Dear Ms Hillier,

Many thanks for inviting me to give oral evidence on Monday 8 July in connection with the Committee’s inquiry into Official Development Assistance.

Please find attached the additional information that I agreed to provide to the Committee during the session.

MATTHEW RYCROFT
Annex A: Additional Information for Public Accounts Committee

Q50 – How many DfID projects are value for money at the moment?

All DFID programmes which are implemented have an evidenced business case setting out a clear value for money case. All DFID programmes are subject to an annual review, which scores each programme against whether they are performing in line with expectations. As of June 2019, in accordance with DFID management information criteria, 801 of 887 programmes are classified as meeting or exceeding expectations. In the remaining 86, measures are in place to ensure that any areas of underperformance are being addressed.

Q54 – What proportion of your value for money tests are qualitative?

Value for Money is assessed as part of the annual review process which each DFID programme goes through. We do not have standardised Value for Money tests – each of the 887 programmes has its own metrics for efficiency, effectiveness, economy and equity based on what the programme is trying to achieve and where it is operating. In the majority of cases, both forms of assessment will be used, with the ratio of quantitative to qualitative evidence varying according to the nature of the programme and context. To estimate an exact proportion across all 887 programmes would require a significant investment of staff time.

Q59 – Give me your current proportion of projects that are based on output or outcomes.

All DFID annual reviews are assessed based on output, outcome and impact-level indicators. The overall score for a programme is currently calculated by measuring outputs, complemented by a narrative assessment of progress towards outcomes. We are continually strengthening our approach to performance measurement, ensuring that we get the balance of indicators right across the various levels of assessing results. 100% of our projects are assessed at least in part on outputs or outcomes.