Integrating value for money into the programme cycle

The diagram offers some suggestion on how value for money considerations can be integrated into the programme cycle and how an NGO can build a robust and defensible case for how an intervention balances economy, efficiency and effectiveness and delivers the most value for poor and marginalised people.
Have we analysed the context to ensure we have correctly identified the problem and are putting our money in the right place?

Are we linking resource allocation to previous performance data?

Do we have an understanding of what would happen without our intervention?

Who will benefit from the intervention and what value do they put on the results?

How does this intervention fit in with our comparative advantage? Are we avoiding duplication with other actors?

Will we be working with hard-to-reach groups or fragile and conflict-affected states where costs are high and trade-offs are necessary?

What results do we hope to achieve from the resources put in?

Are there multiplier effects from the intervention?

Are we generating important learning through this intervention?

Are there benefits from replication or scaling up this intervention?

Are we collecting monitoring data and is there evidence that we are achieving what we set out to do?

Are we monitoring the costs of units, activities or sets of interventions? Are we analysing costs alongside results?

Are stakeholders involved in identifying benefits? How are their perspectives included?

Where results and costs vary from expectations are we able to explain why?

Are we adapting our objectives based on learning?

Is there evidence our theory of change worked in practice?

Are we able to identify if our interventions delivered more or less than expected?

What value was created by this intervention and how can we describe it in concrete and specific ways? Who is identifying this value?

Do we have evidence to show that the impact from the programme is long term and sustainable?

Can we show how resources were spent to achieve changes?

Was this a good use of resources? What would we do differently next time?

Are we incorporating learning into future / other programmes?

What is the ratio of expenditure on organisational to programmatic costs?

What steps are we taking to manage risk in this intervention? Will this demand higher expenditure?

What steps are we taking to prevent corruption in this intervention?

Do we have a clear theory of change? Is this supported by previous experience or evidence?

Is there a budget linked to the Theory of change?

Do we have clear objectives, milestones and targets, building on a baseline?

How could we achieve more value for the same/less resources?

Can we compare the cost of different strategies to achieve similar outcomes?

Are we involving partners and communities in identifying which activities and outcomes have greatest value, and where savings can be made?

Have we considered how this intervention is going to be sustainable in the long term?

Can we build synergies with existing programmes?

Can we leverage contributions from other sources?

This diagram was developed by Bond and ITAD drawing on earlier research conducted by Belinda Duff and Daisy McDonald