, farmers continue to sell poultry on an individual basis when money is needed;
- Evidence of achieving value for money was limited, and an area that the LEAD programme should address in the future.

### Publication Information

- [Itad UK and Oxford Policy Management \(2017\)](#). Tanzania LEAD - The Mid-term Evaluation Report.
- [Management Response \(2018\)](#).

# Africa >>> Social Development

## Child Development Grant Programme Evaluation (Nigeria): Midline Report

### What

The [Child Development Grant Programme](#) (CDGP) is a DFID funded pilot programme operating in the Zamfara and Jigawa states of northern Nigeria and implemented by Save the Children and Action Against Hunger. Between 2013 and 2019, it is aiming to test an approach for reducing widespread poverty, hunger and malnutrition. This approach consists of two components, i) an unconditional, monthly cash transfer of 4000 NGN a month to pregnant women and mothers of children under two, and ii) a counselling and behaviour change programme. The cash transfer aims to address the economic causes of inadequate dietary intake and is expected to contribute to increased food security and improved nutrition in children. The counselling and behaviour change component aims to provide communities with education and advice about nutrition and health, influencing maternal and childcare knowledge and practices. This is done through either 'low intensity' or 'high intensity' delivery of Behaviour Change Campaigns (BCC).

The programme evaluation seeks to provide an understanding of the impact of the programme's components on the households and communities it has supported, through testing six key hypotheses underpinning the programme's Theory of Change. Three of these hypotheses were tested through this quantitative component of the evaluation, and are as follows: i) the CDGP intervention will result in the consumption of larger quantities and more varied types of food which will cause an increase in dietary intake and subsequent reduction in child malnutrition; ii) the provision of regular, predictable cash transfers will result in a reduction in negative risk-coping behaviour, particularly the distress sale of assets and debt accumulation amongst beneficiary households; and iii) the knowledge, attitudes and practices of targeted people will improve following the nutritional advice and counselling provided by the programme.

### How

This quantitative, midline report forms part of an overall impact assessment and evaluation of the CDGP. For this element of the evaluation, a cluster randomized control trial was conducted, whereby randomly selected villages were assigned to either a control or treatment group. The control group did not receive any intervention under the CDGP, the treatment group received either cash transfers and 'low intensity' BCC, or cash transfers and 'high intensity' BCC. Data was collected from households across both groups in 2014 for baseline and again in 2016 for the midline assessment. It is envisaged that an endline survey will be conducted in 2018.

The impacts of the CDGP have been estimated by comparing the outcomes of women and their families who were pregnant at baseline living in CDGP communities, with pregnant women residing in non-CDGP communities.

### Findings

Overall, participation in the CDGP amongst eligible households was high, with higher rates of participation in Jigawa than Zamfara state. In most households, women reported exerting control over how money from the cash transfer is spent, and this was predominantly on food and also other child related expenditures. Regarding the BCC component of the programme, posters and food demonstrations were the most frequently reported mechanism for information dissemination from women, and for men radio and posters were the most frequent. These are both examples of 'low intensity BCC'. No differences were found between the high and low intensity CDGP communities in terms of reported access to BCC.

The evaluation found:

- The CDGP had no overall impact on household income and livelihoods, but there was some, limited improvements for women alone through increased earnings and animal ownership. This partly supports hypothesis ii;

- The CDGP has had a positive impact on the knowledge, attitudes and practices of women relating to maternal health and infant and young child feeding practices, with women in CDGP communities being more likely to correctly identify, for example, that colostrum is good for their baby or that it is best to start breast feeding within thirty minutes of giving birth than women in non CDGP communities. Importantly, such indicators have also been affected positively for men, indicating that the knowledge from CDGP is spread to women's husbands and wider family members as well. This supports hypothesis iii);
- There has been a positive impact on household demographics, poverty, expenditure, food security and sanitation due to the CDGP. Monthly household food expenditure was found to increase by more than 90% of the size of the transfer, and more households stated they had enough food to eat at different times of the year. This partly supports hypothesis i. There was found to be a greater percentage of births between the baseline and midline of women in CDGP communities compared to those in non CDGP communities;
- There was a positive impact of the CDGP on child health and development indicators outside of nutrition, such as statistically significant increases in the number of children receiving vaccinations, getting deworming treatment, and suffering diarrhoea, some of which are associated with malnutrition.

### Lessons Learned

This evaluation has identified a number of lessons learnt based on the findings and impact of the programme to date:

- The CDGP is reaching very vulnerable populations with a high incidence of serious health and nutrition problems. Women usually receive their first cash transfer payment around the time of delivery, but this has varied widely across the women participants. They do, however generally retain control of the cash transfer and most of it is spent on food;
- Lesson for BCC implementation: there was no significant difference in implementation between 'high' and 'low' intensity BCC communities, and in practice BCC is implemented in a fairly consistent manner anyway. It is important to provide BCC through multiple different channels, though as different people access messages from different sources. Particularly women access through different channels than their husbands;
- The CDGP has positive impacts on the health, nutrition, and development of young children proving that a combination of cash transfers and information provision can generate important changes for young children. It has led to an increase in height of children but not to an increase in weight. Stunting rates have improved but only for children who were born during the implementation period of the CDGP, not prior to this. Overall more children have been born to women living in CDGP communities, however the populations here are still malnourished and subject to substantial food insecurity despite the programme's positive impacts;
- The CDGP can be a viable social protection instrument with important implications for health and wellbeing of children during their first thousand days, but the programme will need review and adjustment if it is to become a less resource intensive, scalable, national programme.

### Publication information

The evaluation was conducted by e-Pact, a consortium led by Oxford Policy Management and co-managed with Itad, and in association with the Institute for Fiscal Studies.

- Carneiro et al. (2018). Nigeria Child Development Grant Programme Evaluation. Quantitative Midline Report [Volume I: Midline findings](#).
- Carneiro et al. (2018). Nigeria Child Development Grant Programme Evaluation. Quantitative Midline Report [Volume II: Midline Technical Compendium](#)
- [Management Response \(2018\)](#).

## Process Evaluation of the Pakistan IIm Ideas Education Innovation Programme (Phase II)

### What

[IIM \("Learning"\) Ideas 2](#) is a four-year education programme providing grants and technical support which began in March 2015. It is a continuation of the work that was implemented in IIm ("Learning") Ideas 1. The overall objective of the programme is to increase access and improve learning outcomes for 250,000 Pakistani children by taking proven innovative ideas in education to scale, and to develop the required business and commercial capabilities in Pakistan that can continue to support education innovations beyond the lifetime of the programme. It aims to facilitate 50,000 new enrolments amongst the poorest and most marginalized households, of which 50 percent should be girls; and support 15,000 children to complete one grade and enter another. In addition to specific educational outcomes for children, the project aims to create a 'self-sustaining community enabled to continue investment in evidence-based education solutions'.

### How

This is the second process evaluation that has been conducted during the programme's life cycle. The purpose of the 2016 evaluation was to learn from the delivery process to help identify changes that can improve the programme's implementation, and as a result its future effectiveness for the remainder of the programme. It was guided by the project's Theory of Change and logframe. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used, more specifically: semi-structured interviews, a telephone survey and a document review of relevant programme and project documents. The evaluation data was collated, triangulated and assessed against a traffic light rating system as follows:

- Green - a strong performance against plan and agreed scope of work in performance area, which stands out as an example of good practice;
- Green-Amber - performed well against plan and agreed scope of work in performance area. Some improvements could be made to strengthen performance in this area;
- Amber-Red – under-performance against plan and agreed scope of work in performance area. Significant improvements could be made to strengthen performance in this area;
- Red – poor performance against plan and agreed scope of work in performance area. Urgent remedial actions required to address significant under-performance in this area.

### Findings

- Using the process evaluation rating, (PER), at this stage of the project's life cycle there are several challenges. Of the areas evaluated the majority have a PER of Amber-Red. This implies that the programme has some way to go if it is to meet its objectives. Areas of specific weakness centred around the assumptions that were made about the programme meeting the needs of the grantees, and the programme's limited adaptability to challenges that were encountered. At this stage of the four-year project there is a major underspend, also affecting progress;
- The fund managers have directly provided grantees with technical support, but more broadly the programme needs to define how partnerships with other actors in the educational sector can be developed and maintained;
- Grants relating to the proposed scale up of the project in cycle 2 have not been made, the possible implications of this being that the objectives of the project may not be met;
- There is a lack of shared vision between DFID and the fund manager in relation to who they think should benefit from this project;



- A key support organisation was unable to gain visas to Pakistan, which presented challenges. Finally, DFID and the fund managers are yet to be successful in acquiring investment funding. As highlighted in the [Management Response](#) publication, all recommendations spelled out in the evaluation report have been well received, accepted, and taken on board by the management of the program: specifically, the program strategic framework as well as the log frame have been reviewed to better clarify objectives and plans to achieve them, a more standardized and systematic approach to deliver capacity building has been developed to ensure a more proportionate fund manager's technical engagement with grantees, and stakeholder engagement activities have been intensified.

### **Lessons Learned**

The key area of learning has been how to identify and define specific educational issues against which solutions can be tested which are feasible within the market. This makes it challenging, without intervention, to make markets work for the poorest. This learning has helped maintain the project's focus on equity without compromising on a new emphasis on commercial viability of the innovative ideas.

At time of writing (March 2018), the programme is supporting 11 large projects and 16 start ups and the majority of them are well placed on both equity and commercial sustainability goals in the new round of the performance evaluation starting from May 2018.

### **Publication Information**

- [Coffey \(2017\)](#). Process Evaluation Report.
- [Management Response \(2017\)](#).

## Growth in Rural Economies & Agriculture in Tajikistan: Final Evaluation

### What

The [Growth in Rural Economy and Agriculture in Tajikistan](#) (GREAT) Programme was funded by DFID and the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development to alleviate poverty in an inclusive manner by boosting economic growth in rural areas. GREAT focused on: i) strengthening the business enabling environment, ii) increasing economic activity in agricultural, food processing and energy efficient products through the private sector, iii) improving access to financial services, and iv) Increasing revenues through cross-border trade. The evaluation assesses the performance of GREAT over the period 2013-2016. It also provides recommendations to inform future programming and government policy on growth in the rural economy and agri-businesses.

### How

The end-of-programme evaluation employed a mixed-methods approach to collect primary data including 68 key informant interviews, 334 structured interviews, 35 focus group discussions, and an electronic survey. The selection of programme participants invited to take part in the evaluation was based on a combination of structured and cluster sampling. Purposive selection ensured the inclusion of women in focus group discussions and interviews.

Primary data collection was complemented by literature review, analysis of secondary data including official statistics and national data, programme documentation, and wider data sets generated by

implementing partners and internationally available data sets such as FAOStat3.

The original evaluation aimed to incorporate value for money assessments but due to the limited availability of data, the value for money assessment was restricted to the Agriculture-related Output using Benefit Cost Analysis.



Image credit: Department for International Development.

### Findings

The evaluation found that the GREAT programme was highly relevant to and aligned with Tajikistan's economic situation, and implemented efficiently. The programme was based on a good understanding of the policy context and addressed relevant factors. It was, however, difficult to relate specific outcomes solely to the programme's achievements because they may also have been impacted by other organisations' interventions.

There was evidence that the programme may not have been as efficient as possible due to the lack of coordination between programme managers as well as unforeseen institutional complications. Some of the initial targets set out in the logframe were unrealistic and some

indicators were not adjusted over time which meant that some significant achievements were not reported as part of the overall result framework.

Despite unrealistic expectations of what a limited regional initiative could achieve in securing changes at the national level, GREAT established sustainable structures and mechanisms to improve dialogue between the government and the private sector. GREAT was successful in developing low-cost fee-based advisory and business support services with promising signs of sustainability of such services. GREAT contributed to a significantly increased agricultural productivity, with a net annual income increase of USD 10 million for five major crops. GREAT also helped expand the production and sale of energy-efficient products, mainly wooden windows, doors and energy-efficient stoves, from rural to urban areas. It helped microfinance institutions to develop tailor-made loans and savings products for farmers, crafts people and starts-ups. The wider use of responsible lending principles and the promotion of financial literacy also were assessed as having a sustainable benefit. The programme helped improve cross-border trade relations between Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan and Afghanistan, ultimately benefiting communities who live in cross-border areas. It achieved this by creating the physical markets themselves, assisting traders make effective contact with each other, raising awareness of business opportunities and providing legal and administrative support. For agriculture, energy efficiency, and promoting cross-border trade, GREAT demonstrated that through engaging market forces effectively, it allows donor interventions to achieve greater value for money and sustainability.

### **Lessons Learned**

Lessons on programme design are the following:

- A holistic approach to growth in the rural economy is better served by a more cohesive programme management structure, rather than distinct or separate teams for each output;
- The potential for conflict between rural economic growth and inequality issues, particularly poverty and gender, should be addressed during programme design. These twin aims should be built in from the outset, possible contradictions identified, and measures put in place to address them;
- Gender was not well mainstreamed. Although attention was paid to reaching and including women, there was not a comprehensive gender approach which would have helped the programme address issues in relation to how they affect both women and men.

### **Publication Information**

- [iMC worldwide \(2017\)](#). Growth in Rural Economy & Agriculture in Tajikistan – Final Evaluation.
- [Management Response \(2017\)](#).

## The Evaluation of the International Forestry Knowledge Programme

### What

The [International Forestry Knowledge Programme](#) (KNOWFOR) was a DFID-funded £38 million forestry project implemented between March 2012 and October 2016. The purpose of this global programme was to improve the way knowledge on forests is understood and used internationally. The programme worked across a wide range of forestry and land use themes while focusing on forest landscape restoration, forest governance, mobilising investment for forests and land use management, and the relationships between forests, livelihoods, climate change, gender, and economic development. The overall aim of the programme was to increase the interaction between policy-makers and forestry practitioners and to fill knowledge gaps with evidence. The implementing partners were The Centre for International Forestry Research, The International Union for the Conservation of Nature, and the World Bank Programme on Forests.



Image credit: Department for International Development.

### How

The primary focus of the evaluation was assessing the effectiveness and success of the project. A secondary focus was on value for money and the project approach. The evaluation process was partner led, with representatives of the implementing partners participating in the evaluation and conducting the majority of the data collection. The evaluation design used was the Collaborative Outcomes Reporting approach, with the project logframe guiding the evaluation. The evaluation used both primary data collection and secondary data analysis, with the primary qualitative method being semi-structured interviews. Evidence sources included nine deep-dive case studies, 19 outcome stories, 8 lessons learned stories, and a programme-wide results chart.

### Findings

Key findings were identified as:

- The cumulative targets for all the implemented global projects was vastly exceeded, and KNOWFOR was found to be successful in facilitating policy makers, as well as forestry practitioners to increase their knowledge in the areas of forestry and land use. The result being that practitioners and policy-makers now have access to a range of knowledge, research, scientific and technical products, resources, and tools;
- A range of audiences have had their knowledge enhanced, be this at the micro or macro levels;

- The projects that were supported were all different and though all performed well, some were more productive than others especially in terms of meeting the needs of women and girls;
- Implementing partners of KNOWFOR, have been able to influence national policies, for example, in Brazil issues pertaining to gender have now been included in the Brazilian National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. This noted, the degree in to which policy changes happened varied from case-to-case, and in some cases attributing a more modest role in change may be appropriate.

### Lessons Learned

Key lessons were identified as:

- Issues related to gender inequality should be focused more on impact rather than women's participation and, to varying extent, all implementing partners could improve this;
- Theories of change should continue to be supported by the appropriate Design Monitoring Evaluation and Learning leads for each implementing partner as well as be implemented in all DFID projects;
- All implementing partners need to improve how they monitor and track the people who they have reached with the relevant project knowledge. This is especially relevant when capturing the usage of social media data;
- Though returns are thought to be high, all partners as well as DFID could give a greater focus to value for money;
- The partners who have undertaken this work, are in direct competition with each other for development funding, thus there were instances where it was not possible to discuss implementing limitations openly.

### Publication Information

- [Clear Horizon Consulting \(2017\)](#). International Forestry Knowledge Programme (KNOWFOR): Final Evaluation.
- [Management Response \(2018\)](#).

## Mid-term Evaluation of the Results-Based Financing for Low Carbon Energy Access Facility within Energising Development

### What

The [Results Based Financing for Low Carbon Energy Access Programme](#) is part of the global Energising Development (EnDev) programme, a partnership between the Netherlands, Germany, Norway, the UK, Switzerland, and Sweden. It aims to open access to clean energy in low income countries and gives incentives to private sector businesses that deliver and operate clean energy products, services, or systems. The project has so far been implemented in selected countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, South East Asia and Peru during three rounds with funding of approximately 47 million Euros.

### How

This mid-term evaluation assesses the performance of the programme from its implementation in July 2012 until December 2016. It is the fourth phase of a multi-phase evaluation process. Of the 17 projects that are being implemented within the EnDev programme, 12 of these were evaluated. Though achievements were noted by the evaluation, a greater emphasis was placed on documenting learning from the programme and developing recommendations. The evaluation included both primary and secondary data collection, with the primary methods being semi-structured interviews.



Image credit: Abbie Trayler-Smith (Panos Pictures), Department for International Development

This mid-term evaluation assesses the performance of the programme from its implementation in July 2012 until December 2016. It is the fourth phase of a multi-phase evaluation process. Of the 17 projects that are being implemented within the EnDev programme, 12 of these were evaluated. Though achievements were noted by the evaluation, a greater emphasis was placed on documenting learning from the programme and developing recommendations. The evaluation included both

primary and secondary data collection, with the primary methods being semi-structured interviews.

## Findings

- Nearly 350,000 results-based financing users gained access to modern energy services. Although potential users were and are all treated the same, regardless of their socioeconomic status, people from poorer backgrounds have benefitted due to results-based financing being implemented in rural and hard to reach areas where levels of poverty can be high. The projects in the implementing countries are guided by varying governmental policies, several of which are volatile and have a degree of uncertainty. This in itself is seen as being a significant challenge. Therefore, it was concluded that it is imperative that the programme aligns itself to pre-existing energy projects;
- The inception period for the programme took longer than planned, this is therefore reflected in the success of the project. As of December 2016, only 13% of sales target had been achieved;
- Where incentives were offered, it was found in general that results-based financing ensured market acceleration, and that there is the potential for lasting market reform;
- The evaluation noted that market transformation is a long-term process, which limited the ability of the evaluation at the mid-point to provide a definitive assessment;
- The evaluation found that to date the programme had not focussed sufficiently on addressing demand for clean energy, and there was scope to consider and address barriers to access.

## Lessons Learned

The lessons that were documented were intended to be action-orientated, and therefore they form the basis of the evaluation's recommendations. Although the evaluation drew on incomplete data, it was able to highlight that results-based financing is most effective when specific circumstances and design aspects are taken into account:

- The programme design did not take into account potential barriers that could hinder the project, for example policy insecurities, and market distortion by other donors and actors;
- Distribution models as well as firms' learning experiences and knowledge are potential barriers. There is no automatism for transnational synergies even if country projects are absorbed into multiple country projects;

- Designing effective incentives requires more considerations of market barriers, stakeholders and target groups than of incentive levels. The decisions of whom to incentivise and what results to incentivise are pivotal strategic choices. There is a minimum incentive level, and incentive levels should be reduced over time in order to phase out the projects;
- Results-based financing programmes can remove market barriers, but they need to be clearly understood, and the right results-based financing tool needs to be designed. In addition, not all market barriers can be addressed by results-based financing.

**Publication Information**

[Particip GmbH \(2018\)](#). Mid-term Evaluation.

## Evaluation of the Girls Education Challenge Fund

### What

In 2012, DFID launched the first phase of the Girls' Education Challenge (GEC), which ended in April 2017. This £355 million programme aimed to improve the education outcomes of up to one million marginalised girls.

The programme ran three funding windows:

- The Step Change Window (SCW) - projects received up to £30 million each to deliver approaches that improve girls' education at scale;
- The Innovation Window (IW) - projects received up to £2 million each to test and pilot new approaches that, if successful, could be scaled up or replicated elsewhere;
- The Strategic Partnerships Window (SPW) - focussed on developing partnerships with the private sector to generate solutions that were both commercially sustainable and delivered education outcomes for marginalised girls.

NGOs and private sector organisations delivered projects with the aim of improving the learning (literacy and numeracy) and retention (enrolment and attendance) of marginalised girls. Thirty-seven projects operated in 18 countries (Afghanistan, Burma, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe).

### How

The evaluation aimed to provide reliable evidence of the effectiveness and impact of interventions. The evaluation operated at two levels. Firstly, individual projects collected data at baseline, midline, and endline from samples of girls and households that they supported, and from similar girls and households that they were not supporting to form a 'control' group against which projects could assess their impacts. These samples were designed to measure impact on the groups specifically targeted and supported. Secondly, at the programme-level, the independent Evaluation Manager collected additional primary quantitative and qualitative data at baseline, midline, and endline to evaluate the effectiveness and impact of the SCW. This sample (treatment and control) was representative of all of the communities targeted by SCW projects and could measure the combined effects on girls in these communities. For the IW and SPW, the programme evaluation used the projects' data and evaluation reports to conduct meta-analysis and synthesize the reported findings and results.

### Findings

Over 730,000 marginalised girls improved their learning outcomes because of the support provided by 33 projects in 16 countries across the Girls' Education Challenge Step Change and Innovation Windows.

'Lessons from the Girls' Education Challenge: Endline Evaluation of the Step Change and Innovation Windows' (Coffey, 2018) summarises findings from the independent evaluation of these funding windows. This document shows that the independent evaluation provides evidence that the following activities contributed to improving girls' learning outcomes:



Project activities that directly improved the quality of teaching and enabled girls to engage better with what they were being taught worked well:

- Training teachers to improve their teaching methods, particularly in participatory learning techniques, helped girls engage better in class;
- Extra-curricular activities and tutorial classes enabled girls to learn better through smaller and less intimidating groups with more one-to-one support;
- Building girls' confidence and self-esteem worked well when structured around activities focused on improving their literacy and numeracy.

Reducing the cost of schooling enabled girls to go to school, but poverty remains a barrier.

Activities that helped families overcome the cost of schooling, such as stipends, bursaries and scholarships, enabled girls to go to school when otherwise they would not have been able to. However, projects working with poorly resourced schools had to address the quality of teaching in school as well as poverty-related barriers to improve girls' learning:

- Loans, savings, income-generating activities encouraged parents to spend more on girls' education, but it is unclear how much more they actually spent;
- Mothers' groups and forums helped overcome and resolve barriers to accessing education for individual girls;
- Early marriage and pregnancy remain barriers to girls staying in school.

All projects put in place mechanisms to enable marginalised girls to complete a full cycle of education. Yet, few activities would have continued after the GEC without additional funding. A combination of poverty and severely under resourced education systems made this difficult.

### **Publication Information**

- [Step Change Window](#): Coffey (2018). Endline Evaluation Report – Step Change Window
- [Innovation Window](#): Coffey (2018). Endline Evaluation Report – Innovation Window
- [Strategic Partnerships Window](#): Coffey (2018). Endline Evaluation Report – Strategic Partnership Window
- [Management Response \(2018\)](#)
- [Lessons from the GEC Endline Evaluation of the Step Change and Innovation Windows](#): Coffey (2018)
- [Lessons from the GEC Strategic Partnerships Window](#): Coffey (2018)

## Independent Process Monitoring and Evaluation for DFID's "Accelerating Sanitation and Water for All in Neglected off-track Countries" Programme

### What

WYG International, in association with Aguaconsult, conducted the final evaluation (on behalf of both DFID as funder of the program, and the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund as the implementing partner) of the [Accelerating Sanitation and Water for all \(ASWA\) Programme](#) in Neglected, Off-Track Countries between November 2013 and September 2016.

The programme aimed to accelerate access to sanitation in countries where progress had been slow by increasing access to sustainable services for five million people at least. Based on DFID's selection criteria, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) proposed nine countries for implementation. These were Madagascar, South Sudan, Niger, Cambodia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal and Yemen.

The evaluation shares lessons on the programme's sustainability of outcomes, value for money, reasons for achievement or non-achievement of results, and the quality of the outputs. The evaluation's primary concern is learning within and for ASWA country programmes, rather than more widely across all of UNICEF's and DFID's programmes in the health sector, seeking to understand how programme outcomes are affected by contextual specificities.

### How

The ASWA programme had various complexities surrounding the geographic, organisational, and security contexts. Therefore, a realistic and practical approach was undertaken, utilising mixed-methods and drawing on case-based and theory-based evaluation approaches.

Embedded in a larger ASWA programme case-study, the case-based elements were the primary method pursued through three ASWA country case-studies. Through analysis of the theory of change, the theory-based elements enabled tracking of ASWA's contribution to creating an enabling environment for sanitation and water at global, regional, and country-scales. It also enabled tracking of the behavioural change aspects in the theory of change.



Image Credit: Gemma Blackburn/Department for International Development

### Findings

The evaluation found that the overall objectives of this programme were achieved, and some of the output level results were exceeded. The evaluation also suggested that the programme represented good value for money.

The evaluation considered the programme's sustainability and suggested that requisite provision was not sufficiently considered in the design stage, and this may affect the long-term results of the interventions. Recommendations were made in this regard.

It was also suggested that considerations regarding the monitoring of progress within countries was insufficient at the design stage, and this has limited the effectiveness of the programme and the measurement of results.

The evaluation points to the differences between the results ambitions between country programmes and explains these through the countries' experiences with key approaches. This may reflect the fact that the programme was designed to accelerate progress in off-track countries, with differing capacities.

### **Lessons Learned**

The key lessons learned relate to both sustainability of results and monitoring of progress against targets. They include:

- Regarding sustainably, when deploying project staff directly into government agencies, they should be tasked with both the direct implementation of the project as well as the development of institutional capacity, so that suitably skilled permanent staff can cover vital positions;
- The drive to meet targets should be balanced with focus on ensuring sustainable funding and conditions. Sustainability should be monitored (both in terms of the enabling conditions and the achievement of suitability) at repeatable and agreed intervals;
- Regarding monitoring more broadly, programme planning needs to factor-in the risks associated with operating in countries affected by conflict and/or natural disasters, including the interruption of programme implementation and the limited scope for the independent verification of results;
- At the programme design stage, clarity and consensus is needed on equity objectives and targets. This needs to include how results will be assessed and reported. There is also need for consensus on the level of ambition at outcome level, and on how and when outcome level results will be assessed and reported;
- Country-specific log-frames are needed for multi-country programmes. There should be embedded in the global log-frame.

### **Public Information**

The evaluation was conducted by WYG International in association with Aguaconsult.

- [WYG International Limited \(2017\)](#). IPME Evaluation – Final Report
- [Management Response \(2018\)](#).

# Annex – Evaluations published (2017/18)

Evaluation Reports & Management Responses 2017/18		
1	<a href="#">Maternal &amp; Newborn Child Health, Zimbabwe</a>	NA
2a	<a href="#">Child Development Grants Programme, Nigeria - Quantitative Midline Report Volume I: Midline Findings</a>	<a href="#">Management Response</a>
2b	<a href="#">Child Development Grants Programme, Nigeria - Quantitative Midline Report Volume II: Midline Technical Compendium</a>	
3	<a href="#">Midterm Evaluation of the Results Based Financing for Low Carbon Energy Access Programme</a>	MR still to be uploaded
4	<a href="#">KNOWFOR</a>	<a href="#">Management Response</a>
5	<a href="#">Accelerating Sanitation and Water for all in Neglected off-track Countries</a>	<a href="#">Management Response</a>
6	<a href="#">WINNN Quantitative Impact Evaluation</a>	<a href="#">Management Response</a>
7a	<a href="#">Nigeria Stability &amp; Reconciliation Programme - Volume 1</a>	<a href="#">Management Response</a>
7b	<a href="#">Nigeria Stability &amp; Reconciliation Programme - Volume 2</a>	
8	<a href="#">IIMS Ideas Phase II</a>	<a href="#">Management Response</a>
9	<a href="#">Livelihood Enhancement Through Agricultural Development (LEAD) Programme</a>	<a href="#">Management Response</a>
10	<a href="#">Independent Monitoring and Evaluation of Programmes (IMEP)</a>	<a href="#">Management Response</a>
11	<a href="#">Musika Evaluation</a>	<a href="#">Management Response</a>
12	<a href="#">Growth in Rural Economies &amp; Agriculture in Tajikistan (GREAT)</a>	<a href="#">Management Response</a>
13a	<a href="#">Girls Education Challenge Fund, Innovation Window End-Line Report</a>	<a href="#">Management Response</a>
13b	<a href="#">Girls Education Challenge Fund, Innovation Window - Endline Annex</a>	
13c	<a href="#">Girls Education Challenge Fund, Step Change Window End-Line Report</a>	
13d	<a href="#">Girls Education Challenge Fund, Step Change Window - Endline Annex</a>	
13e	<a href="#">Girls Education Challenge Fund, Strategic Partnership Window - End-line Report</a>	
13f	<a href="#">Girls Education Challenge Fund, Strategic Partnership Window - Endline Annex</a>	

# References

- Attanasio, Orazio, and Elisa Cavatorta. 2017. "Complements and Alternatives to RCTs in Evaluation in Development." *CEDIL Pre-Inception Paper*, August. <https://cedilprogramme.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Complements-and-Alternatives-to-RCTs-in-Evaluation-in-Development.pdf>.
- Carneiro, Pedro, Giacomo Mason, Lucie Moore, and Imran Rasul. 2018. "Nigeria Child Development Grant Programme Evaluation. Quantitative Midline Report Volume I: Midline findings." [http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati\\_documents/24336333.pdf](http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati_documents/24336333.pdf).
- Carneiro, Pedro, Giacomo Mason, Lucie Moore, and Imran Rasul. 2018. "Nigeria Child Development Grant Programme Evaluation. Quantitative Midline Report Volume II: Midline technical compendium." [http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati\\_documents/24341715.pdf](http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati_documents/24341715.pdf).
- Clear Horizon Consulting. 2017. "International Forestry Knowledge Programme (KNOWFOR): Final Evaluation." [http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati\\_documents/21820881.odt](http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati_documents/21820881.odt).
- Coffey International Development Ltd. 2018. "Endline Evaluation Report - Strategic Partnerships Window." [http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati\\_documents/26064759.pdf](http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati_documents/26064759.pdf).
- Coffey International Development Ltd. 2018. "Endline Evaluation Report - Innovation Window." [http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati\\_documents/26096642.pdf](http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati_documents/26096642.pdf).
- Coffey International Development Ltd. 2018. "Endline Evaluation Report - Step Change Window." [http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati\\_documents/26064760.pdf](http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati_documents/26064760.pdf).
- Coffey International Development Ltd. 2017. "Process Evaluation Report - Evaluation Service Provider for the Pakistan Innovation Fund Phas II (IIm Ideas 2)." [http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati\\_documents/20284051.odt](http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati_documents/20284051.odt).
- Davey, Calum, Syreen Hassan, Chris Bonell, Nancy Cartwright, Macartan Humphreys, Audrey Prost, and James Hargreaves. 2017. "Gaps in Evaluation Methods for Addressing Challenging Contexts in Development." *CEDIL PreInception Paper*. <https://cedilprogramme.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Gaps-in-Evaluation-Methods-for-Addressing-Challenging-Contexts-in-Development-1.pdf>.
- DFID. 2013. *International Development Evaluation Policy*. Crown Copyright, 30 May. Accessed 11 16, 2018. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/204119/DFID-Evaluation-Policy-2013.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/204119/DFID-Evaluation-Policy-2013.pdf).
- . 2014. "DFID Evaluation Strategy 2014-2019." June. Accessed November 16, 2018. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/380435/Evaluation-Strategy-June2014a.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/380435/Evaluation-Strategy-June2014a.pdf).
- GSDI UK. 2017. "Independent Evaluation of Wealth Creation Development of Rural Markets in Zambia." [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/678846/Evaluation-of-Wealth-Creation-Development-of-Rural-Markets-in-Zambia-Musika.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/678846/Evaluation-of-Wealth-Creation-Development-of-Rural-Markets-in-Zambia-Musika.pdf).
- Hansford, Frances, Aly Visram, Emma Jones, and Patrick Ward. 2017. "Integrated Evaluation Report of the WINNN Programme." [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/701051/Working\\_to\\_Improve\\_Nutrition\\_in\\_Northern\\_Nigeria.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/701051/Working_to_Improve_Nutrition_in_Northern_Nigeria.pdf).
- iMC worldwide. 2017. "Growth in Rural Economy & Agriculture in Tajikistan (GREAT) - Final Evaluation." [http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati\\_documents/5752902.pdf](http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati_documents/5752902.pdf).
- ItadUK and Oxford Policy Management. 2017. "Tanzania LEAD - Mid-term Evaluation." <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attach>

- ment\_data/file/678869/Mid-Term-Evaluation-of-Livelihood-Enhancement-through-Agriculture-Development-LEAD-Programme.pdf.
2018. "Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine." <https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-202637/documents>.
- Oliver, Sandy, David Gough, and James Copestake. 2017. "Approaches to Evidence Synthesis in International Development." *CEDIL Pre-Inception Paper*, August. <https://cedilprogramme.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Approaches-to-evidence-synthesis-in-international-development.pdf>.
- Oxford Policy Management, ECORYS, The Policy Practice, and Phillips Consulting. 2017. "The Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Project for the DFID Nigeria State Level Programmes (IMEP) Performance Evaluation of the DFID Nigeria State Level Programmes: Final Evaluation Report Volume 1: Executive Summary and Main Report." [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/678856/Independent-Monitoring-and-Evaluation-Project-for-the-DFID-Nigeria-State-Level-Programmes-IMEP.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/678856/Independent-Monitoring-and-Evaluation-Project-for-the-DFID-Nigeria-State-Level-Programmes-IMEP.pdf).
- Particip GmbH. 2018. "Mid-term Evaluation - Evaluation of the Results-Based Financing for Low Carbon Energy Access Facility (RBFF) within Energising Development (EnDev)." [http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati\\_documents/23740344.PDF](http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati_documents/23740344.PDF).
- Phillips, Daniel, Christopher Coffey, Stergiani Tsoli, Jennifer Stevenson, Hugh Waddington, John Eyers, Howard White, and Birte Snilstveit. 2017. "A Map of Evidence Maps Relating to Sustainable Development in Low- and Middle-Income Countries Evidence Gap Map Report." *CEDIL Pre-Inception Paper*, September. <https://cedilprogramme.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/A-Map-of-Evidence-Maps-Relating-to-Sustainable-Development-in-Low-and-Middle-Income-Countries.pdf>.
- WHO. 2011. *World Report on Disability - Summary*. World Health Organization. Accessed 11 16, 2018. [http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/70670/WHO\\_NMH\\_VIP\\_11.01\\_eng.pdf;jsessionid=3F9DAFD49B541EE70486B49C6F80E3E2?sequence=1](http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/70670/WHO_NMH_VIP_11.01_eng.pdf;jsessionid=3F9DAFD49B541EE70486B49C6F80E3E2?sequence=1).
- WYG International Limited. 2017. "Final Evaluation Report - Independent Evaluation Provider to the Nigeria SStability and Reconciliation Programme (Volume 2)." [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/701038/Nigeria-Stability-and-Reconciliation-Programme-Volume-2.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/701038/Nigeria-Stability-and-Reconciliation-Programme-Volume-2.pdf).
- WYG International Limited. 2017. "Final Evaluation Report - Independent Evaluation Provider to the Nigeria Stability and Reconciliation Programme (Volume 1)." [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/701037/Nigeria-Stability-and-Reconciliation-Programme-Volume-1.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/701037/Nigeria-Stability-and-Reconciliation-Programme-Volume-1.pdf).
- WYG International Limited. 2017. "IPME Evaluation - Final Report." [http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati\\_documents/21860039.odt](http://iati.dfid.gov.uk/iati_documents/21860039.odt).

The Department for International Development:  
leading the UK government's fight against world poverty.

Department for International Development  
22 Whitehall  
London  
SW1A 2EG  
UK

and at:

Abercrombie House  
Eaglesham Road East  
Kilbride  
Glasgow  
G75 8EA  
UK

Tel: +44 (0)20 7023 0000

Fax: +44 (0)20 7023 0016

Website: [www.dfid.gov.uk](http://www.dfid.gov.uk)

Facebook: [www.facebook.com/ukdfid](http://www.facebook.com/ukdfid)

Twitter: @DFID\_UK

Email: [enquiry@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:enquiry@dfid.gov.uk)

Public enquiry point: 0845 3004100 or +44 1355 84 3132 (if you are calling from abroad)

© Crown copyright 2019

Copyright in the typographical arrangement and design rests with the Crown. This publication (excluding the logo) may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium, provided that it is reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright with the title and source of the publication specified.

Published by the Department for International Development