Value for Money at CARE DK

From responsible economy to catalytic impact

Authors: CARE DK

CARE Denmark's approach

Version	Update
1.0	Update and consolidation of existing approaches into one framework

A holistic approach to good resource use

This framework outlines CARE DK's approach to Value for Money (henceforth VfM) and contains guidance on how to **assess** different levels within VfM from HQ level to international projects. Overall, CARE DK **understands** value for money as the maximization of impact of each development investment following the well-established concept of good resource use (King, 2019a).

CARE works across the nexus continuum, seeking to support climate vulnerable populations in different situations and contexts. CARE invests in innovative, inclusive, and scalable climate solutions that improve adaptive capacities and resilience of households and communities, forge new partnerships and develop proofs of concepts for scale and impact beyond the aid. At the same time, CARE responses rapidly to communities affected by climate and conflict induced disasters via a localised approach.

The VfM framework assesses whether CARE's use of resources is justified by the value created in terms of:

- Lean and efficient project management
- Cost-effective interventions
- Climate resilience outcomes
- New and green opportunities for marginalised communities
- Equity and inclusion (particularly women, youth, and marginalised groups)
- Localisation and sustainability of solutions
- Innovation and learning for scale
- Catalytic impact – gearing resources beyond institutional funding

CARE DK's ambition for Value for Money and good resource use:

CARE DK seeks to leverage institutional funding for maximum impact by co-creating, developing and testing solutions that have a significant potential to scale out of the aid bubble and become financially, socially and environmentally sustainable for the benefit of the highest number of climate vulnerable communities possible.

While CARE DK adheres to the **bond framework,** qualitative methods are added to the mixture to gain a more holistic understanding of good resource use beyond quantifiable metrics. The need to deploy qualitative methods within VfM comes from the consideration that no one-size fits all

in terms of quantification of intervention results. Rather **an evaluative and explorative approach** informed by multiple data entry points and context can supplement and guide the assessment of VfM in all aspects.

The evaluative judgement approach is inspired by OPMs framework[1] which lends itself particularly well to complex development interventions with less linear pathways. This applies to CARE DK's climate innovation projects that takes as its point of departure local challenges over predefined solutions using human-centred design to develop responses.

VfM principles at CARE DK

CARE DK's Value for Money framework is guided by the mandate to support climate vulnerable populations.

- **Optimisation:** Value for Money is ultimately about the optimisation of gains for climate vulnerable populations and places
- **Responsible project management:** We translate institutional funding into well-functioning projects that deliver impact, green opportunities and inclusion
- **Community-led:** Early involvement, co-creation and inclusion are prerequisites for local value generation
- **Multi-faceted:** Value comes in many forms; adherence to protocols and best practice, sustainability, greening, local leadership, blended finance etc.
- **Catalytic impact:** the success of CARE DK's work should be measured against the extent to which local gains increase exponentially over time and last beyond institutional funding

Scope of VfM assessment

CARE DK approaches VfM as an interdisciplinary domain involving multiple stakeholders across the chain of influence. This ranges from *upwards accountability* to donors (demonstrating high quality resource use and results) to *downwards accountability* to partners as well as communities supported via international projects (for maximum social and environmental impact and local relevance).

VfM assessment takes place at multiple levels; At the HQ level, CARE DK staff assesses adherence to best practice guidelines for grants management, programme quality, and procurement (*economy*), and undertakes analysis of **input-output ratio** at the *portfolio level* to compare and improve quality of spendings (*efficiency*). MEAL and project staff, uses VfM indicators and learning questions to assess overall progress within VfM and good resource use, feeding into the overall value proposition of the ToC (*effectiveness* and *cost-effectiveness*). At the HQ level, VfM assessment is predominantly linked to strategic oversight of projects, ensuring promotion of the framework and practical guidance for project implementers.

At the *programme and project level,* VfM assessment revolves around more in-depth assessment of a project's performance against the indicators and pre-defined criteria presented below. During design phase, project staff mainstream, MEAL and partners mainstream rio-marker and gender assessment and develop coherent selection criteria for end-users and/or crisis affected

---

[1]

communities (*economy and equity)*. Ongoing VfM assessment, includes the ability to track how procurement is undertaken and providers chosen and continuous monitoring of cost per end-user and solution infrastructure striving for the highest degree of cost-quality balance possible (*efficiency*). Based on learning questions from the global results frame, evaluations directly include VfM into terms of references (ToR) to assess CARE's and partners ability to deliver outcomes, distribute gains, and create sustainable impact beyond funding (cost-effectiveness).

VfM cover all types of projects as well as CARE DK's ability to deliver on those. This spans from multi-year climate innovation projects to rapid emergency responses. While these programmes are different in nature, the performance criteria are applied contextually while some indicators can be deployed universally for comparison across programmes (e.g. is project partner-led, development of selection criteria, etc.).

VfM-informed decisions, learning and accountability

The VfM framework provides an organisation-wide view of VfM by synthesising project-level data across both CARE DK's climate adaptation and emergency projects and is closely linked with CARE's global **Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) system**. Lines of inquiry are integrated directly into the global results framework ensuring that CARE DK continuously assess its contribution to VfM (at least annually) and creates learning products based on proven and cost-effective approaches from within different projects. **Learning questions** related to VfM include:

- Is CARE DK performing satisfactorily in the role as grants holder and in accordance with grants management systems and programme quality standards?
- What types of actions are taken to minimise output level costs? (e.g. cost per end-user or small-scale infrastructure)
- Are solutions based on the needs of front-line communities and embedded locally by the end of projects?
- Are we creating solutions with real scaling potential? Are they viable after project end?
- To what extent are we reaching those most in need? Do we apply criteria consistently?
- How green is our portfolio? (environmental screening, addressing both adaptation mitigation).

To facilitate the institutionalisation of a VfM thinking, CARE DK further integrates VfM considerations into **project cycle management (PCM)** across all phases. This means that design considerations revolve around selecting and developing promising models for climate responses and that market analysis is carried out to support **long-term uptake and sustainability**. CARE DK conducts annual **pause & reflect sessions** with country offices and partners, to assess overall progress on the ToC and VfM aspects. While these sessions are primarily designed to assess and potentially revise the global ToC, this also involves a critical look at CARE DK's value proposition and the degree to which we are able to deliver long-term social impact based on the minimum number of inputs and project activities.

VfM analysis and reporting are part of both ongoing monitoring as well as end-of-year stock taking processes at the programme level. Based on evidence from projects, VfM findings are presented as means to strengthen decision-making and compare progress between

programmes and projects. In cases where programmes perform "poorly" or "modest" (in accordance with performance criteria), the **value for money task force**[2] convenes to analyse and suggest overall improvements to project implementation - financially and programmatically. Conversely instances of "excellent performance" are elevated to best practices and products to facilitate organisational-wide learning and knowledge exchange between projects and partners.

> **Programme Quality in CARE: Metrics, standards and guidance.**
> CARE's 10 drivers of program quality are drawn from global criteria such as OECD DAC, from CARE's policies, principles, standards and commitments, and from external standards and agreements (Grand Bargain, Climate and Environmental Charter for Humanitarian Organisations etc.). They can be applied to our humanitarian work, as well as programs working in long-term development or nexus contexts, and in advocacy as well as programming, in ways that are flexible and adaptable to the different contexts we work in. The 10 drivers are:
>   1. **Gender & Inclusion –** different needs, inclusion, participation and women-led
>   2. **Accountability –** ongoing feedback from communities and transparent adjustments
>   3. **Do No Harm –** routine monitoring of needs and vulnerabilities incl. mitigations.
>   4. **Partnership –** Purposeful relationships based on mutual trust and learning.
>   5. **Relevance & Coherence –** projects are locally-led and owned
>   6. **Climate & Environmental Responsibility –** building climate resilience
>   7. **Sustainable Impact at Scale –** projects are designed for sustainable impact
>   8. **Adapting and Learning -** evidence-based and continual learning
>   9. **Effectiveness –** Programmes are inclusive and deliver observable results
>   10. **Efficiency –** Projects are cost-effective and delivered on time

Reporting

Reporting and monitoring value for money begins at the project level and is integrated into general progress reporting, in particular for programmes that have a direct focus on climate solutions. COs and partners are instructed to use VfM indicators in reporting related to both indirect support costs and direct project activities. In addition, major interventions prioritize **economic type of evaluations** and directly integrate CARE DK's VfM framework and learning questions on par with OECD-DAC criteria to gain in-depth and independent assessments that can supplement CDK's ongoing VfM monitoring.

In combination with tracking performance on selected HQ VfM proxy indicators including average kick-off, adherence to Programme Quality Standards, and rio-marker application - CARE DK is able to get a broad perspective on VfM that is used for strategic decision-making while contributing to the overall learning agenda. VfM reporting will take place on **an annual basis**, and in line with existing reporting to major donors to ensure alignment and utilization. Finally, a set of stand-alone VfM learning products are delivered on a bi-annual basis in accordance with global learning indicators, comparing programmes and competitiveness in concrete interventions.

---

[2] The task force is lead by CDK MEAL with support from different Programme & Grants Managers and controllers depending on the programme under review.

Integration of ESG Factors

CARE's new strategy - *Green and Resilient Futures Beyond Aid* - has a strong emphasis on green opportunities, inclusive responses and market-based approaches within the climate space. Hence, there is a natural link to associated ESG metrics, incl. across core outcome areas as contained within the global results frame. This includes measuring local resilience to climate shocks, contribution to sustainable livelihood opportunities, inclusion of women, youth and other marginalised groups, and support to local environments, biodiversity and natural resources management. Indicators and targets have been designed with a direct outlook to ESG frameworks enable access to financial institutions and unlock external investments and blended finance.

CARE DK uses a mix between tested and validated indicators to measure and track local resilience (e.g. Confederation domain) and established frameworks for ESG reporting including **IRIS+ impact metrics** and **European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS).** At the project level, CARE DK directly applies ESG data to understand both the *feasibility* (users, jobs, and # structures), *viability* (RoI, break-even and revenue generation), and *social impact* of each solution promoted. This facilitates value for money assessments, enables comparison of most competitive options, and supports the development of business cases for locally led entrepreneurship.

How CARE DK's Value for Money progress is assessed in practice

This section elaborates on CARE DKs VfM framework and provides a set of performance standards for each of the E's in accordance with the Bond Framework.

Economy

CARE's operations are lean, flexible and responsive with attention to cost-quality balance, ongoing assessments of project delivery, and expansion of the green envelope/climate finance.

The economy criteria assess how well CARE DK procures inputs and partnerships at the right quality and cost, while balancing localisation and environmental considerations by looking at:

1) The ability of CARE DK to start new projects on time and continue implementation without delays
2) Procurement practices as competitive at the project level and follow procurement standards
3) The net positive impact on local eco-systems of each project, directly addressing either climate adaptation, mitigation or other environmental concerns

Performance standard	Definition
Excellent	At least 80% start in accordance with plan and there are little to no delays in implementation At least 80% of projects can demonstrate that procurement is competitive (as defined by CARE's procurement standards), and that decisions balance cost, quality, localisation, and environmental considerations to maximise value. At least 80% of projects have a 'principal' ('significant' for emergencies) focus on addressing climate or environmental aspects
Good	At least 60–79% of projects start in accordance with plan and there few albeit insignificant delays. At least 60–79% of projects use competitive procurement processes. Most projects show some consideration of cost-quality balance and localisation/environmental impacts, though application is uneven. At least 60–79% of projects have a 'principal' ('significant' for emergencies) focus on addressing climate or environmental aspects
Modest	At least half of projects start in accordance with plan and there are several instances where delay influences quality of the project.

 	At least 40–59% of projects use competitive procurement. Considerations of localisation or environmental impacts are occasional or ad hoc, with cost often prioritised over other value dimensions. >50 % of projects have a 'principal' ('significant' for emergencies) focus on addressing climate or environmental aspects
Poor	Fewer than 40% of projects start cannot meet actual start date and more than half of projects faces severe challenges to implementation. Fewer than 40% of projects demonstrate competitive procurement. Little or no evidence of balancing cost with quality, localisation, or environmental impacts. Procurement is often delayed, inefficient, or non-compliant. Fewer than 40% of projects have a 'principal' ('significant' for emergencies) focus on addressing climate or environmental aspects

Efficiency

CARE chooses the right partnerships and solutions based on community needs, minimises cost of outputs over time and conducts transparent decision-making and adaptations based on local feedback.

The efficiency criterion assesses how well CARE converts financial, technical, and human resources into responses and solutions that are cost-aware, replicable, and needs driven. This entails that:

- CARE demonstrates risk willingness and the ability to seek out new potential partners and/or service deliveries for improved solutions design and / or potential reach (crises settings)
- Solutions designed with an outlook to cost-recovery and break-even calculations as integrated in proof of concept or model description

Performance standard	Definition
Excellent	At least 80% of (non-emergency) projects/solutions produce a documented proof of concept or model description, enabling replication, scaling, or clear learning on why scaling is not suitable; and CARE DK demonstrably adapts its inputs (funding, technical support, partnerships) to emerging needs to increase the likelihood of proof of concept success; and

	At least 80% of projects systematically track cost per household (or relevant unit) and take actions during implementation to reduce costs or improve efficiency without compromising quality or equity.
Good	60–79% of projects/solutions develop at least partial proof of concept or model documentation, though uptake and scalability considerations are uneven; CARE DK adapts some inputs to support emerging needs; most projects track cost per household, but actions to reduce costs are inconsistent.
Modest	40–59% of projects/solutions show early or incomplete proof of concept work; adaptation of inputs is limited or ad hoc; cost per household is sometimes tracked but rarely used to guide decisions or efficiency improvements.
Poor	<40% of projects/solutions produce usable proof of concept or model documentation; CARE DK makes little or no adaptive input adjustments; cost per household is not systematically tracked, and no actions are taken to improve efficiency.

Effectiveness

CARE's interventions create desired and observable improvements in relation to the resilience and self-reliance of local communities by enabling access to new opportunities while influencing the sector with proven models for adaptation and green emergency responses.

The effectiveness criterion assesses how well CARE's work deliver meaningful, measurable and observable outcomes for climate vulnerable communities and crisis-affected populations. This entails looking at:

- Clear increases in values for **core outcome indicators** (adaptive capacities, economic resilience, and satisfaction with humanitarian assistance)
- The ability of CARE and partners to deliver sustainable outcomes and solutions that are viable and transferred to local partners (evidence of local anchorage)

Performance standard	Definition
Excellent	≥80% of projects meet or exceed set targets for core outcome indicators (Adaptive capacities, economic resilience, satisfaction with humanitarian assistance - thresholds defined in global results frame / counting methodologies); Within these, verifiable proof of concepts with a credible scale pathway, including at least one identified scale actor (government, private sector, or other partner).
Good	60–79% of projects meet or exceed set targets for core outcome indicators; Within these, a majority have developed proof of concepts, incl. initial scale discussions under way but limited commitment from scale actors.

Modest	40–59% of projects meet or exceed set targets for core outcome indicators;
	Few projects have credible proof of concept or identified scale actors.
Poor	<40% of projects meet or exceed set targets for core outcome indicators;
	Solutions are largely untested, lack proof of concept, and have no identified scale actors.

Equity

CARE's interventions reach the world's most climate vulnerable, in particular women, accompanied by concerted targeting strategies.

The equity criterion assesses how fairly CARE's projects distribute benefits and gains to the most climate vulnerable with particular attention to women and the poorest refugee and host households, ensuring dignity and inclusion.

- Both project design and evaluation include leave no-one behind considerations and clear criteria for end-user selection / targeting of crisis affected communities
- CARE's projects reach intended target audiences through projects and are capable of disaggregating results (gender, age, disability and other vulnerability dimensions)

Performance standard	Definition
Excellent	≥80% of projects provide disaggregated evidence (gender, displacement/refugee status) showing that climate-vulnerable groups — especially women and the poorest refugee and host households — are reached, benefit meaningfully, and report improved dignity and inclusion. Projects demonstrate intentional strategies that reduce inequities between groups.
Good	60–79% of projects show disaggregated evidence that most climate-vulnerable groups benefit, though depth or consistency varies. Some groups (e.g., poorest refugees or women-headed households) are less well covered.
Modest	40–59% of projects provide partial or inconsistent evidence of equitable benefits. Inclusion strategies exist but are weakly implemented; climate-vulnerable groups benefit unevenly, with gaps for some sub-groups.
Poor	<40% of projects demonstrate equitable outcomes. Climate-vulnerable groups, especially women and the poorest refugee and host households, are under-represented or excluded. Solutions benefit accessible populations with limited deliberate efforts to target the most vulnerable.

Cost-effectiveness

CARE's interventions are based on cost analysis, robust evidence, and scaling pathways to enable a significant increase in reach and impact beyond institutional funding.

The cost-effectiveness criterion assesses whether CARE's projects and pilots use resources wisely to generate sufficient and optimal impact or credible learning to justify investment, and whether there is a clear pathway showing that solutions can achieve strong outcomes relative to costs when scaled.

- CARE and partners can showcase exponential reach by the end of projects OR have established credible scaling pathways to ensure sustainable impact
- Solutions are rooted in market analysis and/or analysis of existing (climate-smart) practices to showcase competitiveness and advantage of selected approaches

Performance standard	Definition
Excellent	≥80% of projects/pilots demonstrate that resources were used efficiently to generate credible outcomes or proof of concepts, and provide clear evidence of a pathway to scale (e.g., cost modelling, scale actors identified) showing strong potential outcome-to-cost ratios at larger scale. Reach numbers are exponential towards the end of projects and there is credible evidence of project viability.
Good	60–79% of projects/pilots generate meaningful outcomes or robust learning that justifies investment, with some indicative evidence of cost and scale potential. Scale pathways exist but are at an early stage (e.g., exploratory partnerships or pilot cost benchmarks). Steady increase in reach towards the end of projects with limited evidence of project viability.
Modest	40–59% of projects/pilots generate limited outcomes or learning relative to costs. Evidence of cost-effectiveness at scale is weak, speculative, or not yet developed. Limited reach over the course of project implementation and there's limited evidence supporting project continuation beyond funding.
Poor	<40% of projects/pilots provide sufficient outcomes or learning to justify resources. No evidence of scale potential or cost-effectiveness pathway exists. Reach remains static or declines over the course of implementation with evidence supporting project continuation.

Examples of CARE DK contribution to Value for Money

Below is a series of examples that illustrate Value for Money in CARE DK's projects and protocols in both design and implementation. The list represents examples of successful practices or outcomes and will be updated over time.

Design considerations that are built to promote Value for Money:

- Rio markers are deployed strategically at proposal / design phase to ensure both environmental, adaptation and mitigation perspectives are actively integrated into all projects (*economy*)
- Proposals development actively includes the 10 drivers of programme quality to ensure overall contribution and coherence with best practices from the outset (*economy*)
- Projects monitor input-to-output ratios – incl. in progress reporting - overtime and seek to improve figures (*efficiency*)
- Projects have clear and explicit targeting strategies impact group and end-users (*equity*)
- Climate innovation projects are embedded in learning, starting with narrow testing and evidence generation to enable later replication and/or scaling (*cost-effectiveness*)
- Market analysis and mapping of supply chains increase viability of selected solutions as well as local ownership (*effectiveness*)
- Proposal demonstrates cost competitiveness to enhance impact and outline potential models for cost-recovery (*cost-effectiveness*)

Results that demonstrate VfM in CARE's work to date:

- Replication of Reverse Osmosis plants based on savings from sales of purified water accompanied by women-led governance models (proof of concept) in Bagherhat, Bangladesh. This ensured an effective expansion of women directly involved in managing the plants with low activity costs, while increasing indirect reach to an additional 500 households in need of clean water (*cost-effectiveness, equity*)
- Private sector onboarding and subsequent investment of local private partner in Niger, led to a co-investment of EUR 25.000 which translated into the installation of 36 *additional* biodigesters for climate-vulnerable households on top of the contribution from institutional funding (*cost-effectiveness)*
- Establishing a locally led and pooled rapid response mechanism in Ukraine via civil society umbrella organisation International Renaissance Foundation (IRF). This resulted in significant reach numbers that exceeded set targets with 800% (63% women) enabled by channelling support directly and rapidly to established frontline organisations (*equity, cost-effectiveness*)
- Aligning anticipatory action with government priorities in Somalia, supporting the development of pastoralist corridors for safer and more predictable seasonal migration. The project worked closely with government entities which resulted in the establishment of Somalia's first state-run Early Warning System (*effectiveness, cost-effectiveness*)
- Endorsement of innovation project in Ethiopia by regional government, resulting in sustainable restoration of 34.5 Ha of invaded land for productive purposes and climate-smart agriculture. Restoration has led to +500 jobs, income generation from irrigated land and more than USD 9.000 from subsequent sales of prosopis-based products (*effectiveness*)

Annex 1 - Rubric for VfM performance measurement

To assess performance against VfM targets and indicators, the table below has been developed to clarify levels of progress and allow for better communication of results.

Performance standard	Definition
Excellent	Projects and interventions exceed set targets / expectations and show promising potential in terms of sustainable project management. Few/none improvements needed
Good	The intervention meets most set targets / expectations with few insignificant deviations and/or shortcomings. Still room for adjustments and/or adaptive measures.
Modest	The intervention, though not meeting all expectations/targets, is fulfilling minimum 'bottom-line' requirements and is showing acceptable progress overall. Significant improvements may be needed.
Poor	The intervention is not fulfilling minimum 'bottom-line' requirements and/or not showing acceptable progress overall. Immediate and major improvements are needed.

Annex 2 – VfM Overview

Below is a condensed overview of types of data sources CARE DK uses to assess value for money from HQ policies, design considerations and project impact and in accordance with the Bond framework. The overview highlights a long list of indicators used to inform the "evaluative judgements" based on performance standards defined above.

VfM dimension	Methods Used	Evidence/Data	Level of analysis	Suggested Indicators (proxies)
Economy	Internal reviews, Competitive procurement (logged), framework agreements, market surveys, Rio-Markers	Market price analysis; best price-quality ratio documentation; project documents	Applies to both HQ level policies and international projects	• Average time before project kick-off / IPIA signatures • % of procurement contracts awarded competitively • % of projects with *significant* or *principal* focus on adaptation, mitigation or environment
Efficiency	Unit cost calculation	Cost per end-user analysis / cost per solution infrastructure, progress reports	Financial analysis, output-based	• Cost per end-user accessing climate solutions • Cost per solution infrastructure • Proportion of projects that made adaptations during implementation
Effectiveness	Outcome indicators (global RF), outcome harvesting	Surveys that link to CORE outcomes indicators of CARE DK's global resultsframe; post-distribution monitoring and PIIRs analysis	Analysis of results in international projects and degree of achievement	• % of achievement against CDK CORE outcome indicators by the end of projects (adaptive capacities, economic resilience, satisfaction with delivery) • # of new jobs and/or sustainable livelihood opportunities supported (as per targets per project)
Equity	Targeting criteria prioritizing most vulnerable, percentage achievement against predefined impact group; Project Evaluations	Targeting lists disaggregated by gender/age/disability and other vulnerability criteria	Design AND impact of international projects	• % achievement against target for project reach – incl. gender split • A majority of external evaluations integrate equity criteria and assess CDK's ability to deliver on LNOB

Cost-effectiveness	Social Return on Investment (SROI) analysis and reach projections	Impact metrics and revenue streams from scalable solutions	Financial analysis, inputs / PPA versus impact and projected reach	• # of people benefitting from solutions – by end of project and projected (evidence of exponential reach) • Amount (Ha) of land under Climate-smart practices • # of projects that achieved sustainable scale
Other VfM proxies (TBU)	PIIRs accountability dashboard	Project accountability data, progress reporting	Portfolio, PIIRs	• % of projects that are either MOSTLY or FULLY partner-led • % of projects with a functional Feedback & Accountability Mechanism (FAM) and % of issues responded

Annex 3 – Roles & responsibilities in VfM framework

Function	Role in VfM integration / assessment
VfM Task Force	Overall coordination of VfM assessment at portfolio level and progress reporting & consolidation.
MEAL	Ensure centralisation and aggregation of project level VfM data, consolidation of VfM reports
Financial Controller	Facilitate efficiency analysis, and calculate input-to output ratio at portfolio level, oversee adherence to procurement guidelines and local audit instructions
Fundraiser	Ensure adherence to Programme Quality standards, screen project documents and proposals for gender mainstreaming and greening, assessment against rio-markers
Programme & Grants Coordinator	Include Value for Money assessments in Quarterly Project Follow-Up Meetings (QPFM), as well as progress reporting, ensures adherence to Programme Quality standards
Technical team	Strengthen scalability of selected solutions, facilitate market analysis for
Country Office project lead	Track and register procurement, incl. data on cost-benefit analysis of procured service and/or product; monitor output-based unit analysis such as cost per end-user
International Programme Director	Oversees VfM progress, uses VfM analysis for decision-making and external positioning

Resources:

OPM - Assessing Value for Money: the Oxford Policy Management Approach - second edition (2023). Available at: https://www.opml.co.uk/sites/default/files/2024-06/opm-value-money-vfm-approach-v2-1.pdf

CARE - Cost effectiveness in CARE: An overview of cost effectiveness framework and tools

Programme Quality in CARE