

DFID

Department for International Development

Evaluation Department

Formative Evaluation of
*Taking Action: The UK's strategy for
tackling HIV and AIDS in the developing
world*

EVALUATION DESIGN PAPER

FULL VERSION

AUGUST 2005

consultation document
(Comments requested by 30 September 2005)

PREFACE

This design paper was developed in close collaboration between the Evaluation Department (EvD) of the UK Department for International Development and HLSP Consulting. The main authors are **Julia Compton** of EvD and **Bob Grose** of HLSP, and it draws on the valuable work carried out by an evaluation framework team from HLSP led by **Wendy Roseberry** with **Jim Bennett, Bob Grose, Susan Beckerleg, Jackie Mundy, Mark Pearson, Alan Whiteside and Monika Zabel**.

Because this is a design paper for a formative (lesson-learning) evaluation, great demands have been put on the Evaluation Steering Group – not only to define and prioritise the evaluation questions and indicate which approaches are likely to be feasible, but to promote the evaluation through their own work with partners, ensuring that important evaluation questions can be included in joint country reviews and multilateral review mechanisms. Sincere thanks are due to the members of this group for their commitment and thoughtful contributions. Many of them are very busy people who put in extra time to make comments and help with this design. The Evaluation Steering Group includes **Hans-Martin Boehmer** (Chair) (DFID Head of Human Development Group, Policy Division), **Jenny Amery** (DFID Asia Policy Dept); **Sandy Baldwin** (DFID United Nations, Conflict & Humanitarian Division); **Mike Battcock** (DFID Civil Society and Communications Unit); **Phil Cockerill** (DFID Policy Division, Global AIDS Policy Team, Statistics Adviser); **Madeline Church and colleagues** (UK Consortium on AIDS and International Development and member NGOs); **Janelle de Gruchy** (DFID, Africa Policy Dept); **Kerstin Hinds** (DFID Corporate Strategy Group); **Mary Jane Hunt** (DFID International Division, Cabinet); **Sue Kinn** (DFID Central Research Department); **Andrew Long** (DFID Central Research Department); **Jane Pepperall** (DFID Africa Policy Department); **Louisiana Lush** (DFID International Division Advisory Department); **Lisa Maguire** (FCO Global Economics Dept); **Malcolm McNeil** (DFID Europe Middle East and Americas Division); **Kay Orton** (Dept. of Health, HIV Services and Sexual Health Promotion); **Sheila Round** (DFID Policy Division, Aid Effectiveness Team); **Carolyn Sunners** (DFID Europe Middle East and Americas Division) and **Tim Waites** (DFID Policy Division, Social Protection Team, Livelihoods Adviser). We are also grateful for the very helpful inputs from other ‘friends of the evaluation’ including **Robin Gorna**, Head of DFID Global AIDS Policy Team, **Angela Bester**, DFID South Africa; **Svetlana Pkhidenko**, DFID Russia, **Robin Owen**, National Audit Office, and our colleagues from EvD, especially **Nick York (Head), Ian Belshaw, Joanne Bosworth, Jane Gardner, Kate Tench and Shona Wynd**. Many more people have contributed ideas informally - we thank them for their inputs and regret that they are too many to list here.

Many thanks are also due to **Masood Ahmed**, Director General (Policy and International), DFID, who is the ‘evaluation champion’ for this evaluation. Masood has outlined key evaluation questions from the perspective of the DFID Top Management Group and has also helped raise the profile of this evaluation.

John Murray of EvD is the manager of this evaluation. **Comments on this paper are welcome** and should be addressed to him at j-murray@dfid.gov.uk
An electronic version of the paper can be accessed at <http://www.dfid.gov.uk>

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVE

The UK Government's new AIDS strategy ('*Taking Action: the UK's strategy for tackling HIV and AIDS in the developing world*', referred to here as '*Taking Action*' or '*TA*') was launched by the Prime Minister in July 2004. The Department for International Development (DFID) is the lead government department for implementing *Taking Action*, working together with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO), Department and Health (DoH) and others. The Government has committed significant funding for HIV and AIDS: at least £1.5 billion over 3 years, up from £270 million in 2002/3.

This 'formative' (lesson-learning) evaluation of *Taking Action* will run during 2006 and report at the end of the year (see page 11 for details). It will be carried out by independent consultants. This is the design paper for the evaluation. It sets out the main questions the evaluation will address, and proposes approaches to answering them.

The objective of this evaluation is to make recommendations in four areas:

1) to improve implementation and monitoring of the current strategy

Taking Action runs from 2004-2008. One important aim for this evaluation is to spot areas where implementation of the strategy is proving challenging, and to stimulate debate about how best to tackle these. This debate will be an important part of the evaluation process during 2006.

2) on indicators of success for the final evaluation of *Taking Action* in 2008/9

Taking Action represents a large commitment in resources for the UK Government. The final evaluation of the strategy, planned for 2008-9, will assess whether those resources have been well used for the purpose intended. This is far from straightforward, as the UK Government works within a complex international effort to tackle multiple facets of HIV and AIDS. For this reason, another important aim of this formative evaluation is to propose and discuss the indicators of success and approaches to the final evaluation.

3) for the UK Government's next steps on AIDS from 2008

Taking Action represents an ambitious attempt to tackle multiple facets of the HIV and AIDS crisis in the developing world. This evaluation will examine some of the experience gained to date and help the UK Government to decide on its future priorities and approaches.

4) regarding future UK (especially DFID) strategies on development issues

Taking Action and its spending targets were launched at a time when UK development aid is increasingly moving towards a 'country-led approach' to development. *Taking Action* is therefore an important test case for the following question, which is at the heart of current debates on how best to manage development aid: "*As a donor country we have things we wish to achieve, policies we would like implemented, spending targets we need to meet. How do we square those with letting countries choose priority policies, sectors and manage donors themselves?*" The evaluation should therefore throw up interesting lessons for other development strategies.

STRUCTURE OF THIS PAPER

The **Table of Questions and Approaches (TQA)** below outlines the evaluation design.

The first column of TQA contains the main questions for the evaluation. In a formative evaluation, it is critical that the questions reflect accurately what UK Government decision-makers need to know in order to improve and give better focus to their work. The wording for these questions was therefore developed in close collaboration with the Evaluation Steering Group (see Preface)¹.

There are 13 questions in total, grouped under these three main questions that are taken from the evaluation's four objectives (Obj1-4):

1. (Obj1) How is *Taking Action* being implemented to date? Can this be improved?
2. (Obj2) How should the success of *Taking Action* be measured (in the final evaluation of the strategy, 2008/9)?
3. (Obj3-4) What lessons does *Taking Action* hold for future UK strategy on AIDS - and other development issues?

Most of the questions need to be broken down further to be answered properly. The **second column of TQA** explains the expected evaluation product for each question, for example a summary of progress or a critical analysis of gaps in coverage. This column also lists key sub-questions to be covered. In most cases the 'evaluation product' will be a written section of a report; in some cases a separate working paper is proposed. However, in all cases, the process of debate, reflection and learning is expected to be as important as the final written report.

Taking Action sets out over 140 separate commitments and actions for the UK government, and it is not possible to look at all of them in one evaluation. Tough choices must be made. **Tables A and B**, in annexes, indicate the proposed areas of UK work to be examined in order to answer Question 1.1 (What progress has been made on *Taking Action*'s seven priority actions?) and Question 1.5 (How is *Taking Action*'s specific focus on "women, young people and vulnerable groups" being interpreted by UK government decision-makers? Is a significant proportion of funding and benefits reaching these priority groups? If not, how can this be improved?).

The criteria for prioritising specific areas of work to be evaluated (marked with **X** in **Tables A and B**) have been: (a) the interest in particular areas expressed by decision-makers (b) topicality – e.g. 2006 is a good time to look back at work with the G8 in 2004-5 (c) ease of collecting information – for example, it is relatively easy to collect together information on funding levels (Table A - A1a-f), whereas it is too resource-intensive to look in detail at all the broader causes and effects of AIDS (A4d), so only a few examples have been chosen. One thorny issue has been the ability of this evaluation to cover broad, long-term issues such as the International Finance Facility (A1g) and human resources for healthcare (A4e2). It is not envisaged that the evaluation will have the resources to collect primary data (first-hand information) on these topics; however secondary data (existing reports) may be used to give a picture of what information is available and point

¹ The evaluation questions were originally presented in the terms of the OECD-DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability) but this organisation and phraseology was not found to be of practical usefulness for decision-makers. Nevertheless, the evaluation consultants will be expected to take DAC criteria as a guiding principle when answering the questions in TQA.

out issues that require attention. Evaluating general UK support to developing country health care systems would require a separate evaluation.

The **third column of TQA** shows proposed information sources for each question. This helps to assess the resources needed and whether information is available.

A NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

The methodology proposed for this evaluation is influenced by three important needs:

- getting the information necessary to improve UK policy and practice, by answering the questions in the Table of Questions and Approaches (**TQA**)
- adhering to the UK's international agreements to harmonise with other donors and minimise the burden of evaluation on national governments and other partners
- covering the very large and complex area of tackling HIV and AIDS with a limited budget

In this context, it is proposed that:

- The evaluation will **not** normally seek to attribute specific development outputs or outcomes (for example: number of people treated with ARV drugs) to UK support, since the UK government is part of a large international effort to tackle HIV and AIDS, co-funding with many partners. The evaluation will instead concentrate on UK government *policy, systems and choices of partners*, and ask if and how these could be improved to get better and more cost-effective outcomes.
- Most of the information will come from critical analysis of the **data in existing reviews and reports**. There are already a large number of existing reviews of many aspects of HIV and AIDS work, including overarching international reviews by UNAIDS. The **TQA** indicates how these might be analysed to extract much of the information needed by the evaluation. For example, comparative analysis of existing reviews of different partner organisations may give useful information about their comparative effectiveness and efficiency.
- Some of the information (e.g. understanding how government decisions are made) will still need to come from **individual interviews and group discussions** with UK staff and programme partners. The guiding principle will be to 'ask the right people the right questions' and not overburden interviewees. Video conferencing and phone interviews will be used whenever possible to cut costs and minimize the strain on country offices and partners.
- **Choice of countries for further study:** Country visits will be used to answer evaluation questions that cannot reasonably be answered any other way. The benefit of country visits is that they enable evaluators to verify and better understand information in reports, and to hear the views of local programme partners who might not otherwise have a voice in the evaluation. The challenge is to collect high-quality information while being aware of the need to minimize the time burden on partners. About six countries will be selected to represent various country contexts and aid management issues. Criteria to be considered are listed in the following table. A future annex to this document will list candidate

countries against key criteria and make specific proposals. **To date, the countries which have been proposed by members of the Evaluation Steering Group for consideration are Russia, China, India, Cambodia and Sierra Leone. More candidate countries are needed in Africa and to represent “country led approaches” (see table). Comments and proposals are welcome, especially from readers based in developing countries.**

Criteria for country selection

Criteria	Observations
Geographic region	Africa and Asia/Eastern Europe are top priority
Stage of epidemic	Emerging, early-established, long-established
Country context	Low income, Middle income, Post-conflict, Fragile States, Poverty Reduction Strategy/none, etc
Aid instruments, partnerships and funding lines	General Budget Support, Sector support, National Aids Commission, vertical programmes, multilateral agencies, direct funding to NGOs etc. Examples of countries dominated by “country-led approaches” such as budget support are particularly needed, to answer TQA 1.4 and 3.2
Level of UK Government resources allocated to particular partners/activities	High spending areas will be tentatively identified from the 2004 mapping study and DFID management information systems (see TQA – 1.2)
Priorities of top UK Government decision-makers and the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG)	
Lesson-learning from particular successes and failures	Examples may be identified by the ESG and others
Interest/willingness of national governments, DFID country offices and FCO posts to collaborate	It is intended that this evaluation will answer questions of relevance and interest to these important stakeholders, as well as to central UK government. For this to happen, comments on the TQA and Tables A and B are particularly welcome from readers based in developing countries.
Existence of joint country reviews with which the country study can collaborate, to minimize burden on partners	Readers with knowledge of upcoming joint country reviews are kindly requested to send this to the evaluation manager (see preface to this paper)

TABLE OF QUESTIONS AND APPROACHES (TQA)

Question no./level	Question	Expected ‘evaluation product’ (W- working paper or S- section of main report)	Details and suggested sources (not comprehensive list)
1	How is <i>Taking Action</i> being implemented to date? Can this be improved?	Recommendations to improve implementation and monitoring of the current strategy	Summary of 1.1-1.6
1.1	What progress has been made on <i>Taking Action</i> ’s six “priority actions”? (<i>Closing the funding gap, Strengthening political leadership, Improving the international response, Better national programmes, Long-term action, Translating strategy into action.</i>) What are the lessons from these?	<p>S- Review of <i>progress</i>, challenges faced, lessons and recommendations. As <i>Taking Action</i> sets out over 90 activities and targets for the UK government under these six priority actions, only a limited sample will be examined for each – see Table A of the main design document for details.</p> <p>Key questions to cover: With which priority actions has the UK made clearest progress? Which have been the most challenging? Are there areas that need more UK attention and resources in the coming years? Are there areas that the UK should de-prioritise/ leave to others, and in what circumstances? Are there any interventions that have turned out to be inappropriate, and what are the lessons from these? The OECD-DAC criteria (see Footnote 1 for explanation) should be considered throughout this analysis.</p>	See attached Table A – the suggested sample of <i>Taking Action</i> commitments to be examined is marked with an x. Focus groups of involved/interested UK staff and other stakeholders (e.g. AIDS consortium) to discuss issues and lessons arising.
1.2	Overall, does the distribution of current UK-supported HIV and AIDS activities reflect the priorities laid out in <i>Taking Action</i> ? If not, why not?	<p>W - Analysis of trends in DFID/OGD portfolio in 2006 since <i>TA</i> (2004-6). This should examine (at minimum) trends in the relative weight given to national and international work; to prevention, research, treatment, care and mitigation (including wider impact mitigation); to funding through government and civil society channels; to capacity-building; to programmes for universal access and those focusing on particular groups, and the balance between AIDS-specific actions and broader ‘enabling actions’ (e.g. predictable aid, health systems). Recommendations.</p> <p>Key questions to cover: Does the overall balance</p>	Mapping study of DFID portfolio, using <i>Prism</i> , Country Assistance Plan, Directors’ Delivery Plan reviews etc. Comparison of trends from the 2004 mapping study made just prior to <i>TA</i> (within the limitations of the data). Comparison with total country needs and funding via UNAIDS/CRIS data. Analysis of a sample of plans, including DFID Country Assistance Plans (≥6), Regional Assistance Plans (≥3), Institutional Strategy Plans (≥3), etc (in discussion with country offices and other relevant departments). Focus group discussions of emerging issues, as above.

Question no./level	Question	Expected ‘evaluation product’ (W- working paper or S- section of main report)	Details and suggested sources (not comprehensive list)
		reflect <i>Taking Action</i> ’s priorities? If not, what needs to change: the strategy, the implementation or both? Is the overall balance reasonable in terms of country needs/stage of epidemic and appropriate UK role? What hidden choices and opportunity costs are there?	
1.3	How is the UK government making decisions in practice, e.g. how are choices being made about partner institutions for tackling HIV and AIDS in developing countries? How can decision-making systems be improved?	<p>S - Analysis of decision-making at different levels of DFID and FCO, with recommendations for improvement.</p> <p>Key questions: How are needs and the UK’s comparative advantage assessed before taking programming decisions? How is the potential sustainability of actions (economic and institutional) assessed? How (if at all) are the 6 UNGASS targets highlighted at the front of <i>TA</i> considered in prioritising activities? How are changing external circumstances picked up, communicated and translated into changed policy and programming? What are the incentives for UK staff at different levels to implement <i>Taking Action</i>, both in programming UK funds and in influencing other institutions?</p>	<p>Analysis of relevant decision <i>processes</i> in DFID and FCO (e.g. planning, budgeting, programming funds, deciding on partnerships) through analysis of a sample of files on decisions (e.g. Country Assistance Plan discussions) and discussion with staff. To include at least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DFID Corporate Strategy Group - DFID international/UN division - six DFID/FCO country offices/posts in contrasting countries - DFID Regional Policy Depts - FCO <p>Analysis of relevant project/programme documentation together with staff interviews in ≥ 4 country programmes, (?Interviews with / reported views of national partners, key donors, INGOs in same countries) Sample to include non-health sector work (for example PRBS, food security, transport)</p>
1.4	What is the UK’s experience with moving to “country-led” aid instruments (see Objective 4 and next column for more explanation) regarding commitment and resources allocated to HIV and AIDS? What are the lessons on managing this?	<p>S - Review of effect of move to country-led aid instruments, e.g. Poverty Reduction Strategies, PR Budget Support, Sector Programmes, etc. on level of commitment and resources going to HIV and AIDS. Lessons from best practice; recommendations.</p> <p>Key questions: How do country offices manage the tension between promoting a country-led agenda and promoting specific priorities in <i>Taking Action</i>, e.g. human rights, focus on equity, marginalised groups etc – what approaches have been tried and what lessons are</p>	<p>Analysis of trends in country commitment to tackling AIDS, based on international reviews and data e.g. UNAIDS, CRIS. Search for (a) examples of successful support to building country-wide commitment, and (b) situations where challenges are faced due to reduced national government commitment – what has UK role been (for example encouraging political commitment, supporting civil society advocacy, technical assistance etc) and what are the lessons? Focus group discussions with</p>

Question no./level	Question	Expected 'evaluation product' (W- working paper or S- section of main report)	Details and suggested sources (not comprehensive list)
		<p>there? Have country-led instruments led to any improvement in issues such as ability to utilise funds (budget execution), sustainability of programmes etc? Have there been any cases of waning commitment to tackling AIDS (in the broad sense) from national governments – in what circumstances, and how has the UK responded - both at country level and through international institutions such as the Global Task Team? How have capacity gaps been addressed? To what extent do country offices have access to timely information on relevant spending plans of partner governments – if so, how is this information used? Are DFID's approaches to working with multilaterals and vertical funds in harmony with country-led approaches to AIDS? See also 1.5, 3.2.</p>	<p>UK staff and partners around key questions.</p>
1.5	<p>How is <i>Taking Action's</i> specific focus on “women, young people and vulnerable groups” being interpreted by UK government decision-makers? Is a significant proportion of funding and benefits reaching these priority groups? If not, how can this be improved?</p>	<p>W - Analysis of decisions and challenges faced, and recommendations, based on a sample of the 40+ commitments made in <i>TA</i> (see Table B of main design document) Analysis of trends in DFID portfolio in 2006 since <i>TA</i> (2004-6) with reference to country and international data. Within the limitations of the data, an estimate of to what degree joint / country programme funding is going to priority group beneficiaries. Desk review of a sample of recent reviews of country programmes, and follow-up with country staff. Discussion of issues raised, and recommendations.</p> <p>Key question: How does the UK government balance this focus on the most vulnerable with <i>Taking Action's</i> other focus on donor harmonisation and alignment with countries' own policies? (see also 1.4). What are the lessons from different approaches tried, e.g. for funding local civil society organisations to support vulnerable groups, for advocacy, etc?</p>	<p>Analysis of decision-making as in 1.3 above. Specific attention needs to be paid to decisions on influencing / advocacy work as well as financing. Make use of gender and social exclusion frameworks for analysis. Critical analysis of mapping study of DFID portfolio (see 1.2) – within limitations of the data. Country case studies should include at least two contrasting Poverty Reduction Strategy/budget support countries. Assessment of progress on a sample of specific commitments: see attached Table B – the suggested sample of commitments to be examined is marked with an X.</p>

Question no./level	Question	Expected 'evaluation product' (W- working paper or S- section of main report)	Details and suggested sources (not comprehensive list)
1.6	Are appropriate UK Government systems and staff resources in place to implement <i>Taking Action</i> ?	<p>S- Analysis of dedicated UK staff resources and systems for tackling HIV and AIDS in developing countries, as well as wider staff skills and time resources for addressing key 'enabling environment' issues (for example health systems, AIDS and rural livelihoods). Review of HIV and AIDS monitoring in DFID/OGD government information systems. Recommendations for improvements.</p> <p>Key questions: [<i>UK staffing</i>] Are the roles of different staff and the division of labour clear and coherent? Do staff have adequate knowledge and skills? Are decisions about staffing for HIV and AIDS-related work (both specific and 'enabling environment') based on assessment of needs and the UK's relative advantage vs. other donors? What lessons can be learned from different approaches tried to manage decreasing UK government administrative and staff budgets ("Doing More with Less")? [<i>Monitoring and lesson learning</i>] What experience is there with UK systems for tracking, monitoring and lesson learning on HIV and AIDS? How well do UK systems fit with international systems? How are specific target groups monitored (see also 1.5)? How is non-health sector work and 'enabling environment' work monitored? What experience is there with communication strategies? Is up-to-date- guidance available for staff on key issues? How could systems be improved?</p>	<p>Analysis of staff resources (HR data? Membership of networks etc). Should be put into context of other organisations' resources. in each case. ?Joint country reviews could cover issue of donor/embassy staffing and effectiveness.</p> <p>M&E review to include Prism, Aries, Quest systems (for DFID). Interviews with Corporate Strategy Group/Statistical R.S.Group Interviews with country-level and other managers and advisers to determine information needs at different levels and how they are met, any gaps. Interviews: through advisers retreats, country visits. The mapping study (see 3.2) will also produce recommendations for improving information systems.</p> <p>This analysis is likely to raise generic questions about government systems and staffing as well as specific ones about HIV and AIDS. It will draw on, and share analysis frameworks and data with, other evaluations investigating the same issues (e.g. DFID's 2005 gender evaluation).</p>
2	How should the success of <i>Taking Action</i> be measured (in the final evaluation of the strategy, 2008/9)?	Proposed indicators and approaches for the final evaluation of <i>Taking Action</i> in 2008/9	
2.1	<i>Taking Action</i> includes over 130 specific commitments for UK government action (see 1.1 and 1.5). In	W- Analysis of the indicators (explicit or implicit) already set out in <i>Taking Action</i> (<i>these are also summarised in Tables A and B of the main design document</i>), in light of findings on <i>TA</i> 's current	Textual analysis of <i>TA</i> , building on work already done (Tables A and B). Discussion of indicators for success of strategy with key stakeholders. Detailed appraisal of

Question no./level	Question	Expected 'evaluation product' (W- working paper or S- section of main report)	Details and suggested sources (not comprehensive list)
	the light of experience, are these still the most relevant targets against which to measure the success of UK strategy? If not, how should success be measured?	relevance (3.1) and lessons from its implementation (Q1). Recommendations for indicators and approaches for 2008/9 evaluation, including data sources and how data should be measured and reported (international or harmonised data sources whenever possible).	international and other data sources for each proposed indicator. Reflection on approaches to data collection and lesson learning, together with stakeholders, taking into account the lessons so far from the approaches to this evaluation. Must include a review of methodological lessons learned from the current evaluation.
3	What lessons does <i>Taking Action</i> hold for future UK strategy on AIDS - and other development issues?	Recommendations for (a) the UK Government's next steps on tackling HIV and AIDS in the developing world (from 2008) (b) other future UK strategies on development issues	Summary of 3.1-3.3
3.1	Is <i>Taking Action</i> (still, in 2006) the most relevant strategy for the UK to adopt to tackle HIV and AIDS in the developing world? Are there major outstanding issues that are not adequately addressed in <i>TA</i> (bearing in mind that the UK is only one player among others)? What are the implications for future AIDS strategy?	<p>S - Short review of current priorities, progress against key international targets, major constraints and bottlenecks to tackling HIV and AIDS, identified from international reviews and for about six diverse case study countries. Review of priority actions of <i>Taking Action</i> in light of this, with any recommendations for current and future strategy.</p> <p>Key questions to cover: What are the main constraints to achieving (a) the six international AIDS targets highlighted in <i>Taking Action</i> (p.1) (b) other important HIV and AIDS objectives identified at country level? Are there important policy or programming issues which are not being adequately addressed? (bearing in mind that the UK is only one player and should not be expected to tackle everything.) Has the international situation (biological or institutional) changed significantly since <i>TA</i> was published – and does <i>TA</i> adequately consider future scenarios? Are there particular areas of work (e.g. post-conflict, food security) that need more clearly formulated UK strategy? Are there areas of work that could be safely</p>	<p>(a) UNAIDS reviews, progress on UNGASS targets (especially the six targets identified on page 1 of <i>Taking Action</i>)</p> <p>(b) UNAIDS 2025 scenario planning</p> <p>(c) World Bank and other donor reviews</p> <p>(d) desk review of national country level reviews (at least 6 countries)</p> <p>(e) focus group discussions with UK staff (e.g. health advisers retreats)</p> <p>(f) Focus group UK/international specialists/PLWHA/others</p> <p>(g) revisit earlier comments made on <i>Taking Action</i> e.g. by All-Party Parliamentary Group on AIDS, AIDS Consortium, Justice Africa</p>

Question no./level	Question	Expected 'evaluation product' (W- working paper or S- section of main report)	Details and suggested sources (not comprehensive list)
3.2	How are the potential tensions between top-down AIDS targets and a flexible, country-led approach being managed? What are the lessons (a) for future UK AIDS strategy (b) for other UK development strategies?	<p>S- Review of evidence on the pros and cons of the UK-specific AIDS targets in Taking Action, especially the UK spending targets, on (a) the HIV and AIDS multisectoral response (b) health systems development (c) mainstreaming HIV and AIDS into other work (d) opportunity costs for other development programmes. This should include a review of how AIDS spending is calculated and an assessment of the additional spending generated by the target since it was set. Recommendations for future AIDS strategy and lessons for other strategies and spending targets. See also 3.3 (basis of spending targets) and 1.3 (incentives).</p> <p>Key questions: What is the evidence on the advantages and disadvantages of having a special AIDS spending target? How has this been managed? Have any problems been experienced with 'absorptive capacity' (ability to execute the budget and carry out planned activities) and how has this been managed?</p>	Following mapping study to look at trends (see 1.2), examine a sample of apparent changes in spending – are they real or just 'rebranding'? Compare UK with other donors' systems for counting AIDS spend, and the overall international pattern of spending on AIDS. Focus group discussions on pros and cons of spending targets, with DFID country office heads, health specialists and other disciplines: e.g. at advisory retreats, in country, international division.
3.3	Taking Action has several interesting features: it is a cross-Whitehall strategy, contains spending targets, and was developed through a consultative process. What lessons can be learned for developing future strategies (AIDS and other) from the <u>process</u> of developing <i>Taking Action</i> ?	<p>S- Summary of lessons from the <i>process</i> of developing the Taking Action strategy. Recommendations for future strategy development processes.</p> <p>Key questions: What were the main challenges in developing <i>TA</i> - e.g. time, evidence base, consultation? How did it fit with other strategies? How were spending targets set? Taking Action is a cross-Whitehall strategy, led by DFID - what have been the advantages and disadvantages of this, compared to separate Departmental strategies?</p>	Analysis of documentation on strategy development. Interviews with key informants in different UK Government Departments, DFID country offices, other stakeholders (NGOs etc). Comparison with approaches of other DFID and cross-Whitehall strategies.

PROPOSED OUTPUTS AND TIMING

The table below shows proposed outputs and timing. Interviews and field visits are expected to take place between approximately Feb-Oct 2006.

Proposed date	Proposed product	Proposed topic	Proposed coverage	TQA questions
Feb-Mar 2006	Inception report	Consultants' Inception Report for the formative evaluation of <i>Taking Action</i>	Preliminary review of written material; preliminary analysis of secondary data sources and identification of key data gaps; detailed methodology for field work phase	All
May 2006	Working Paper 1	Taking Action: a mapping study of UK funding and activities to tackle HIV and AIDS in the developing world.	Analysis of trends in UK Government funding and activities related to HIV and AIDS (in particular the DFID portfolio) since <i>Taking Action</i> (2004-6). Comparison to a baseline study carried out in April 2004.	1.2, 1.5
August 2006	Working Paper 2	Taking Action to Reach Women, Young People and Vulnerable Groups	Analysis of decisions and challenges faced, and recommendations, based on the mapping study (above) and a sample of the commitments in <i>TA</i>	1.5
December 2006	Working Paper 3	Measuring Success: Indicators and approaches for the final evaluation of Taking Action in 2008	Analysis of the indicators (explicit or implicit) already set out in <i>Taking Action</i> , in light of findings on <i>TA</i> 's current relevance and lessons from implementation. Recommendations for indicators and approaches for 2008/9 evaluation, including an appraisal of the main data sources and proposals as to how data should be measured and reported (international or harmonised data when possible). To include a review of methodological lessons learnt from the current evaluation.	2.1
Feb-Oct 2006	Short reports (if agreed)	Short country and other visit reports if appropriate.	To be decided by the Evaluation Steering Group. Likely to include short country summaries to feed back to the countries visited.	--
Draft - Oct 2006 Final Report - Dec 2006	MAIN REPORT	Formative evaluation of <i>Taking Action: the UK's strategy for tackling HIV and AIDS in the developing world</i>	The draft will be widely disseminated for comments. <i>Dissemination events for the final report are yet to be agreed – suggestions are welcome from those interested in participating.</i>	All
Jan 2007	Recommendations	In DFID, EvD sends recommendations to operational departments, based on report recommendations	Relevant operational departments of DFID must respond to recommendations to outline the follow-up action they plan to take – or in some cases to explain why they do not agree.	All
Jul 2007	Follow-up report	EvD follow-up of recommendations	Six month follow-up by EvD of action taken following evaluation	--
2008-2009 (to be agreed)	<i>Final evaluation of Taking Action</i>		<i>Evaluation questions and approach to be agreed, based on 'Measuring Success'.</i>	--