

Disability Inclusion Helpdesk Report No: 138

Query title	Good practice examples on Value for Money incorporating consideration of equity in the analysis in Business Cases and Annual Reviews
Authors	Amy Harrison and Nick Corby
Date	April 2025
Query	To collect good practice examples from Business Cases (BCs) and from Annual Reviews (ARs) which show how equity can be incorporated into VfM analysis across a range of contexts that FCDO work in.
Enquirer	Equalities Impact Unit

Case Study: Humanitarian Action and Response Programme Nigeria

Programme summary

The [Humanitarian Action and Response Programme](#) (HARP) is a flexible 3-year programme being implemented in Nigeria from 2022 to 2025, with a value of up to £150 million. HARP is a critical component of the UK's overall response to the Lake Chad Basin crisis. It is delivered by a consortium of stakeholders, including the World Food Programme, UNICEF, the International Committee of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, CARE UK, and the Nigeria Humanitarian Fund (managed by OCHA). A consortium led by CLEAR Global provides third-party monitoring. HARP builds on the legacy of FCDO Nigeria's 5-year NENTAD programme (Nigeria Transition to Development Programme, 2017-2022, £425 million). HARP provides life-saving humanitarian assistance to people affected by conflict in North-East Nigeria, while also building their resilience to shocks. It aims to reduce mortality and increase resilience for people with the most severe humanitarian needs by addressing food insecurity and malnutrition, and by protecting vulnerable people from harm.

Equity and Value for Money (VfM) on HARP

The HARP [Strategic Case](#) sets out the need to proactively consider equity in order to achieve its intended impact of 'reducing mortality and increasing resilience for people with the most severe humanitarian needs,' It recognises that high levels of malnutrition almost certainly 'hide pockets of extreme vulnerability,' and that women and children account for 81% of people in need of protection assistance. It notes how the high cost of operating in some areas can mean humanitarian actors contribute to existing exclusion if an equity lens is not adopted. HARP committed to 'reaching populations based on need, as opposed to access,' investing in 'real-time monitoring, data collection and analysis to inform the evidence-driven approach to *who* people in need are, *where* they are and *what* they require, to inform inclusive and impartial prioritisation of limited funds to those who need them most.'

Disability Inclusion Helpdesk Report No: 138

The **Appraisal Case** considers the VfM 4Es. HARP has two outputs, each with two indicators. Metrics for were identified for output indicators, and indicator were assigned a 'VfM range.'

Output	VfM metrics	Indicative VfM ranges (low = improved)	
Output 2.1: Protection and humanitarian access	<u>Efficiency</u> : £ unit cost per person provided with support to address protection risks <u>Effectiveness</u> : # of referrals for protection support from other HARP sector assistance <u>Effectiveness</u> : % recipients report higher confidence in personal safety/security <u>Equity</u> : % of women and girl recipients of protection support	≤ £39	≥ £50
Output 2.2: Rapid response	<u>Efficiency</u> : Total % Nigerian Humanitarian Fund (NHF) funding allocated to program activities <u>Effectiveness</u> : Average number of days for HARP funding to be allocated <u>Equity</u> : % NHF funding allocated to local organisations <u>Equity</u> : % women and/or girl recipients of assistance/support	≤ 43 days	≥ 54 days

The **Appraisal Case** also set out the rationale for adopting five cross-cutting priorities: Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP); Gender; Inclusion; Cash; and Localisation. In combination, these priorities – which were both mainstreamed and the focus of standalone activities – served to promote VfM in terms of equity and more broadly. For example, AAP supported HARP to understand better, and respond to, people's lived experiences and needs; to foster legitimacy; to improve access, including in otherwise hard-to-reach areas; and to promote inter-sector coordination and integration with other relevant programmes in North-East Nigeria (therefore supporting VfM effectiveness, efficiency, equity).

The HARP **Commercial Case** recognises potential cost savings associated with accessing local expertise where possible. This commercial driver is reflected in the cross-cutting theme of 'localisation,' with global evidence showing barriers to localisation are often perception-based. HARP's cross-cutting commitment to localisation is based on the aim of improving the effectiveness of the response, as humanitarian aid is contextualised and delivered more cost-effectively (in addition to improving access and increasing sustainability and AAP).

HARP delivery partners were required to demonstrate capacity to 'take a robust approach to localisation.' This was supportive of programme targets – for example, Output 2.2's target on rapid response (25% of HARP assistance to be delivered by local organisations) as well as programme monitoring which measured the proportion of activities delivered by local actors across each Output. HARP used FCDO's Humanitarian Response Funding Guidelines for NGOs to improve the transparency of budgets of downstream partners, strengthen oversight both at partner selection and throughout partnership management, and manage core cost percentages and non-

Disability Inclusion Helpdesk Report No: 138

project attributable costs. Commitment to localisation did not come at the cost of opportunities economy or efficiency: for example, the 2023/4 Annual Review highlighted how FCDO's funding to UNICEF, rather than CSO partners, allowed life-saving services to be provided at a lower cost (with savings of more than 10%).

HARP's 2023/2024 [Annual Review](#) reported on the programme's VfM performance, with equity captured across all 4Es. For example:

- **Economy:** UNICEF collaboration with a national NGO partner with local experience in cash assistance programming proved effective in delivering the cash delivery intervention at low cost, in a way that prioritised localisation.
- **Efficiency:** UNICEF's delivery through local partner, Monclub, has facilitated provision of timely and life-saving assistance in a local authority that is extremely hard to reach and cannot be accessed by INGOs or the UN.
- **Effectiveness:** increased use of cash transfers across all HARP-funded projects, plus alignment with the Nigerian government by UNICEF and WFP, supported HARP in directing significant amounts of funding to some of the least funded sectors of the Northeast humanitarian response, including protection and access sectors.
- **Equity:** under the NHF, the proportion of funding going to local partners increased from 36% to 55%, with accompanying training delivered to 42 national women-led/women's rights organisations (increased from 30 in 2022/2023).
 - **Areas for improvement:** increased targeting of cash assistance for women led to increased hostility towards women and thus increased risk of gender-based violence. HARP is monitoring this and plans to work with partners to mitigate the risk through renewed focus on including men in delivery of protection activities.

Key takeaways

- Humanitarian programmes have the opportunity to build equity into all aspects of design and delivery – and to be more ambitious than relying on the fact that humanitarian programming inherently targets marginalised populations, including by taking an intersectional view of who is most likely to be left out.
- Working with and through local partners can support equity aims (through increased access and localisation) while also reducing costs and improving efficiency.
- Equity can be meaningfully reflected across the VfM 4Es; this should be supported by regular monitoring during implementation, to track successes and also monitor and respond to risks.

Disability Inclusion Helpdesk Report No: 138

About Helpdesk reports: The Disability Inclusion Helpdesk is funded by the UK Foreign, Commonwealth, and Development Office (FCDO), contracted through the Disability Inclusion Team (DIT) under the Disability Inclusive Development Inclusive Futures Programme. Helpdesk reports are based on between 3 and 4.5 days of desk-based research per query and are designed to provide a brief overview of the key issues and expert thinking on issues around disability inclusion. Where referring to documented evidence, Helpdesk teams will seek to understand the methodologies used to generate evidence and will summarise this in Helpdesk outputs, noting any concerns with the robustness of the evidence being presented. For some Helpdesk services, in particular the practical know-how queries, the emphasis will be focused far less on academic validity of evidence and more on the validity of first-hand experience among disabled people and practitioners delivering and monitoring programmes on the ground. All sources will be clearly referenced.

Helpdesk services are provided by a consortium of leading organisations and individual experts on disability, including Social Development Direct, Sightsavers, ADD International, Light for the World, Humanity & Inclusion, BRAC, BBC Media Action, Sense and the Institute of Development Studies (IDS). Expert advice may be sought from this Group, as well as from the wider academic and practitioner community, and those able to provide input within the short timeframe are acknowledged. Any views or opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of FCDO, the Disability Inclusion Helpdesk or any of the contributing organisations/experts.

For any further request or enquiry, contact enquiries@disabilityinclusion.org.uk