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1 Introduction

1.1 Structure of the final study report

The final report of the Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation (CPDE) study builds on the learning insights gathered from different converging sources during the 13 months of implementation of the study (February 2014 – March 2015):

- The daily interaction between the Management Group, the Project Co-ordination Team and the country co-ordinators in the 18 countries which expressed willingness to take part in the study.
- The background material (concept note, update notes, various terms of reference, etc.) that were developed prior and during the implementation of the study.
- The country studies implemented by 14 out of the 18 countries initially foreseen to take part in the project, and the various feedback loops (initial review, quality assurance, final review, …) during the process of finalisation of these studies.
- The proceedings workshop reports of the Launching Workshop held in Kampala - Uganda in March 2014 and the Synthesis Workshop held in Manila – Philippines in December 2014.
- The four thematic papers commissioned by the project and addressing the lessons learned from the CPDE country studies: 1) review of the Paris Declaration Evaluation in support of country evaluation systems 2) other collaborative partner-donor opportunities for future CPDE work, 3) CPDE’s contribution towards strengthening country evaluation systems and 4) the multiple partnership dimensions under CPDE.

The report starts by recalling the history of the CPDE initiative and its importance in the current evaluation landscape (chapter 1), it then explains the CPDE Study design including the objectives and the various components of the study (chapter 2), and provides a retrospective analysis of the CPDE Study journey and the main learnings derived from the study (chapter 3).

Chapter 4 introduces the thematic papers that were developed in order to systematize the learnings derived from the CPDE Study process and harvest conceptual and practical insights which can feed into a future partner-donor collaboration.

Chapter 5 looks at the lessons learned from the country studies, with contributions from Pablo Rodriguez Bilella for the meta-review of the section in the country studies on the Paris Declaration Evaluation in support of country evaluation systems.

Chapter 6 looks at the lessons learned from the country studies, with contributions from Mohammed Hedi Manai for the meta-review of the sections on other collaborative partner-donor work and opportunities for future CPDE.

Chapter 7 discusses the systemic issue of CPDE’s contribution towards strengthening country evaluation systems through the thematic paper authored by Jacques Toulemonde.

Chapter 8 analyses the multiple partnership dimensions under CPDE with contributions from Serge Eric Yakeu together with Jacques Toulemonde.

Chapter 9 closes the report by recapitulating the main learnings from the process and drawing a potential roadmap for the continuation of the CPDE work beyond the current stage.

1.2 A brief history of CPDE

The evaluation of the Paris Declaration is widely regarded as a high point in collaborative partner-donor evaluation, unique in its scale and scope. A lessons-learned workshop in February 2012 allowed the country co-ordinators and other actors to review that experience and draw lessons. This in turn contributed to a decision by EvalNet that same month to continue the engagement with the 21 Paris Declaration Evaluation (PDE) partner countries in order to capitalise on the heightened visibility and renewed momentum for development evaluation. EvalNet accordingly offered to serve as a hub for maintaining sustainable exchanges within the PDE Network and undertaking light joint activities. There was agreement on the need to explore ways to achieve the following:

- To create an informal platform for exchange to encourage and respond to proposals for country-led evaluations and promote joint evaluations;
- To keep donors and partner countries updated on opportunities and good practices;
- To identify opportunities for learning by doing; and
- To link with capacity building and learning initiatives.

France accepted the task of preparing a proposal and submitted a note at the 14th EvalNet meeting in November 2012. France was then given the mandate to propose “a survey of partner countries involved in the PDE to identify opportunities for supporting joint partner-donor evaluation work.” The project was...
then inserted in the 2013 annual programme of the evaluation capacity development (ECD) Task Team. In June 2013, EvalNet reiterated the mandate for a “Study on Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation Work” under the conditions that a sufficient number of partner and donor countries confirm their interest. Contacts with the 22 PDE partner countries elicited expressions of interest to participate from 17, and 16 donor agencies also expressed their interest and willingness to fund. This study has been conducted in the spirit of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, established in 2011 after the High Level Forum in Busan.

1.3 Why CPDE in the current evaluation landscape?

There are at least four reasons for partner countries to play a stronger role in the hitherto largely donor dominated practice of evaluation of Official Development Assistance (ODA):

- Changes in ODA;
- Commitments to use partner country systems;
- Commitment to increase result information and mutual accountability;
- Successful collaboration on the PDE.

**Changes in official development assistance (ODA)**

ODA represents a declining share of the overall financing for development, relative to domestic resources, trade related assistance, or financing climate and biodiversity actions. This calls for ODA to play a catalytic role rather than working in isolation. By extension, this then calls for ODA evaluation to consider the broad picture of country development activities rather than specific operations.

As ODA delivery modalities evolve toward more programmatic approaches aligned with partner country strategies and more use of country systems through budget support for example, partner countries will play a stronger role in ODA evaluations.

Furthermore, a growing share of ODA is delivered through partnerships involving multiple donors. This calls for ODA evaluations to consider the combined impact and effects of all partners’ activities, including country policies, rather than the distinct impact of each partner.

**Commitment to use partner country systems**

In the Paris Declaration, donors made a commitment to use partner country systems as the default approach and to justify the exceptions. This commitment has been reiterated in the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation and should be applied in the area of evaluation.

This calls for:

- Making greater use of partner country evaluation systems;
- Assessing the strengths and weaknesses of country evaluation systems and monitoring their evolution;
- Collaborating on action plans or programmes that aim to strengthen country evaluation systems;
- Avoiding any practices that might hinder the development of country evaluation systems in line with the “Do No Harm” principle.

**Commitment to increase results information and mutual accountability**

The Results and Mutual Accountability Agenda is supported by a coalition of donors and partner countries on a voluntary basis within the framework of the Global Partnership (Busan). The Agenda seeks to address two problems:

- Result information is often insufficiently clear and strategic to assess whether development co-operation is making a lasting difference in the lives of the poor. Among the reasons are the fact that:
  - Donors have set up separate information systems that undermine partner countries’ own capacity to define, track and evaluate their results;
  - Information systems tend to track resource flows and inputs much better than results; and
  - Result indicators may not be properly owned by the partner countries.
- Accountability for development co-operation tends to satisfy donor needs in an unbalanced manner.

---

1 “Use country public financial management systems as the default option for development financing, and support the strengthening of these systems where necessary” – High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, 2011.

2 OECD, 2010.
In response to the identified problems, participating partner countries are invited to set country Results and Accountability Agreements aimed at strengthening results-oriented dialogue, mutual accountability between partner countries and donors, and accountability to partner country citizens. More specifically, the agreements cover all or part of the following:

1. Production and use of results-oriented performance information;
2. Use and strengthening of existing country structures and frameworks;
3. Results-based public sector management;
4. Results-based aid; and
5. Results oriented reporting.

In the framework of this Agenda, participating partner countries and donors can build upon positive experiences to date, especially as regards monitoring and evaluation.

**Successful collaboration during the Paris Declaration Evaluation (PDE)**

During the second phase of the PDE process, 21 partner country evaluations\(^3\) were carried out within a common framework. These evaluations were implemented by partner country organisations under the responsibility of country co-ordinators using country systems. At the end of the process, the country co-ordinators participated in a 'lessons learned workshop'\(^4\).

In the report to the following EvalNet meeting, the PDE Secretariat stressed that:

- International evaluations like the PDE are the exception rather than the rule;
- There is a strong interest in joint evaluations on both donor and partner sides;
- Some partner countries have the institutional capacity to lead joint evaluations, while others need support and/or mentoring in order to play that role;
- Evaluation training opportunities are available (IPDET, CLEAR, evaluation associations, universities) but participation could be increased by more financial support and bursaries;
- There is a need to promote learning by doing.

In response, EvalNet accepted to play the role of a hub for taking collaborative action on these points. The following countries, donors and other organisations indicated support: Denmark, France\(^5\), Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UK, and US, and the EU and UNEG.

## 2 The CPDE Study design

### 2.1 Objectives of the CPDE Study

The objectives of the CPDE Study were to:

- Understand the capacity building potential of collaborative evaluation work;
- Draw new lessons about capacity development strategies;
- Pave the way to future partner-donor collaboration on evaluation work;
- Prepare the ground for the elaboration of a best practice document on collaborative partner-donor evaluation work.

### 2.2 Defining collaborative partner-donor evaluation work and country evaluation systems

A joint evaluation is an evaluation "in which different donors and/or partners participate" (OECD, 2006). Over the last ten years, joint evaluation has been studied, promoted, and applied widely, although in a form that focuses on the collaboration between different donors. This initiative adds value to the current approach by focusing explicitly on collaborative partner-donor evaluation, an evaluation practice which involves one or more organisations/institutions of the partner country and one or several donors.

---

\(^3\) Countries included Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Cambodia, Cameroon, Colombia, Cook Islands, Ghana, Indonesia, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, The Philippines, Samoa, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda, Vietnam, and Zambia.


\(^5\) France organized a workshop in February 2013 on perspectives for development evaluation, including a session on lessons learned from the PDE at partner country level, with presentations by country PDE co-ordinators in Benin, Mali and Senegal.
The term **collaborative partner-donor evaluation work** encompasses a range of evaluation related practices such as partner-donor evaluations, partner-donor evaluation plans, and joint partner-donor undertakings at any stage of the evaluation process, e.g. financing, assessing quality, or synthesizing results.

The **scope** of a collaborative evaluation is a set of activities that have been designed, financed, and/or implemented jointly, such as a projects, programmes, sectoral policies, budget support, debt relief, or “Results and Mutual Accountability Country Agreements”.

The main purpose of a collaborative evaluation may be **joint learning** and/or **mutual accountability**. In this latter regard, it is important that both the donor and country partner needs for accountability can be satisfied.

There are various **hybrid** forms of collaborative evaluation, of which: “(a) delegating responsibilities to one or more organisations while others take a ‘silent partner’ role; (b) undertaking some components of the evaluation jointly while others are delivered separately; (d) agreeing on a common evaluation framework [or programme] and delegating responsibility for the implementation of individual evaluations to different partners …” (OECD, 2006).

The degree of **jointness** depends on the extent to which the involved organisations/ institutions co-operate in the evaluation process. The degree of **partner-donor jointness** depends on the extent to which country organisations / institutions and donors co-operate in the evaluation process.

The **partner-donor profile** of an evaluation describes the degree of jointness at all stages of the evaluation process, as follows:

- Deciding to conduct the evaluation, including date, scope, main purpose;
- Establishing the co-operation arrangements, e.g. involved donors and country organisations /institutions, sharing of roles;
- Raising and channelling financial resources for the purchase of evaluation services;
- Establishing the management structure, e.g. management group / reference group / steering group, internal versus external tasks, type and location of meetings;
- Referring to evaluation standards;
- Developing the terms of reference, including evaluative questions and methodological requests;
- Procuring the evaluation services, including procurement rules, selection of bids;
- Setting contractual relations, including consortium, sub-contracting, fee level;
- Setting the composition of the evaluation team, including team leader, core team, quality assessor, and other members;
- Developing the evaluation method, incl. data collection tools, analysis approach, work plan;
- Formulating draft evaluation results, i.e. findings, conclusions, lessons, recommendations;
- Assessing evaluation quality;
- Discussing draft evaluation results incl. seeking feedback from stakeholders;
- Finalizing the contents of the report;
- Disseminating results, incl. layout, language, printing, Internet version, seminars, media release;
- Assuring the follow-up of utilisation.

This study has used the following definition of a **country evaluation system** that is further developed in the following chapters of this report. An evaluation system is understood to be composed of:

- A sustained evaluation demand at various levels in various sectors;
- A supply of competent evaluation services;
- A practice of utilizing evaluation results in the public sector and in the public arena;
- An institutional framework securing public confidence in evaluation.

The term **system** suggests that the four above components are integrated into a web of virtuous circles which maintain evaluation culture, institutions, practices, markets, and capacity over the years. The system includes individual actors, organisations, networks, and mechanisms.

The term **country individual actor** applies to staff and managers of country organisations involved in a collaborative evaluation on the side of demand, supply, or utilisation. Individual actors on the supply side also include country-based freelance evaluators. The term does not apply to stakeholders or individual informants who are consulted during the evaluation process.

**Country-based organisations** may be located on the three sides of a triangle:
• Demand side of the market for evaluation services, i.e. public sector bodies or foundations commissioning external evaluations;
• Supply side i.e. universities, consultancy firms, internal evaluation units in governmental or non-governamental organisations;
• Utilisation side such as horizontal or line ministries, regional or local authorities, parliamentary commissions, political parties, or the media. Consultancies and NGOs are country-based if their management is located in the country.

**Country evaluation networks** are professional associations, research networks, or less formal communities devoted at least in part to evaluation (e.g. a national evaluation association, a temporary research project on health policy evaluation, a monthly gathering of heads of evaluation units from ministries).

**Country evaluation mechanisms** consist of rules, standards, co-ordination arrangements, or regulatory bodies (e.g. a set of guidelines on how to establish an evaluation function, an expert committee in charge of assessing evaluation quality, an annual meeting dedicated to evaluation co-ordination, a law enabling the Supreme Audit Office to carry out evaluations). The existence and proper functioning of such mechanisms are important drivers of the quality, independence, and/or utility of evaluations. The term “evaluation mechanism” does not apply to the internal routines and culture of an organisation. It should rather be understood as cutting across organisations, policy areas, and levels of government. Such mechanisms are established by public authorities and/or professional communities.

Far from being an end in itself, a sound country evaluation system is important because it is assumed to generate extensive and frequent utilisation of sound evaluation results, to raise interest in using evaluation evidence in public policy making, to contribute to better and faster learning from experience, and then to improve the effectiveness of country policies. Moreover, a sound system makes country-led evaluations credible and trustworthy for donors.

### 2.3 Components of the study

#### 2.3.1 Country studies

Each participating country produced a country study that presents an overview of the country evaluation system in place. The three main parts of the country studies are:

- Part I: Review of the Paris Declaration Evaluation (PDE) experience in support of country evaluation systems;
- Part II: Instructive case studies of other collaborative partner-donor evaluations;
- Part III: Opportunities for collaborative partner-donor evaluation work.

**Part I: Review of the Paris Declaration Evaluation experience in support of country evaluation systems**

This part capitalises on what has been learned from the PDE experience as regards the enhancement of country evaluation systems, in terms of demand, supply, confidence and utilisation.

The **objectives** were:

- To understand how and why country PDEs have contributed (or not contributed enough) to enhancing country evaluation systems.
- To assess the extent to which the lessons of the PDE experience are transferable in the context of future partner-donor evaluations.

**Design**: This part describes and analyses the country PDE experience, including the collection of views and factual information on the process involved. The country studies comprise an analysis of the contribution of the PDE to strengthening the country evaluation system, plus an assessment of the extent to which the PDE exercise may or may not prefigure future partner-donor evaluations. Useful concepts in this regard are the partner-donor profiles (see above), the capacity-friendly features of the PDE process, and the presence or absence of external factors.

**Part II: Instructive case studies of other collaborative partner-donor evaluations**

This part aims to promote the practice of partner-donor evaluation on the basis of real life examples which are complementary to that of the PDE.

**Objective**: To produce at least one and possibly more narratives of collaborative partner-donor evaluation works that have helped strengthen country evaluation systems.

**Design**: This part is based on the same approach and template for analysing the PDE experience in Part 1 as described above, but lighter in terms of investigation and analysis. It focuses on partner-donor profile, capacity-friendly features, and actual learning at the level of country individual actors,
organisations, and networks. In principle, eligible collaborative partner-donor evaluations were those that comply with the OECD-DAC definition of evaluation: the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results; the aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

**Part III: Opportunities for Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation Work**

This third part paves the way to future partner-donor collaboration intended to strengthen country systems.

**Objective:** To produce a list of promising collaborative work that could be launched within the next years.

**Design:** Elements taken into consideration in this part of the study include:

- Organisations that could be interested in commissioning collaborative evaluation work;
- Country evaluation networks and mechanisms;
- Policy areas with the best potential for partner-donor evaluations;
- External factors that may strengthen/weaken the benefits of partner-donor evaluations;
- Unintended negative effects arising from donor-led evaluations;
- Specific opportunities for partner-donor evaluation works.

**2.3.2 Thematic papers**

A wealth of learning emerged from the country studies as well as opportunities for future collaborative partner-donor evaluation work. In order to systemise the learning and to pave the way for a longer term strategy, the study design envisaged four thematic papers. The process of preparing these papers had a twofold objective:

- To provide a structured framework which can help CPDE participants to reflect on their experience during the present phase of the project and the lessons learned from implementation (both positive and negative).
- To harvest conceptual and practical insights which can feed into the CPDE initiative with concrete recommendations for possible follow-up work to be undertaken by the countries and donors engaged in the process, as well as other countries interested in future CPDE work.

The topics of the thematic papers are:

- Managing CPDE projects: success components and elements for a way forward. Looking critically across Part I of the country studies. The paper introduces characteristics and lessons learned from the PDE as a means to engage in critical thinking about collaborative partner-donor evaluation work.
- Learning from CPDE experience: a compendium of current and planned CPDE work: an analytical compilation of Parts II and III of the country studies with an analysis of emerging trends and possible ways forward.
- How can CPDE contribute towards strengthening country evaluation systems?
- Multiple partnerships dimensions under CPDE: The paradigm shift in approaching partnership under CPDE (partner-partner, partner-donor, donor-donor, intra-partner, intra-donor etc. including the notion of mutual accountability).

**2.3.3 The launching and synthesis workshops**

Two workshops were held during the implementation of the study.

*The Launching Workshop*

The Study on CPDE was launched at a workshop held in Kampala (Uganda) on 24 - 25 March 2014. It was hosted by the Office of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Uganda. The workshop was attended by representatives from 12 partner countries⁶ as well as by representatives of 10 EvalNet members⁷.

---

⁶ Benin, Cameroon, Colombia, Ghana, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, The Philippines, Senegal, Uganda and Zambia.
⁷ AfDB, Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, UK, USA and the World Bank.
The workshop was to attain the following objectives:

- Achieve a consensus on objectives and working modalities of the CPDE Study;
- Review draft ToR for country co-ordinators and adopt the documents for operational use.

**The Synthesis Workshop**

Following the completion of most country studies, a synthesis and systematisation workshop was held on 02-04 December in Manila, co-hosted by the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) of the Republic of the Philippines and the Asian Development Bank (ADB). Its aim was to capitalise on the findings of country studies and country papers, and to propose steps forward for future partner-donor evaluation work. More specifically, the objectives of the workshop were:

- To share the results and lessons learned from the country studies;
- To generate inputs for four thematic papers summarising the CPDE experience;
- To identify the main building blocks for a joint CPDE learning framework;
- To identify concrete suggestions for CPDE work in coming three years.

The workshop was attended by more than 40 participants, consisting of country co-ordinators (or their representatives), representatives of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) from the CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CSOPDE) and Voluntary Organisations of Professional Evaluation (VOPEs), the Parliamentary Forum on Development Evaluation (PFDE), representatives of bilateral and multilateral donors, and members of the Management Group and the Project Co-ordination Team.

### Box 1  Representatives at the Synthesis Workshop

**Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) from the CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CSOPDE):** The CSO Partnership is an open platform that unites civil society voices from around the world on the issue of development effectiveness. The framework for the CSOPDE was developed in Nairobi, Kenya from Dec 8-9, 2012. 50 civil society leaders and representatives met to outline the issues and define a common mission, vision, goals and objectives. Participants represented all regions of the world – Africa, Asia-Pacific, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, North Africa, and the Middle East and North Africa, and their sub regions, as well as different sectors of civil society, including faith-based, feminist, labour, rural sectors, and international civil society organisations. [http://www.csopartnership.org/](http://www.csopartnership.org/)

**Voluntary Organisations for Professional Evaluation (VOPE):** VOPEs is an umbrella term for all kinds of groups interested in advancing evaluation as a profession. VOPEs can function at regional and national levels, and bring together evaluation practitioners from various fields – including government, academia and non-governmental organisations. VOPEs promote equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluations, and aim to influence organisational and national evaluation policies in benefit of society at large. [http://www.iocenet.org/en/aboutVOPEs.php](http://www.iocenet.org/en/aboutVOPEs.php)

**Parliamentary Forum on Development Evaluation (PFDE):** PFDE is a collective of parliamentarians who are committed to development evaluations in SAARC countries. The Forum is an EvalPartners member and IOCE regional VOPE. The Forum was initiated by a small group of parliamentarians aiming to establish National Evaluation Policies in SAARC region. It is managed by the “Core Team” which is represented by parliamentarians from each SAARC country. It was founded as a result of initial meeting and discussion by a group of parliamentarians from Sri Lanka, Nepal and Bangladesh. This is historical in parliamentarians giving a voice for national evaluation policies and promising commitment to realise it at country level. [http://www.pfde.net/](http://www.pfde.net/)

### 2.3.4 Who did what in the study

**EvalNet** set the mandate for launching and implementing the study. EvalNet is one of the main intended users of the project results. The Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD) Task Team monitors the project and ensures co-ordination with other ECD initiatives.

The **Management Group** was composed of representatives of Finland (Riitta Oksanen, and Jyrki Pulkinnen), France (Claude Leroy-Themeze), and Uganda (Timothy Lubanga), chaired by the representative of France. It used mainly virtual working methods. The group has taken all decisions related to the substance of the project.

---

8 The need for an alternative format and modality of the country studies emerged throughout the study to accommodate specific situations in some countries. The country papers capture the various dimensions foreseen with the country studies, yet within a “lighter” format that could be implemented along a faster track than the country studies (See ToR in Vol 4).
The Reference Group was composed of participating partner countries and sponsors committed to provide financial or technical resources. It has been consulted electronically at the main steps of the project. ADETEF\(^9\) (represented by Jean Philippe Nadal and Paul-Alexis Berthezène), a French public agency, under an agreement with the French Ministry of Finance, has collected the sponsors’ contributions, managed the project co-ordination contract, handled the logistics of the international workshops, and carried out all translation and publishing tasks.

**Country Co-ordinators** in each of the participating partner countries took responsibility for the country studies and presented their findings at the Synthesis Workshop. Previously, most of them had played a similar role in the PDE process.

**Donor Representatives** in the partner countries have contributed to the country studies by supplying information and/or resources (in-kind or financial) usually on a bilateral basis specific to each partner country.

The **Contracting Firm, Particip GmbH**, was responsible for the contractual deliverables, and hired the Project Co-ordination Team, composed of a principal project co-ordinator (Ziad Moussa\(^10\)), and a second project co-ordinator (Ian Hopwood).

The **Project Co-ordinators** worked under the authority and supervision and in close contact with the Management Group. They liaised with country co-ordinators, designed the ToR and tools for the country studies, briefed country co-ordinators at the Launching Workshop, monitored the progress of the country studies, established the workshop agendas, liaised with ADETEF and the host countries as regards the logistics of the workshops, ensured that thematic papers are written in order to synthesise the study findings, and managed quality throughout the study process.

The **Quality Assurance Experts** (Pablo Rodríguez Bilella, Jim Rugh and Dr. Georg Ladj) have commented on draft country studies and draft thematic papers through electronic channels.

The **four Thematic Authors** (Pablo Rodríguez Bilella, Mohamed Hedi Manai, Jacques Toulomonde, and Serge-Eric Youke Djiam) of the thematic papers analysed the country studies, helped animate the Synthesis Workshop, and produced the thematic papers.

### 3 The CPDE journey in retro perspective - Learning from the CPDE Study implementation

#### 3.1 The CPDE Study as a catalyst for collaborative learning

Looking back at the cumulative literature and day-to-day interaction during the CPDE Study, one can observe a significant learning-by-doing curve, especially towards the end of the process and although the “warm-up phase” took longer than anticipated.

The first milestone with a significant impact on the learning curve was the completion of the country studies. Only one country (Benin) was able to complete the study within the first foreseen deadline set for the end of July 2014, followed closely by Zambia and the Philippines. The rest of the countries provided their studies sequentially so that a critical mass of 12 out of the initially foreseen 18 countries were able to prepare at least a first draft which was used as a basis for exchange and learning during the Synthesis Workshop in Manila. Country studies were intentionally designed along a learning-by-doing model, while arguably they could have been done in a timelier and less complex manner through external consultants. The idea was to challenge both partner countries and EvalNet members to work collaboratively across the various stages of the country studies starting from the contextualisation of the ToR to the country context, all the way to securing funding sources, identifying the right expertise, setting-up a Steering and/or Advisory Committee, validating the findings of the study and the dissemination of the results.

Based on the above, four countries were not able to complete the studies (Cambodia, Cook Islands, Malawi and Nepal) although Nepal and Malawi took part in the Launching Workshop and even the Synthesis Workshop in the case of Nepal. This has been mainly related to an overloaded calendar in the cases of Nepal and Cook Islands and the difficulty to mobilise the right expertise to champion the study at the national level, which also holds true for Malawi. Cambodia on the other hand had opted-out during the consultations with the PDE partner countries in the summer of 2013.

Three countries completed their respective studies only after the Synthesis Workshop (Cameroun, Senegal and Uganda). Cameroun constitutes a good showcase of the learning-by-doing momentum, in the sense that the country study was completed in a record time (and of convincing technical quality)

---

\(^9\) ADETEF merged on 1 January 2015 with five other public operators into “Expertise France”.

\(^10\) Lucien Back was involved as Principal Project Co-ordinator until July 2014.
just after the Synthesis Workshop in Manila, which can be attributed to the collaborative learning momentum generated by the workshop.

A key assumption in the design of the study was the collaborative capacity of member countries and EvalNet members to identify interested donor(s) with whom the study could be completed in a collaborative manner, given that the raison d’être of CPDE is partner-donor collaboration. This proved however to be a significant challenge for the timely completion of the country studies and required extensive backstopping by the Management Group to identify potential donors, develop a road map for implementation, hire and supervise the consultants in charge of the drafting, and perform the validation steps for completing the studies.

Ten countries were successful in securing funding from bilateral and multilateral funding agencies:

- Bolivia and Colombia from the Spanish Co-operation Agency;
- Cameroun and Senegal from Germany through GIZ;
- Mozambique through the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
- Ghana and Uganda from Austria through the Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs;
- Zambia through the Irish Co-operation Agency; and
- Benin and Mali through a pool fund administered by UNDP on behalf of the partner agencies working in the two countries.

Samoa was also able to hire a consultant and complete the study using its own national resources, and savings in the budget of the Launching Workshop were later reinvested to partially cover the costs for preparing the studies in the cases of Ghana, Uganda and Vietnam.

It is noteworthy that the Philippines was able to complete the country study using internal in-house expertise, and without relying on external consultants, and that Sri Lanka prepared a country paper instead of a full-fledged country study also using in-house expertise.

The table below highlights the collaborative arrangements through which the country studies could be completed.

### Table 1  Collaborative arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sponsored by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>GIZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>Dropped-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>CPDE Project / Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Dropped-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Dropped-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>GIZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>CPDE Project/ Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>CPDE Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the global level the CPDE Study was supported by the following donor agencies/ institutions:

### Table 2  Contributors to the CPDE initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 As Cambodia already declined during the consultations with the PDE partner countries in the summer of 2013, it is not listed in the table above anymore.
The learning curve can also be captured through the **positive feedback received at the Synthesis Workshop**, whether through the workshop evaluation itself as highlighted in the following figure below\(^\text{12}\) or through the commitments beyond the CPDE Study phase expressed by the country co-ordinators and which will be discussed in a subsequent section of this chapter.

More than two thirds of respondents agreed that the CPDE Study “increased collaboration between partner countries and donors around joint evaluations” whether through the direct interaction in the joint preparation of the country studies, or through the review and validation process at the national level. The same gradient of agreement was also observed around the increased knowledge about success factors in managing CPDE projects, ECD, strengthening of CES and contribution to the strengthening of mutual accountability.

The (potential) contribution to the strengthening of the country evaluation system *per se* can be better observed from 2015 onwards once the CPDE Study phase is completed. Just as the PDE process, which was a truly global collaborative evaluation paved the way for this CPDE Study, the momentum from the **CPDE Study should contribute to a more enabling environment for the longer term strengthening of partner country evaluation systems**.

### Figure 1

**Ranking of perception on a scale of 0 to 10 about the achievement of the following workshop outcomes (10 most satisfied, 0 least satisfied)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception (0-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase collaboration between partner countries and donors on joint evaluations</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased knowledge on success factors for managing CPDE projects</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased knowledge on how CPDE can contribute to ECD and the development/strengthening of CES</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased knowledge to what extent CPDE can contribute to the strengthening of mutual accountability</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Workshop evaluation, Synthesis Workshop in Manila 2014*

### 3.2 What were the main learnings from the process

One of the most significant lessons is the **absence of a “one size fits all” approach to CPDE**, since both the country evaluation capacity and the country evaluation systems vary significantly from one country to another. Any planned CPDE effort needs to be adaptive, constructively opportunistic and championed by one or more institutions, without which it risks losing its potential added value.

The diversity is clearly highlighted in the table below, which indicates the institutional affiliation of the country co-ordinators who were in charge of the CPDE country studies. As such, seven country co-

---

\(^{12}\) See section 4.4 in the final report of the synthesis workshop
ordinators are affiliated to Ministries or Authorities in charge of Planning and Development (and often economy), and three others are affiliated to the Ministry of Finances and/or Investment. On the other hand, some countries like Benin have a dedicated Ministry for the Evaluation of Public Policy, while others like Colombia and Uganda have specialised agencies attached to the Prime Minister’s Office or the Presidency in charge of evaluation oversight. Only Zambia entrusted the study to an analysis and research think-tank affiliated – among others – to the Ministries of Economy and Finances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Institutional affiliation of the country co-ordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Ministry for the Evaluation of Public Policy, Promotion of Good Governance and Social Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Ministry of Economy, Planning and Regional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Presidential Agency for International Co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>National Development Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Ministry of Finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>National Economic and Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Ministry of Finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Ministry of Economy, Finances and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Ministry of Plantation Infrastructure Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Department, Office of the Prime Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning and Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Zambia Institute for Policy Analysis and Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Institutional affiliation of the country co-ordinators

Based on the above, it appears that the CPDE Study (and its predecessor the PDE) has been among the rare global arenas connecting in a concerted manner the evaluation functions of donors and partner countries, despite the diverse configurations of the evaluation function at the partner countries level as highlighted above, and in addressing the Aid Effectiveness/Harmonisation to evaluation nexus.

In this regard, the CPDE Study process has shown the significant interest from a broader range of stakeholders, starting with Parliamentarians and VOPEs all the way to academia, civil society and evaluation users at the national level, all of whom constitute important stakeholders.

The results of the country studies also indicate a clear potential for enhancing both development effectiveness and accountability through mutual ownership of the process and the outcomes, but also for improving utilisation by engaging in a mutual peer-to-peer exchange of experiences and practices.

3.3 Ownership and way forward at the national level

Most country studies were subjected to a validation process, whether internally through joint partner-donor committees involved in the design and oversight of the studies, or through an external multi-stakeholder reference group explicitly formed to advise and inform the country studies during their different stages and to validate the findings once these studies were completed. (see Annex 10.2)

The following table provides further insights on the country ownership and possible ways forward as expressed by the country co-ordinators following the completion of the country studies. The (positive) impact of the process can be clearly seen, whether through the commitment to engage in further CPDE work over the coming years (Benin, Ghana, Mozambique, Samoa), or through mainstreaming CPDE in national evaluation strategies (Philippines, Vietnam, Zambia), or even the design of national CPDE guidelines (Benin). Other countries will be also exploring opportunities to carry further CPDE pilots (Colombia, Cameroun, Senegal, Sri Lanka), while Zambia has gone a step further by maintaining and expanding the reference group for the country study to become a permanent interlocutor for further CPDE work.

13 The insights were captured through a “country study handover document” where country co-ordinators were asked to provide further details about the use of the country studies and the planned actions for a way forward.
## Table 4  Commitments for 2015 as a follow-up to the CPDE Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Commitments for 2015 as a follow-up to the CPDE Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Design national CPDE guidelines based on the outcomes of the study and other international standards and guidelines. Pilot at least one collaborative evaluation with interested donors in 2015 and disseminate findings and lessons from this pilot. Mainstream the principle of collaborative evaluations in the next national evaluation plan Share experiences and information regionally and globally with other participants to the CPDE initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Strengthen the Vice Ministry of Public Investment and External Financing of the Ministry of Development Planning, as the governing body of the National System of Public Investment, in order to establish formal monitoring mechanisms. Additionally, continue to work with the international co-operation in a co-ordinated manner through the instance of GruS Group Development Partners of Bolivia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Present the national CPDE Study report to the next Multi-Donor Committee. Develop a collaborative roadmap for implementing the recommendations of the study (where feasible). Disseminate the results through workshops and meetings of sectoral platforms for development partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Promotion of collaborative evaluations based on the CPDE Study experience, especially in programmes related to the post conflict phase in Colombia following the recently signed peace agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Pilot three CPDEs from 2016 to 2018 with Canada, France and Germany, and with Denmark contributing to the quality assurance and technical backstopping. The three CPDEs will revolve around portfolio evaluation (Canada), support to Public Sector reform (France) and tackling urban poverty (Germany).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Dissemination workshops for the study. Validation of the areas that have best potential for CPDEs with an implementation action plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Develop a more collaborative approach for monitoring ODA flows and Aid Effectiveness Commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Embed CPDE principles in the draft National Evaluation Policy, together with the Department of Budget and Management, in support of GoP thrust on performance-based decision making in planning and budgeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Develop a collaborative approach for the Joint Policy Matrix with the collaboration of 5 donors and the Government of Samoa to determine the level of commitment to using country systems for Aid implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Disseminate and share the results of the CPDE Study and use it as basis for planning future CPDE work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Pilot programme on CPDE in Annexure- II of the country study will be promoted for implementation. National ECD; strengthening CES and promotion of joint and collaborative evaluation &amp; the success stories of influential evaluations will be promoted for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Continuing the implementation of new joint evaluations where they intend to apply the recommendations and principles of the study. The new joint evaluations proposed are: • Evaluation of the land titling and registration reforms (Office of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Lands and Urban Development and the World Bank), • Evaluation of Youth Livelihood Program (YLP), • Evaluation of the University Primary Education Programme, • Evaluation of the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund, Initiated discussions with development partners for conducting joint evaluations of National Development Plan priority projects under NDP 2. Identifying specific activities to popularise joint evaluations with the action plan for the national monitoring and evaluation policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Promote a CPDE approach in the draft strategy for monitoring and evaluation of the Public Investment programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Maintain and expand the country reference group (in charge of the country study oversight) to include Civil Society &amp; Academia. Disseminate key findings of the study to government, cooperating partners &amp; other stakeholders. Mainstream CPDE work into the M&amp;E Department at the Ministry of Finance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Country studies handover notes*

It must be noted that in order to sustain all commitments detailed in the table above, a systematic follow-up work is needed in order not to lose the momentum, and to serve as a showcase for other
countries that are willing to engage and learn from the CPDE Study experience, as detailed in the following sections.

4 Thematic papers

In order to systemize the learning that occurred through the CPDE Study and inform future follow-up action, four thematic papers were commissioned:

- **Managing CPDE projects**: success components and elements for a way forward.
- **Learning from Experience**: a compendium of current and planned CPDE work.
- **How can CPDE contribute towards strengthening country evaluation systems?**
- **The multiple partnership dimensions under CPDE** (partner-partner, partner-donor, donor-donor, intra-partner, intra-donor etc… including the notion of mutual accountability).

The process of preparing these papers had a twofold objective:

1. Provide a structured framework which can help CPDE participants to draw lessons from country studies and papers;
2. Harvest conceptual and practical insights which can feed into a future partner-donor collaboration by the countries and donors that were engaged in the study as well as other countries interested in future CPDE work.

The development of the thematic papers was organically linked to the Synthesis Workshop, and where the authors of the papers took an active part in facilitating the sessions related to their respective papers and further refined their assumptions and findings accordingly.

The four thematic papers are provided in chapters 5-8 of this report, with light editing to avoid possible duplications, whether between the other sections of the reports and the thematic papers or between the thematic papers themselves.

The executive summaries are presented in the following sub-chapters.

4.1 Executive summary: Managing CPDE projects: Success components and elements for a way forward

This paper is based on a cross analysis of the country studies produced in the framework of the study on Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation (CPDE). As one key component of the CPDE project is to review the Paris Declaration Evaluation (PDE) experience in terms of strengthening country evaluation systems, this paper introduces characteristics and lessons learnt from the PDE as a means to engage critical thinking around collaborative partner-evaluation work.

This paper has functioned as a background of the following papers, more focused on an analysis of CPDE emerging trends and possible ways forward.

The Paris Declaration (PD) provided the policy framework for partner-donor collaboration by holding both parties accountable for the delivery of development results, while the PDE design was intended to apply the PD principles. As a side effect, it was also a concrete process and exercise that in some cases contributed to strengthen the country evaluation systems – in other words, building evaluation capacity at country level.

Two main groups of countries can be distinguished, based on the activation of national actors, the relevance to strengthening the country evaluation system and their own understanding of whether they could take full advantage of the PDE. These main groups are either (a) favourable or (b) neutral, about the impact of the PDE in strengthening evaluation capacity.

The CPDE country studies show that most countries had the opportunity to align the main purpose and objectives of the PDE with their own development priorities, but only some of them were able to apply this in practice.

The PDE was a collaborative endeavour that led to broader discussions in terms of making programmes and projects more effective, and anchoring and aligning the various country assistance strategies of the development partners with the national Development Plans. It also put a particular emphasis on including the country perspectives by involving country actors and organisations, together with local evaluation service providers.

The constitution of the National Reference Groups (NRGs) – comprised of members from selected development partners, civil society and academia – is mentioned positively in most of the country studies. These groups were convened to manage and provide overall guidance to the surveys and the country level evaluations, and provided the opportunity to work directly with several stakeholders.

It is also possible to identify some challenges in the development of collaborative evaluations. The process is complex and time-consuming, involving high transaction costs and complicated management
structures. The processes for co-ordinating a large number of participants may make it difficult to reach consensus, and the realisation of the evaluation should reflect both the needs of the country and the time of the donors. Conducting these evaluations mechanically, without building ownership and promoting their utilisation, can be counter-productive with regard to internalising and adopting the principles and understanding of collaborative evaluation efforts.

Although most partner countries have not sufficiently internalised and adopted the principles and understanding of collaborative evaluation efforts, the main challenge is the donor willingness to allocate a marginal share of their evaluation resources to CPDE projects and to design these CPDE projects in a way that can contribute to strengthening of country evaluation systems (CES).

Collaborative evaluations help to introduce the subject of the evaluation (a programme, or a policy) to a wider audience. In the case of the PDE, it was also an opportunity to share information with various stakeholders of the Paris Declaration itself, increasing the awareness and attention to the PD and aid management reform.

4.2 Executive summary: Learning from Experience: A compendium of current and planned CPDE work

4.2.1 Methodological approach

This paper presents an analytical compilation of the country studies on collaborative partner-donor evaluation (CPDE) experiences based on their major features, such as the relevance of the CPDE objectives. It has a two-fold objective:

- Provide a structured framework that can help CPDE participants to reflect on their CPDE experiences and on the lessons learned from their implementation (both positive and negative);
- Harvest conceptual and practical insights that can feed into the common CPDE framework with concrete recommendations for possible follow-up work to be undertaken by the countries and donors as well as other countries interested in future CPDE work.

It should be noted that the ToR for the country studies mention that eligible collaborative partner-donor evaluations are those that comply with the OECD-DAC definition of evaluation. While most of the case studies of CPDE comply with this definition, some case studies focus on project/programme reviews or performance assessments. In the analysis, all experiences of CPDE work were taken into consideration although not treated equally in terms of both process or results analysis. The intended and actual learning was analysed at three levels (individual, organisations, and networks) in order to determine the extent to which systematic capacity-building interventions have contributed to the capacity strengthening through the learning-by-doing approach. This relates to skills transfer, coaching, formal training, the reinforcement of the evaluation culture and support of evaluation networks, and the contribution to CES (support of M&E systems, structures and practices, at government, CSOs and private sector levels).

The indication of potential future partner-donor evaluation (future opportunities) was analysed through country willingness to engage in concrete CPDEs in order to build on successful experiences, ensure cumulative knowledge, and/or apply innovative features and new arrangements.

Internal and external factors that have impacted on CPDE experiences were also analysed in order to draw positive lessons at three levels of evaluation capacity development: strategy; systems and structures; processes and practices.

Emerging trends and opportunities for future CPDE were analysed through their alignment to country needs and priorities, the ownership and involvement of national organisations and networks, and their alignment to country planning and budget allocation of resources or to mutual accountability and harmonisation. Interested organisations – such as the government structures, CSOs/CBOs, the private sector, and academia – were identified, as well as the role of the CES and networks in supporting evaluation system improvements and harmonisation with international evaluation practices.

The policy areas to be covered and lessons to be learned were analysed according to their potential impact on development effectiveness of external aid and quality of international co-operation, on the improvement of public policy implementation and management, and on the accountability framework and/or managing-for-development results.

External factors and risks from CPDE and donor-led evaluations – in terms of required capacities, resources, competencies, and legitimacy of country evaluation networks – were analysed, as well as the proposed risk mitigation actions – including capacity strengthening and skills development in support

---

14 As specified in the 2002 DAC Glossary “Evaluation” was frequently used for a more comprehensive and/or more in-depth assessment than “review”. Reviews emphasised more operational aspects. Sometimes, the terms “review” and “evaluation” were used interchangeably.
of country-led evaluations, South-South partnerships, and of the comprehensive agenda for sustainable development.

4.2.2 Main key findings and lessons learned

The country studies offered a wide range of collaborative work experience, with different capacity-building features ranging from a totally donor-led evaluation with light involvement of country capacities to a strong involvement of country organisations and government leadership.

Country ownership with a strong involvement of country government organisations seems to be facilitated by formal commitments through signed MoUs, specifying responsibilities in decision-making, co-ordinating and managing the evaluation. The involvement of relevant national organisations – including CSOs, the private sector, CBOs – indicates the degree of country ownership and engagement. This has increased the usefulness of the CPDE experience, and has worked towards increasing the legitimacy of country evaluation systems, mechanisms and processes.

The timing factor increased the relevance of the exercise, particularly when the CPDE is linked to country planning and budget allocation cycles or to the renewal of a bilateral or multilateral programme. Most of the reported CPDEs were funded by donors through grants and technical assistance funds, with limited contribution from countries to logistical and administrative costs. However, there were few exceptions – in Uganda, for example, where the government used its financial and technical resources, and allocated a dedicated budget line for conducting evaluations, including CPDEs.

When it was adopted, the learning by doing approach in implementing CPDE paved the way for the formulation of action plans for enhanced national evaluation capacity development.

The PDE and other partner-donor collaborative evaluations were seen by many partner countries as an opportunity to strengthen the evaluation culture and the capacity of national structures and organisations, as well as individuals. They formed the basis for a conceptualisation of a collaborative partner-donor evaluation framework in the future.

The main lessons range from rooting CPDEs to the country/national context, political will and national ownership, harmonising the timing of CPDE initiatives with partner country planning cycles and budgetary resource allocations, and making explicit country evaluation system development objectives and linking them to institutionalisation efforts through CPDEs, to streamlining results-orientation in a coherent evaluation system across government bodies and national structures to ensure progress towards development results.

4.3 Executive summary: How can CPDE contribute towards strengthening country evaluation systems

This paper addresses the issue of whether collaborative partner-donor evaluations may contribute to strengthen the evaluation system of the partner country. It is based on the assumptions that at least some partner-donor evaluations (1) are using the partner country evaluation system, (2) are intended to strengthen that system, (3) activate learning-by-doing mechanisms, (4) complement other capacity development efforts, and (5) are adapted to the state of the country system. The country studies, as they were available in January 2015, included 11 stories of collaborative evaluation having a learning-by-doing potential (see Annex 10.6). These 11 stories, plus some presentations made at the Synthesis Workshop held in Manila, were used as evidence for testing these above five assumptions and for drawing lessons from experience.

A country evaluation system is a web of virtuous loops involving individual professionals, organisations and institutions in the public and private sectors, academia, media, and the civil society, plus one or more specialised networks such as a national evaluation association and evaluation communities of practice. Feedback loops apply to the demand and supply of evaluation services, to the demand and utilisation of evaluation results, and to the checks and balances ensuring confidence in evaluation results. Country evaluation systems tend to emerge in the hands of evaluation champions, often within the Ministry of Finance or Planning, and then to extend more widely in the public sector and the society as a whole. However, a mature evaluation system becomes sustainable only if it does not depend on a specific champion anymore.

In the current approach to Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD), donors contribute to developing and strengthening country evaluation systems by training professionals, convening workshops, supplying technical or financial support, and advocating evaluation in their dialogue with partner countries’ governments. One of the potential risks of this approach is that newly built capacities may not be sustainable if they are not used.

This risk is even worsened in some partner countries where evaluation practices are mainly donor-led and make no or little use of country capacities. Even if there is a recognised need to better use regular
donor evaluation works to support capacity development in the partner countries, donors remain quite slow at addressing this need, mainly because their evaluations have a strong accountability focus, require a high level of credibility, and would be weakened if they had close ties with a nascent and fragile country system. The overall picture looks like a vicious circle where donors hesitate to collaborate with partner countries since their country systems are not mature enough, something which in turn slows down or even blocks the maturing of these systems.

In a more sustainable approach to ECD donors and partner countries should pay an equal attention to (1) developing capacities and (2) using the newly built capacities. This could be achieved by initiating a growing number of country-led evaluations, possibly with some donor support. Country-led evaluations make a twofold contribution to ECD by (1) using newly built capacities and (2) opening an alternative capacity development channel, namely ‘learning-by-doing’.

In addition, donors and partner countries could undertake at least a few collaborative evaluations whose merit would be similar to that of country-led ones. Such collaborative evaluations would have an explicit learning-by-doing objective and this would justify some capacity-friendly arrangements, possibly with extra costs and relaxed time constraints.

Collaboration arrangements would need to be adapted to the degree of maturity of the partner country system. In the case of an emerging system, country professionals and institutions would embark as passengers. Where the evaluation system is maturing, collaborations would become more frequent and more balanced. Country professionals and institutions would play a co-piloting role. In a mature system, evaluations tend to focus on national policies rather than donor interventions. However, some collaborative evaluations could be initiated and shaped on a case-by-case basis, both partners being in the driver’s seat alternatively.

4.4 Executive summary: Multiple partnership dimensions under CPDE

This thematic paper addresses the question of “What are efficient partnership configurations for carrying out CPDE works?” The term “partnership” applies to the institutions which formally agree to collaborate in launching, funding, and/or managing an evaluation. On the side of the partner country a “partnership configuration” may include the public body in charge of co-ordinating development co-operation, the institution in charge of the evaluation policy, and/or other the concerned ministries or agencies. On the donor side, partnerships may include one or several aid agencies and sometimes foundations. A given partnership configuration is efficient if its cost is compensated by sufficient benefits in terms of e.g. more relevant results, better ownership and use of results, and/or learning by doing.

With a qualitative assessment approach, data have been gathered from country studies as well as from reference papers in line with the objective of the study using content analysis methods. Moreover, a focus group discussion with participants of the Synthesis Workshop in Manila (see vol 3 for the Synthesis Workshop Report) provided additional insights to the development of this chapter.

Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluations may involve three types of partnership configurations:

- Bilateral partnership with one donor agency and the concerned country institution,
- Triangular partnership involving one donor agency and several country institutions, often including the country evaluation champion, and
- Triangular partnership involving several donors and the most concerned institution in the country.

The costs and benefits of partnerships depend on their configuration. Costs include expenditures and time needed for running a mixed management process, for matching the administrative constraints of various partners, and for satisfying multiple information needs. There are also some risks of diluting priorities, disagreeing on some evaluation conclusions, or disrupting the evaluation process in case of staff or organisational changes. Benefits are mutual accountability, better evaluation results and better ownership of these results, strengthening country institutions, and learning by doing.

Because of the general commitment to use partner country systems, donors should be keen to engage in evaluations partnerships, either on a bilateral or multilateral basis. Also the increasing focus on budget support is a major driver to collaborative evaluation because one-sided evaluations are meaningless in this framework. On the contrary, donors' willingness to enter into balanced partnerships might be limited as they tend to use evaluation for being accountable to their own constituencies.

Factors which could shape partnerships vary from one configuration to another. On the partner country side, major influencing factors are the evaluation capacity in the concerned institutions, the existence and strength of an evaluation champion as well as the existence of a national evaluation policy. On the donor side, various factors can be cited such as the degree of autonomy/responsibility of the donor mission in the partner country and the headquarter commitment to developing evaluation capacity. On both partner and donor sides, other influencing factors are the existence (if any) of budget support...
programme(s) involving multiple donors, the personal contacts between donor missions and the evaluation champion, the connection between aid co-ordination framework and country evaluation policy, and even the trust or mistrust in one to another’s integrity.

Rather than setting general rules for establishing efficient evaluation partnerships this paper sketches a few scenarios characterised by the evaluation capacity of the partner country and the opportunities for partner-donor collaborations. Partnership configurations that can work effectively and efficiently are proposed in the four following contexts:

- Limited evaluation capacity and no collaboration opportunities,
- Limited evaluation capacity but some collaboration opportunities,
- Some evaluation capacity and some collaboration opportunities,
- Strong evaluation capacity but limited collaboration opportunities.

These scenarios and the corresponding partnership configurations emerged from the Manila Workshop and the country studies.

5 Managing CPDE projects: Success components and elements for a way forward

Please refer to section 4.1 for the executive summary.

5.1 Critical review across Part I of the country studies

5.1.1 Baseline and approach

The Paris Declaration Evaluation (PDE) was probably the largest evaluation ever undertaken (OECD, 2012). It was, in a sense, “commissioned” by the Paris Declaration, which committed the partners to “… explore independent cross-country monitoring and evaluation processes … to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how increased effectiveness contributes to meeting development objectives” (Paris Declaration, paragraph 11). The evaluation drew on Contribution Analysis, among other approaches, with evaluation teams being asked to evaluate how, why and to what extent the implementation and consequent effects of the Paris Declaration contributed to development results. Teams drew on a programme theory that set out the declaration’s underlying logic, including desired outcomes – both intermediate (in improved aid effectiveness) and longer-term (in contributions to improved development results) – and a description of how programmatic actions were intended to achieve them.

The country studies developed for the CPDE Study are heterogeneous in the description and depth of analysis of the reality of the PDE in each country. In many cases, the reports stressed how countries’ PDE experiences have been used to highlight where the countries had made significant progress in implementing the PD principles, and what areas were lagging behind. For instance, the reports show that progress has been achieved in some areas, such as: having greater ownership of national policies and adherence to partner country development strategies; greater alignment with national priorities and public financial management system; more performance and goal-oriented achievements. The concept of the PDE helping to create a path for future collaborative evaluations (for example through standardised data gathering, assessment, and reporting framework) was not sufficiently developed in many of the cases.

This heterogeneity prevented the building of a solid typology of the countries in relation to their experience with the PDE. Instead, a classification of the countries is presented in relation to partner country self-assessments of the impact the PDE had in each government in terms of strengthening the country evaluation systems (CES). This classification is a heuristic tool to find some order among the country studies, while at the same time facilitating the extraction of lessons learned which will be developed in the next section.

---

15 The evaluation received the American Evaluation Association 2012 Outstanding Evaluation Award. The evaluation set-up and its process is developed in a special 2013 issue of the Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation.

16 Contribution Analysis is an approach that aims to compare an intervention’s postulated theory of change against the evidence, in order to come to robust conclusions about the contribution that it has made to observed outcomes.

17 For instance, two of the most developed, as well as critical, reports were from two of the countries (Mozambique and Zambia) that seem to lag behind in taking advantage of the PDE.
5.1.2 A heterogeneous picture in terms of country evaluation systems

Two main groups of countries can be distinguished, based on the activation of national actors, the relevance to strengthening the country evaluation system and their own understanding of whether they could take full advantage of the PDE:

- Favourable about the impact of the PDE in strengthening evaluation capacity: Benin, Bolivia, Mali, Philippines, Samoa, Uganda, Vietnam.
- Neutral about the impact of the PDE in strengthening evaluation capacity: Colombia, Mozambique, Senegal, Zambia.

It is in the group of neutrals where a strong emphasis is put on the importance of the political dimension of the Paris Declaration, in order to understand the challenges imposed on government when it comes to exercising effective ownership and leadership of the global agenda. The neutral group also considers that the PDE was an important and relevant endeavour, but that, in some dimensions, it was a missed opportunity.

In Mozambique, for instance, where the PDE offered technical staff, a number of opportunities to take an active role in the evaluation design, this responsibility was put, in reality, on one or two individuals who were managing multiple workloads.

In Zambia, a slow emergence of a culture of evidence-based policy making is most discernible at the Ministry of Finance, which recently established a Department of Monitoring and Evaluation with the objective of promoting a Research and Development Programme across the government’s entire policy-implementing machinery. At country level, donor dependence has been linked to the government’s inability to assert more fully its leadership in the accomplishment of the Paris Declaration aims. At local level, the sharing of leadership with other entities – such as local authorities and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) has also been a thorny issue.

In Colombia, the country evaluation system of management and results (Sinergia) is led by the National Planning Department, which manages the information related to the evaluation agenda, monitors the national development plan, and strengthens the culture of public management. The evaluation of international co-operation programmes, (i.e. the foreign assistance that Colombia receives), has not been integrated into the country evaluation system, and the body in charge of co-ordinating the implementation of those programmes, the Presidential Agency for International Co-operation (APC Colombia), has neither the budget nor the human resources to conduct their evaluation.

This initial description shows that the responsibilities for evaluation in the countries involved in the CPDE Study are quite heterogeneous. Some of them have quite clear centralised systems. Bolivia has all the evaluation function in charge of the Ministry of Development Planning. In Vietnam, the Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI) is the umbrella body for national public investment monitoring and evaluation. It is responsible for monitoring the portfolio of public investment in general, as well as the performance of the projects/programmes of national importance and reviewing evaluation results and feedback to impact evaluations carried out by executing agencies. The Philippines has the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), which is the premier socio-economic planning agency, with major roles in public investment evaluation and programming, in the Development Plan, and in programme/project monitoring and evaluation.

Other countries have several entities in charge of the evaluation function. In Mali, the monitoring and evaluation of public policies is conducted by its various ministries, while collaborative evaluations of specific programmes are conducted jointly by sector ministries and technical and financial partners. Senegal, a country that lacks a national evaluation policy, has evaluation departments in different branches of the government (e.g. ministries of health, education, water & sanitation). In Samoa, the Cabinet Development Committee approves and monitors progress of all development programmes, but the country has limited resources to meet the demands for evaluation.

Finally, in other countries, the organisation of the evaluation function is more complicated. Benin has a country evaluation system that integrates three components: 1) an evaluation mechanism of the Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS); 2) a National Policy evaluation arrangement for development assistance; 3) an institutional framework for evaluating public policies, the general state policy, and interventions that do not fall under the GPRS. In Ghana, the National Development Planning Commission is the institution established to guide the formulation of development plans and to undertake the monitoring and evaluation of the country’s development efforts. It advises the President and Parliament upon request on the performance of public policy and programmes, their impacts, and on the need for policy reforms.

In summary, the country studies draw a heterogeneous picture in terms of who is responsible for evaluation in each country. However, it is possible to review and analyse the lessons learned by all of
them, based on their assessment of the PDE Phase 2 experience, by doing a content analysis. In order to do this, the next section will introduce and discuss several lessons learned by the PDE that may be useful for the future management of CPDE projects. By using tools of content analysis, and by cross-referencing to some selected topics, the emphasis will be put on identifying instructive experiences and lessons learned from the country studies.

5.2 The Paris Declaration Evaluation: Some lessons emerging from the country studies for future collaborative evaluations

While the PD provided the policy framework for partner-donor collaboration by holding both parties accountable for the delivery of development results, the PDE design was intended to apply the PD principles. As a side effect, it was also a concrete process and exercise that in some cases contributed to strengthen the country evaluation systems – in other words, building evaluation capacity at country level. While there are indeed several approaches for achieving that goal – such as evaluation training programmes, technical assistance to evaluation commissioners, evaluation commitments in country strategy documents – the PDE design contributed to strengthening country evaluation systems through learning-by-doing. The presence of nationals was very noticeable in key positions of the evaluation, particularly with regard to the selection of the consultants, the co-ordination of the National Reference Group and the participatory discussion and debates on the questionnaires, progress reports, fieldwork reports, and the draft report.

The partner-donor profile of an evaluation describes the degree of jointness at all stages of the evaluation process (see section 2.2). The country studies show that the PDE was a collaborative endeavour that led to broader discussions in terms of making programmes and projects more effective, and anchoring and aligning the various country assistance strategies of the donor partners with the national development plans.

The different responsibilities entrusted to country organisations for the PDE were in line with the guidelines provided by the international secretariat on the Paris Declaration. Broadly, governments played the central role in the distribution of responsibilities that included in-country management arrangements, communication with stakeholders, and progress reporting. The PDE put a particular emphasis on including the country perspectives in the analysis by involving country actors and organisations, together with local evaluation service providers. Country individuals were involved in key positions of the evaluation management structures of the PDE, particularly with regard to such aspects as the selection of the consultant, co-ordinating the evaluation at national level, and the co-ordination of the National Reference Group (NRGs).

The constitution of the NRGs – comprised of members from selected development partners, civil society and academia – is mentioned positively in most of the country studies. These groups were convened to manage and provide overall guidance to the surveys and the country level evaluation, and provided the opportunity to work directly with several stakeholders. Their tasks included:

- The production of a specific mandate (terms of reference), adapting the general terms of reference of the evaluation;
- Establishment of a local agenda;
- Preparation of the budget, and seeking funding;
- The selection of consultants, and the beginning of the evaluation process;
- The production of the report, and validation and transmission to the International Management Group (IMG);
- Relations with the IMG.

In the Philippines, the multi-stakeholder NRG provided overall guidance to the surveys and the country-level evaluation. Mutual accountability and transparency were also ensured by subjecting the results of the PDE to this multi-stakeholder group. In Zambia, representation on the National Reference/Advisory Group by the Ministry of Finance and other line ministries also meant that a country perspective in the quality assurance process was included. In Vietnam, based on the experience of the PDE, the national aid architecture has been strengthened with the establishment of the Aid Effectiveness Forum (AEF), and by changing the Consultative Group meeting into Vietnam Development Partnership Forum. The dialogues in the AEF have broadened from technical issues related to aid delivery towards more general development effectiveness topics.

---

18 Content analysis is about delving into the documents to extract or analyse specific aspects of the content, particularly recognising that content is linguistic in nature. It can also be viewed as the processing of content into structured representations or databases that captures some aspects of the meaning of the content’s statements (Rao, 2005).
There was some intended and actual learning at country level by individual actors, organisations and networks. As implied above, it was also a task of the NRGs to contribute to the quality assurance process through their own understanding of the country context. By participating actively in the quality assurance process, members of the NRGs came to understand the assessment criteria as well as did the external evaluators. Subsequently to the PDE, several countries adopted this quality assurance process by commissioning independent quality reviews as a mechanism for improving their own national evaluation practices, and in order to determine if evaluators were meeting generally accepted international standards of quality.

The NRGs were also a way of ensuring mutual accountability for development results and transparency (as embedded in the Global Partnership for Development Effectiveness) by subjecting the results of the PDE to them. Through the NRGs, the PDE opened avenues and greater opportunities for wider consultation and complementarity of government efforts with all the development partners operating in the country. These consultation mechanisms also led to increased evaluation independence and, linked to it, credibility to be taken in account more systematically after the PDE.

There were several cases in which shadowing the technical team on analysing data helped to develop a new set of skills. In Benin the quality of the evaluation was assessed at the national level, allowing the local staff to learn about the evaluation criteria, and helped to strengthen the culture of evaluation at the country level. Although the PDE was not designed to strengthen CESs, several country studies put an emphasis on this positive “side-effect”. In Mali, the participation of central governmental actors in the EPD helped the institutional strengthening of the Planning and Statistics Units. A similar situation is referred by the Samoa country study, where it is stated that evaluation systems have been directly informed by the PDE. As an offshoot of the PDE studies, several interventions/initiatives took place in the Philippines, where the development of the in-country National Evaluation Policy meant to provide the overall framework to institutionalise an “evaluation culture” in the Philippine bureaucracy.

However, some limitations of the PDE impact on CES need to be noted: 1) inadequate dissemination of its results; 2) the heavy workloads of some key actors have tended to reduce the focus on the learning aspects; 3) ownership at the political level was limited, and did not extend much beyond the Ministries of Finance and Planning.

The CPDE country studies show that most countries had the opportunity to align the main purpose and objectives of the PDE with their own development priorities, but only some of them were able to apply it in practice. In Mozambique, it was considered that a higher mandate was required both from the government and donors for an effective alignment and division of labour process to take shape. Vietnam has shown important efforts to align the policies and procedures on project/programme appraisal/approval for the ODA and local financed public investment projects.

The real challenge for some countries was their lack of appropriate institutional framework and staff capacities to manage not only the evaluations, but also the general implementation of the Paris Declaration in their countries (as it was explicitly mentioned in the case of Zambia). In other cases, the evaluation of the Paris Declaration was more strongly linked vertically to the global processes than it was anchored horizontally into national processes involving key local stakeholders, such as line ministries, sub-national government institutions, legislature, civil society, the private sector, and members of the public. In Colombia, for instance, the relevant country evaluation system oriented toward measuring outcomes has not been linked with the development and evaluation of international co-operation programmes.

In addition, none of the country reports made references to local communication strategies, suggesting that results of the evaluation processes were not made available to important country audiences (such the Parliament, among others). This omission contradicts the aims of alignment and ownership, which are cardinal principles of the Paris Declaration.

If the PDE actually helped in strengthening country evaluation systems, it did it by giving space for (and allowing learning of) participatory discussions by national actors of the questionnaires, the different progress reports and reports of fieldwork, as well as the draft report.

Collaborative evaluations help to introduce the subject of the evaluation (a programme, or a policy) to a wider audience. In the case of the PDE, it was also an opportunity to share information with various stakeholders on the Paris Declaration itself, increasing the awareness and attention to the PD and aid management reform.

5.3 Emerging trends and recommendations for managing CPDE projects

The number of collaborative evaluations is likely to increase, given the current emphasis on working together more closely in development co-operation initiatives, through the financing of projects taking a sector-wide approach, and the preparation of joint country assistance strategies.
Collaborative evaluations can help assessing the effectiveness of programmes and strategies, the complementarity of efforts supported by different partners, and the quality of aid co-ordination. Linked with this, they can help participating agencies to understand each other’s evaluation approaches and exchange good practices, promoting learning by doing. CPDE seems to be especially relevant when evaluating complicated programmes (interventions which involve multiple components, or which only work in conjunction with other interventions) aimed at high-level results, and involving multiple actors.

Although most partner countries have not sufficiently internalised and adopted the principles and understanding of collaborative evaluation efforts, the main challenge resides in the donor willingness to allocate a marginal share of their evaluation resources to CPDE projects and to design these CPDE projects in a way that they can contribute to strengthening of CESs. This final section will signal some key emerging trends and possible ways forward for the management of CPDE, based mainly on the experience and process of the evaluation of the Paris Declaration. Some of these trends have also been reflected in relevant literature on joint evaluations (Breier, 2005; OECD, 2006; Feinstein and Ingram, 2003).

**Box 2**  
Some recommendations for a way forward to enhance CPDE practice

- Collaborative evaluation approaches are not monolithic. Their management has to recognise that there is considerable differentiation to be applied in terms of intended users and overall approaches.
- Evaluation policies and evaluation guidelines of the development partners need to be harmonised, consistent with the OECD-DAC criteria.
- All country and development partners should develop and upgrade their skills in the conducting of evaluations and mentoring in order to have the institutional ECD needed to lead joint evaluations.
- An emphasis on ECD will be more in line with the purposes of strengthening the capacities of country evaluation systems than with the combination of ad hoc activities (e.g. evaluation training, mentoring and coaching) implemented in one specific, and often narrow, setting.
- While evaluation training opportunities are offered in several circles, financial support and bursaries might increase participation.
- Careful planning and preparation are essential for collaborative evaluations where several, and sometimes diverging, interests must be accommodated.
- The main purpose of a collaborative evaluation may be joint learning and/or mutual accountability. A critical point is that genuine decision-making requires higher political decision-making, and buy-in is required.
- The emphasis on the political dimension of collaborative evaluations should not be underestimated, as it is key to understanding the constraints on government in terms of exercising effective ownership and leadership on these endeavours.

Collaborative evaluations are just one among many capacity-development approaches – or, rather, they are one among many components of an integrated capacity-development strategy. Although international PDE-like evaluations are the exception rather than the rule, there is an increasing interest in joint evaluations, both from donors and partners.

For those participating in the PDE, the experience served as a springboard for conceptualising evaluation frameworks for partner-donor collaboration, as well as providing an opportunity to significantly strengthen the capacity of national structures and individuals. It also brought to the fore that development partners had their own policies and evaluation guidelines that needed to be harmonised, consistent with the OECD-DAC criteria. Likewise, all country and development partners should develop and upgrade their skills in the conducting of evaluations.

Evaluation training opportunities are offered in several circles, but financial support and bursaries might increase participation. While some partner countries have the institutional capacity to lead collaborative evaluations, others need support and/or mentoring in order to play that role. ECD is a broad and long-term process aimed at increasing not only individual knowledge, skills and attitudes, but also organisations’ capabilities and system readiness.

From the point of view of managerial and financial resources, collaborative evaluations may help by pooling evaluation resources and capacity, and by reducing transaction costs for developing countries. A collaborative evaluation may reduce the number of single-agency evaluations all consulting the same stakeholders. By sharing good practice, innovations and improved programming, it paves the way to strengthened evaluation harmonisation and capacity.

By sharing a common conceptual and methodological framework, and favouring the dialogue and discussion through all the evaluation process, collaborative evaluations may improve donor co-ordination and alignment. They can increase donor understanding of government strategies, priorities
and procedures. They could also achieve a broader scope, being able to tackle more complex and wider-reaching subject areas.

For strategic reasons, collaborative evaluations may help to incorporate more of a policy focus, increasing their credibility and being useful for advocating change in—and strengthening—the country evaluation system. They also increase objectivity and legitimacy, enabling greater diversity of perspectives in cases where a consensus must be reached.

The commitment to govern, manage and implement collaborative evaluations in accordance with the Paris Declaration principles poses several challenges at every step. For instance:

- Detailed attention has to be paid to how the principles of ownership and results-based management could be weakened by stakeholders’ lack of capacity.
- The alignment principle faces the possible reluctance of donors to respond to priority needs and to use country systems and procedures.
- The harmonisation principle is threatened by the slow extension of budget support and poor adherence to common features.

The experience of different collaborative evaluations has shown that the principle of mutual accountability is a key one in order to pave the way towards resolving several of the previous-stated (potential) problems.

Careful planning and preparation are essential for joint and collaborative evaluations in which several, and sometimes diverging, interests must be accommodated, and where the background, knowledge and capacity of the various partners are likely to differ considerably. These kind of evaluations have the management of tensions and challenges at their core (Patton and Gornick, 2011). Some of them are strongly associated with:

- The required consultation of all the stakeholders, in order to ensure buy-in on scope and to establish common ground rules;
- The consensus-building efforts, in such a way that they do not compromise the integrity of the evaluation process and product;
- Having a strong and effective lead, but also showing openness and readiness to listen;
- Ensuring evaluator independence to guarantee the integrity and credibility of the evaluations findings, even while engaging diverse stakeholders to ensure relevance and use of the evaluation; and
- Taking the time necessary to get quality results, while respecting timelines.

CPDEs have a holistic nature, and they imply shared dimensions of understanding and work. Otherwise, they are no more than business of donor and partner countries alone, and their capacity for influencing and strengthening evaluation capacity and CES is severely affected. The country studies show that there is significant progress in the institutionalisation of the CES, although there are differing speeds and also varying scope and levels of ambition. The extent of the contribution of the Paris Declaration to the institutionalisation of the CES seems to have been conditioned by the degree of “buy-in” by political leadership, which in turn developed a more favourable context for partner-donor collaborative evaluation work.

Most countries have made some laudable strides in translating at least some of the principles of the Paris Declaration into national policies and strategies. These include the formulation of national development plans to which donors have to align their own country assistance strategies, and the promulgation of policies that specify the government-preferred mode of development assistance. The challenge, however, has been to translate these national policies and strategies into sector plans and sub-national development programmes with corresponding budgetary allocations.

The main purpose of a collaborative evaluation may be joint learning and/or mutual accountability. Once this orientation has been decided, a critical point to be taken into account by the main stakeholders involved is that genuine decision-making requires higher political decision-making, and buy-in is required. A higher mandate is also required, both from the country partners and the donors, for an effective alignment and division-of-labour process to take shape. This emphasis on the political dimension of the collaborative evaluations should not be underestimated, as it is key to understanding the constraints on government with regard to exercising effective ownership and leadership on these endeavours.

6 Learning from Experience: A compendium of current and planned CPDE work

Please refer to section 4.2 for the executive summary.
6.1 Main findings from collaborative evaluation work other than PDE

6.1.1 CPDE process and partner-donor profile

13 country studies and one country paper country studies were submitted; presenting 37 case studies of collaborative partner-donor evaluation work (see Annex 10.1). The case studies covered project level, global or sector strategies, annual reviews of bilateral and multilateral co-operation, as well as multi-donor programmes and frameworks (such as global budget support). They offered a wide range of collaborative work experience with different capacity-building features – ranging from a totally donor-led evaluation, with only light involvement of partner country capacities, to evaluations with a strong involvement of country organisations and partner government leadership.

A joint\textsuperscript{19} or collaborative evaluation confers, in the eyes of partner countries’ decision-makers and other stakeholders, a greater degree of enhanced accountability than a donor-led evaluation that uses its own policies and procedures to monitor and evaluate aid assistance and programmes. It also engenders a more explicit partnership between donors and partner countries’ organisations, providing substantial scope for mutual learning about development performance and evaluation practice. The latter was not, however, explicitly identified and clarified as the ultimate objective of the reported CPDEs.

CPDEs were also described as instruments aimed at strengthening partner country systems in support of good governance. As a learning-by-doing instrument, their content should have been complementary to training programmes, technical support, and advocacy, and been focused on co-operation between development partners and concentrated on collaborative evaluation activities intended to strengthen country evaluation systems.

The relevance of CPDE objectives and their alignment to country needs and priorities were not well evidenced in all reported case studies, or not cited as a major factor for partner country/government involvement. Only a few case studies (Benin GPRS, Senegal PRSP annual reviews) mentioned the relevance of the CPDE within the mutual accountability framework, while possibilities for strengthening country evaluation systems and contributing to evaluation capacity development were not sufficiently highlighted through the learning-by-doing approach.

Country ownership and leadership, with a strong involvement of country government organisations, seems to be favoured by countries that confirmed their commitments through signed MoUs, and with clearly defined responsibility in decision-making, co-ordinating and managing the evaluation. Key positions in the evaluation process were taken up by national actors, who participated in the quality assurance of the evaluation (review of Terms of Reference, intermediary and final reports validation, dissemination, and use of evaluation results).

It was also expected that CPDEs would contribute substantially to the harmonisation of international development evaluation practice, and demonstrate the donor institutions’ commitment to implementing the Paris Declaration, its subsequent Accra Agenda for Action, and also the Global Partnership for Development Effectiveness (Busan Commitments).

The country involvement was through high-level committees (representing the partner government or its structures, as well as major stakeholders), technical committees, and joint partner-donor committees. Reference groups were established in partner-donor initiatives, and were composed of representatives of the major stakeholders of the programme evaluation, including academia, CSOs or donor representatives. Country organisations usually provide the logistical support in conducting the evaluation, for example facilitating face-to-face interviews, focus groups, videoconferences, and perception surveys. This has increased the usefulness of the CPDE experience and has worked towards increasing the legitimacy of country M&E systems, processes and procedures.

The timing was cited as an important factor for increasing the relevance of the exercise – in particular, when the CPDE is articulated with the country planning and budget allocation cycle or the renewal of a bilateral or multilateral programme (Ghana-Denmark co-operation evaluation, for example).

The CPDEs were, in the most cases, funded by donors through grants and technical assistance funds, while partner countries’ contributions were often limited to logistical and administrative costs with regard to their involvement in the different committees and stakeholder meetings. However, exceptions were seen in Vietnam, Uganda and the Philippines. In Uganda, for example, the Government used its financial and technical resources, and has allocated a dedicated budget line for conducting evaluations, including CPDEs.

However, donor influence is more likely to be less dominant and overall “jointness” stronger in countries where a formal evaluation policy and M&E systems, with some degree of credible capacity, are in place. The partner country contribution to some of the evaluation costs may increase its engagement and commitments towards CPDE implementation and use of evaluation results.

\textsuperscript{19} See section 2.2 for further information on terminology.
The involvement of the relevant country organisations – including CSOs, local consultants, the private sector, and CBOs – was mentioned in various case studies, and indicates the degree of ownership and engagement of the national parties.

The opportunity to build up ownership and country capacities was achieved by involving high-level officials, sector leaders, NGOs, academia and country expertise in the whole evaluation process, including quality assurance and dissemination at an early stage of the collaborative evaluation (Mozambique). In several cases, national leadership was ensured by the national planning structures, with a few exceptions (External Aid Division in Mozambique, APC in Columbia) where the co-ordination mechanism took the form of collaborative partner-donor committees.

The use of country systems, in terms of procurement or payment, evaluation systems, and resources (human and financial), varied from country to country, depending on the existing government capacities, the extent of donor trust in country systems, and reliance on the national expertise. International consultants (with the support from time to time of local consultants) were often used to conduct the evaluation, and to manage the evaluation process, while the country partner organisations took care of the co-ordination, validation of terms of reference and draft reports, and even dissemination of the evaluation findings and results.

The use of donor evaluation practices and the adoption of the learning-by-doing approach were preferred by donors in undertaking collaborative evaluation work. A few exceptions, however, were seen in Benin, Bolivia, Ghana and Vietnam, where national evaluation procedures were used in collaborative evaluations. In the case of Ghana, the M&E manual was used as reference material by the national structures involved in the collaborative evaluation, such as the sector working groups (SWG), the NDPC M&E division, District Planning, and M&E co-ordinating units. In Vietnam, the national evaluation manual was used in the Vietnam-JICA collaborative evaluation, and the harmonised guidelines for accountability assessments and reporting were adopted in the case of the Bolivia-Netherlands co-operation evaluation.

The role of the partner country in leading the quality assurance process, through joint technical and management committees and the validation of the evaluation findings, was mentioned as an important factor to ensure its usefulness for the partner country organisations. The particular case of the Samoa-Australia collaborative evaluation helped the government to improve mechanisms for handling negative media statements arising from ineffective communication. It also helped in developing learning processes, which were complemented by the World Bank facility for disaster risk reduction (GFDRR) in implementing a co-ordinated approach to M&E and improved consolidated reporting.

The use of participatory evaluation approaches was revealed to be particularly important for collaborative evaluation work in the social sectors. The case from Zambia allowed the evaluation team to engage with communities designated by the Community Welfare Assistance Committees (CWACs), in complete alignment with the national social protection policy.

A robust partner country communication strategy to share evaluation results with stakeholders, parliamentarians, media and policymakers helped in scaling up the programmes by attracting more donor and public resources to the programme (Zambia Child protection programme, for example).

6.1.2 Intended and actual learning at the level of country individual actors, organisations, and networks

Capacity strengthening of individuals, organisations and networks through learning-by-doing approaches (workshops, lessons sharing sessions, including dissemination of evaluation results) was the preferred approach in implementing CPDE, according to the country studies. It has helped in most of the countries in improving the country evaluation systems at national, sector or project level. It seems also that JICA and Australia have been among the rare donors who have had an explicit focus on system strengthening in their CPDE work.

The Vietnam-JICA and the Bolivian collaborative evaluation had as their immediate objective the creation of a harmonised evaluation and accountability mechanism, with the use of a country evaluation manual with reference to international standards. The technical staff in the Philippines National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) gained understanding of evaluation concepts and processes, with increased awareness of the need for a country-owned evaluation system through evaluation capacity development seminars, focus group discussions, use of hands-on evaluation tools such as survey questionnaires, and developing performance rating systems.

Individual technical skills development and the strengthening of organisational evaluation capacity have been achieved through active participation at different operational levels, and in the various sectors where collaborative evaluation efforts were undertaken. In particular, evaluation capacity seminars and workshops, activities such as focus group discussions, and preparation of survey questionnaires helped in gaining experience of conducting and managing joint evaluations. They have also paved the way for annual reviews of programme implementation and the formulation of an action plan for enhanced
national evaluation capacity building at the exit stage of a joint evaluation, such as in the Philippines. A series of M&E capacity strengthening exercises, through learning and feedback workshops, have been organised for local government representatives and politicians in, for example, Uganda and Vietnam.

Organisational learning was achieved through exposure to various evaluation methodologies that enhanced the quality of the national ex-post evaluation manual, such as in the Philippines. Awareness sessions and more formal capacity-building activities in Vietnam, for example, helped in changing the way the Department of Public Investments appraised, monitored and evaluated projects. The case of the Senegal’s water and sanitation programme evaluation was a good opportunity to develop skills within the national structures in charge of this sector both at the responsible ministry and the country’s water agency.

Network learning was not systematic, as networks were weak at the time of the reported CPDEs. However, in the case of Senegal, this has helped to support the development of the Senegalese Evaluation Association (SenEval). Moreover, knowledge sharing sessions and M&E forums involving various stakeholders including the control and oversight agencies took place. This helped in the creation of M&E communities of practice, for example. Based on this, there needs to be further development of networks learning, and the involvement of networks in collaborative evaluation frameworks.

Samoa benefited from direct assistance to develop evaluation reporting frameworks, methods and processes, guided by the actual Tropical Cyclone Evan recovery system. In Mozambique, a mid-term in-house consultancy contract helped in building and strengthening local capacities with skills transfer and coaching. In Senegal, the management for development results and mutual accountability – pillars of the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action – offered an opportunity to develop technical skills at all levels, using participatory approaches to evaluation.

As mentioned above, few systematic capacity-building initiatives with formal training and skills development have taken place around or parallel to CPDE interventions. Some countries mentioned the full participation of national actors in the validation of evaluation reports as a way to increase awareness and understanding, and as a first step towards capacity building. Other countries said that knowledge sharing and learning were not considered as a priority, and collaborative evaluation in Benin, for example, did not allow for increased learning. Nonetheless, the enrichment of the experience gained through CPDEs reinforced the evaluation culture (on both demand and supply sides) and national evaluation teams capitalised on the operational knowledge gained from these evaluations. In turn, this has built trust between donors and countries.

6.1.3 Contribution to country evaluation systems development

The contribution to the country evaluation systems is analysed through the support to M&E systems improvements and harmonisation with international evaluation standards, and the support of CSOs, CBOs and the private sector. In that context, the country study CPDEs mentioned the strong involvement of national organisations and local experts as a way to promote operational knowledge transfer and learning, and the development of national M&E networks. The cumulative institutional/collective experience gained by international and intra-national agencies helped in developing and/or consolidating the national M&E networks (Vietnam country study), whereas in Ghana, a joint agenda for strengthening M&E and Statistics (JASMES20) was adopted as a key framework for implementation co-ordination of development interventions.

Support to NGOs, CSOs and private sector evaluators did not occur, although the country studies mentioned a strong involvement in some of the CPDE experiences (e.g. Benin, Cameroon). Negative experiences were mentioned by the country study for Colombia, where the involvement of NGOs constituted a challenge to align them with state entities competing for the same co-operation resources. This has led to insufficient geographic coverage and lack of interaction with government entities.

Specific technical assistance programmes – for example, in Samoa – helped to develop consolidated sector-specific reporting templates that constitute an off-the-shelf resource for M&E implementation in future disaster events – addressing vulnerability, cross-cutting issues and risk management in line with the government national strategic policy. This has contributed to a paradigm shift towards an increased emphasis on media learning resources that will enhance future access to M&E online capacity building on disaster management, monitoring and evaluation, with the development of a results-focused M&E guide.

6.1.4 Prefiguration of partner-donor evaluations (future opportunities)

Country studies were not very explicit in identifying a clear partner country engagement in concrete CPDE proposals, or in building on successful CPDE experiences. However, the PDE and other partner-

---

20 Ghana Country Study p.33: JASMES is a “platform for evaluation capacity development and is also a reflection of development partners’ commitments.”
donor collaborative evaluation work were seen by many as real opportunities to strengthen the evaluation culture and capacity of national structures, organisations, and individuals, and can form the basis for a conceptualisation of a collaborative partner-donor evaluation framework in the future. Conclusive signs of this were shown in the implementation of a recent collaborative evaluation in Ghana, in which monitoring frameworks were developed as part of the design of national sector strategies. An MoU between partner government structures and donors was cited as the best vehicle for clarifying collaborative roles and mutual responsibilities, joint decision-making processes, funding procedures, and for developing effective working arrangements – including work plans – and ensuring relevant stakeholders’ involvement.

However, due to low demand for evaluation in partner countries, future collaborative partner-donor evaluations (Colombia, for example) require prior support from relevant stakeholders and willingness to follow-up on the evaluation results. Other countries (Vietnam, Ghana and Senegal) were looking for a further generalisation of the collaborative partner-donor approach by including more systematic capacity-building initiatives of the various stakeholders – such as the CSOs, the private sector and, notably, the local evaluation consulting firms and the national evaluation networks. In Senegal and Cameroon, the CPDE helped in issuing a plan of action for collaborative and joint evaluations and for building the necessary knowledge to boost the dynamics around the achievement of MDGs.

Greater attention to strengthening the country evaluation systems was also suggested by using the existing knowledge management or research centres in universities, such as in Ghana. Stakeholders such as CSOs, the private sector, academia and evaluation networks other than the government entities need to be involved in the development of the collaborative partner-donor evaluation approach, using participatory evaluation techniques.

### 6.1.5 Internal and external factors that may strengthen/weaken the benefits of the collaborative evaluation experiences

Internal factors that have positively or negatively affected the smooth implementation of collaborative partner-donor evaluation work, as reported in the country studies, stemmed from the level of ownership and involvement of national organisations – including the national evaluation networks, the synergies between national actors such as the government agencies and other stakeholders, and also from their role and responsibilities in leading, managing or co-ordinating the CPDEs.

The low involvement of national actors in the design of the evaluation, insufficient synergies between national structures (central and local organs, line and central ministries) and other stakeholders (CSOs, CBOs and other oversight functions), and the lack of utilisation of evaluation results have negatively affected CPDEs. The role of national actors was often confined to logistical support of evaluation teams and to report validation of donor evaluation initiatives. This has limited the relevance and usefulness of CPDE exercises.

Furthermore, the lack of human and financial resources, and the overstretched national actors in charge of M&E, with simultaneous evaluations and with secondary roles in CPDEs explain the low level of participation and ownership. Due to the overstretched workforce and high turnover of staff in governments, gaps were identified and filled through donors funding the recruitment of international consultants and technical assistants. This has undermined the internal capacity strengthening objectives.

Aid dependency of some partner countries and the weakness of country evaluation systems were seen as drawbacks to wider stakeholder understanding of key policy issues raised by partner-donor evaluations, particularly multi-donor programmes such as the GBS (Mozambique), and may still require donor-led evaluations. The need for a national championing of CPDE initiatives and the building of country evaluation systems and mechanisms are seen as a way forward.

Weak government capacities (while relying on external aid units) have negatively affected government contributions to the process of collaborative evaluation efforts (Mozambique), beyond its presence in the management of the evaluation.

The various aid instruments and modalities (sometimes with multiple donors) were a constraint to a multi-actor engagement (GBS, PRSP evaluations) with parallel efforts of evaluation capacity strengthening, M&E systems development, statistics and audit strengthening. These efforts needed better co-ordination and focus. Also, the lack of a consolidated and shared vision with regard to multi-donor reviews of international co-operation did not help to improve partner public policies. In that respect, CPDEs were found to be much less useful when not linked to country planning cycles and budgetary allocations.

There were positive factors around the country leadership and ownership, and clarity of government priorities and needs when embarking on collaborative evaluation exercises. The leadership role of
government, and its strong commitment to agreed protocols across government institutions and donors, helps in implementing fruitful collaborative and joint evaluation work.

The early identification of key stakeholders at the initial stage of the collaborative or joint evaluation work helped in building trust among country actors and donors through fluid and frank dialogue. This will ultimately help in strengthening the country-donor partnership and mutual accountability.

Furthermore, the high-level involvement – even if sometimes limited in scope – of relevant stakeholders representing both the demand and supply side in evaluation work – including the policymakers, the public resource management institutions (MoF, NPC), NBS, sector M&E bureaux, Parliamentarians, CSOs, CBOs and the private sector – has helped in improving the evaluation culture.

The international development co-operation mechanisms may also be seen as an external factor that may hamper the smooth implementation of CPDEs, as they use different accountability systems and procedures, and evaluation and reporting systems. In the case of Samoa, for example, streamlining the reporting mechanism across donors was difficult, and the government had to adopt a joint reporting format on evaluation results.

6.2 Emerging lessons from CPDE experiences: an analytical compilation

Several lessons were drawn from the CPDEs mentioned in the country studies, as well as from the presentations at the Synthesis Workshop. These lessons are at various levels: policy and strategic, systems and structures, and process levels. Some of the lessons may be of a general nature or are well-known lessons from ECD experiences, while others are specifically derived from the analysis of successful and/or unsuccessful CPDE experiences (see Annex).

6.2.1 At policy and strategic level

Several lessons learned emerge from this study at policy and strategic level:

- Donor alignment to country development priorities and needs is key to successful collaborative partner-donor evaluation work (priority outcomes in South Africa, for example).
- National political will, ownership and insistence on the use of country M&E systems are essential to ensure the genuinely collaborative nature of evaluations.
- The evolving demand for evaluation and the existence of national evaluation policies emphasise the growing importance attached to the utilisation of evaluation results.
- Collaborative partner-donor efforts to strengthen country evaluation systems and individual organisational capacities must go hand in hand with the stimulation of domestic demand for evaluation from national policymakers, CSOs and oversight bodies.
- A common partner–donor agenda, with a shared vision for change and common understanding of policy issues, helps in the planning and implementation of collaborative evaluations.
- The harmonisation of the timing of CPDE initiatives with partner country planning cycles and budgetary resource allocations is crucial if evaluations are to be used to inform macro and sector policies, and programme design and implementation. Moreover, timely feedback of evaluation results increases the interest of policy makers and decision makers.
- Making explicit country evaluation systems development objectives a part of collaborative evaluation work, such as in the Philippines and Vietnam, increases the momentum of country engagement, which has to be sustained in future CPDEs.
- Ensuring that CPDE is rooted in the country/national context (e.g. the level and sources of political support, and emerging demands from CSOs and Parliamentarians for development evaluation) facilitates country partner-donor policy dialogue for evaluation capacity development (as in Benin, for example).
- Linking evaluation capacity development to institutionalisation efforts through CPDEs (support of evaluation policy development or M&E roadmap implementation, such as in Benin and Vietnam) enhances the chance for positive changes in the evaluation culture.
- The existence of an explicit national knowledge management strategy in partner countries is necessary to ensure cumulative learning and knowledge sharing through CPDEs, with the development of dedicated websites and platforms for sharing best practices (in Samoa, for example, knowledge-sharing platform of best practices on disaster prevention and mitigation).
- Building on international initiatives (e.g. impact evaluations with 3IE, CLEAR programme) provides more opportunities to develop in-house capacities to undertake collaborative partner-donor impact evaluations.
6.2.2 At the systems and structures level
The systematisation of lesson-learning cannot be adequately achieved on an ad hoc basis, but through agreed protocols for the closure of bilateral co-operation programmes, as is now the case for some multilateral donors (joint partner-donor completion reporting and joint assistance strategy or country programme evaluations).

The existence of institutions at a national level with sufficient budget dedicated exclusively to monitor and evaluate development programmes – including international co-operation projects and programmes in partner countries – may help in mainstreaming CPDEs around aid effectiveness.

Specific institutional support for decentralised M&E Units to promote the development of evaluation expertise at local level, including local governments and municipalities, helps in conducting “decentralised” CPDEs.

Involvement of country partner national structures and organs in designing, planning and conducting the evaluation is necessary, but not sufficient to build a coherent country evaluation system, as evaluation capacities need to be built at all levels (central, local, sector, programme, and project).

Donor support of collaborative partner-donor evaluation of public policies helps to develop coherent national evaluation and statistical systems (such as in Benin), and lays the ground for harmonising external co-operation and aid modalities with national and sector policies.

6.2.3 At the process level
Several lessons learned emerge from this study at process level:

- Conducting an evaluation requires one to go through the whole evaluation cycle/process, from inception to utilisation of evaluation results.
- Maintaining independence for enhanced credibility and the professionalization of evaluation practice are crucial in building trust in country evaluation systems.
- Supporting regional evaluation networks and partnerships – such as Parliamentarians’ Associations and national evaluation networks – enhances partner countries’ engagement.
- Annual forums for development evaluation at country, regional and international levels are opportunities for sharing knowledge and building coalitions.
- The creation of reference and management groups with formal MoUs and ToR strengthens collaboration in the evaluation design, programming of new activities, and use of evaluation results.
- Poor timing and scheduling of joint evaluation activities – including the strengthening of evaluation capacity – hampers country partner-donor joint management and evaluation collaboration, and may lead to clashes with government initiatives and priorities.
- Insufficient budget for the greater transaction costs pertaining to partner-donor collaborative actions may reduce the frequency of collaborative evaluation work that could otherwise enhance the evaluation development capacities in the partner country.

6.3 Emerging Trends and Future Opportunities
6.3.1 Main Pilot CPDEs to be implemented in the coming 3-5 years
Various pilot CPDEs in the coming 3-5 years were proposed, covering global, sector or project-level evaluations (See Annex 10.4). These are, according to country study reports, aligned to partner country priorities and needs. However, these look more like preliminary “shopping” lists than formal engagements with selected donors. The relevance of the proposed pilot CPDEs to partner country priorities and accountability or learning needs was often not put forward or clarified.

Several countries have proposed sector or thematic CPDEs focused on intended or ongoing sector policy reforms (education and health, agriculture and rural development, justice, trade), or prioritised thematic areas such as gender and vulnerable youth employment, inclusive growth of public investments, public private partnerships, environment protection, and climate change. Some other countries mentioned CPDEs with regard to global or multi-donor and/or multi-sector programmes, such as the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), MDGs or the Busan Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation Programmes.

Although all countries have mentioned a strong ownership, with the involvement of partner country evaluation organisations and networks, linking CPDE proposals to the public policy reform agenda and planning cycles or budgetary resource allocations enhances the chances of policy changes, accountability, and learning.
Country studies highlight mainly the challenges for undertaking CPDEs, related to the purpose and scope (sector, thematic or global, and accountability and learning needs) and timeliness to better influence public policies and building evaluation capacities at all levels. Increased objectivity, transparency and independence of collaborative partner-donor evaluation work can bring or achieve in terms of strengthening evaluation legitimacy and impact were not mentioned as a key challenge. Nor was there mention of the asymmetry of partnership between donors and aid-dependent countries that may influence both the evaluation process and the use of evaluation results.

In launching, experimenting and developing future CPDEs, partner and donor decision-makers should resolve questions of how and when future CPDEs should be undertaken, for what purpose, and whether respective capacities would be commensurate with the required level of engagement, while tackling any asymmetrical partnership issues (please see paper in section 8 for various partnership dimensions).

### 6.3.2 Interested Organisations

The demand for future CPDEs, according to country studies, comes from country organisations in charge of aid co-ordination and development planning – including local organisations, public enterprises, sector/line ministries – and also from Evaluation Departments of Public Policies (such as in Benin) or the President’s Office and Ministries of Finance.

Systematic involvement of government entities, sector co-ordination forums, sector advisory groups, national networks and other stakeholders (CSOs, CBOs, the private sector, and academia) were mentioned in few mature CPDE proposals at the sector level (Uganda education programme evaluation, for example).

Other interested organisations cited in country studies include management and public administration institutes, M&E Communities of Practice, networks and forums, Sector Co-ordination Forums or Groups (such as the Ghana Monitoring and Evaluation Forum (GMEF) and Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration (GIMPA)), as well as national and international NGOs (Oxfam, ADRA…).

The country proposals do not elaborate on specific roles for country evaluation systems and networks, as many of these have not yet fully matured. However, it was suggested by most of the country studies that greater attention should be devoted to the evaluation of public policies with evaluation capacity development of national structures and knowledge resource centres on evaluation techniques. For example, support for specific curricula on public policies evaluation within the evaluation centre of the University of Zambia was mentioned as a module for capacity development.

The monitoring and evaluation framework of sector plans could be an entry point to collaborative evaluation (in Zambia, for example), in addition to ongoing collaboration in the implementation of sector-wide approaches (SWAPs). A programme-based evaluation approach for collaborative evaluation work was mentioned as a preferred future direction for more focused evaluation capacity development.

Depending on the government structure and the modalities of the CES, Presidential or Cabinet offices may be used as a potential entry point to CPDEs, and would increase demand for, and use of, public resources for evidence-based policies.

Working with parliaments through their research departments enhances the quality of lawmakers’ debates, improves accountability and transparency, and provides an opportunity for evidence-based policies. In some countries (Zambia, or Uganda for example), a parliamentary reform programme is in place to advocate CPDEs.

Strong support and capacity-building initiatives for CSOs, evaluation networks and the private sector were considered as a pre-condition for enhancing their involvement in CPDEs and, among other things, to combat corruption and mismanagement. A role was suggested for M&E networks and managing for development results (MfDR) communities of practice (CoPs) to contribute to collaborative evaluations, capacity-building and learning, and advance the evaluation culture by the dissemination of ethical values and participatory community-driven evaluation approaches.

Creating an enabling environment for evaluation networks to become more self-sufficient and better regulated organisations – equipped to promote evaluation standards, sharing and discussion platforms of best practices, and quality evaluation standards – was also suggested by some country studies.

### 6.3.3 Policy areas for CPDE and lessons to be learned

The main policy areas of interest to partner countries relate to accountability for results in sector and poverty reduction programmes and MDGs, as well as to national public policy development. Development effectiveness of external aid and quality of international co-operation were also mentioned.

---

21 Programme-based evaluation refers to the Evaluation of a set of interventions, marshaled to attain specific global, regional, country, or sector development objectives (DAC Glossary 2002).
as policy areas for partner countries – in particular, the extent to which development co-operation is effective in terms of impacts on people’s lives (Samoa and Colombia, for example).

From the country studies, the main drivers for a learning experience were related to public policies evaluation that can enhance partner-donor policy dialogue, increase ownership and leadership, stimulate innovations, and accelerate the generation and dissemination of evaluation results to better serve as an input to policymakers, implementers and researchers.

Promoting a legal and institutional framework for the CES – with clear responsibilities for parties involved, and for the creation of a national structure for co-ordination of evaluation initiatives and dissemination of evaluation results – was suggested as an area for policy enhancement, such as in Cameroon.

The improvement of public policy design and implementation was also cited in future CPDEs in sector or thematic areas such as health, education, and poverty reduction programmes. The Colombia country study, for example, mentioned the need to learn from past experiences and to act on deficiencies and pitfalls. Furthermore, building on successful experiences may systematise learning and stimulate the generation and dissemination of the necessary knowledge to better influence policy changes.

The continuous improvement of policy dialogue between Government and CSOs was mentioned, while encouraging: 1) participation of different actors in the various stages of the CPDE process; 2) capacity-building of national actors, structures and individuals, including VOPEs; 3) developing corresponding skills in evaluation planning, processes and management; 4) formulating a communication strategy for report dissemination and use of evaluation findings, while developing a repository of CPDE best practices.

6.4 External and risk factors from CPDE

The external and risk factors from CPDE mentioned in the country studies relate predominantly to the increasingly complex relationships between country partners and donors – with an increasing scarcity of external aid, limited partner country resources and capacities, and insufficient synergies between national aid-related organisations and donor structures.

The donor-led evaluation and the use of, and compliance with, donor procedures and reporting mechanisms undermine the legitimacy of country evaluation networks and participation, and also limit the learning opportunities for M&E systems development and for endogenous/customised evaluation models and practices.

The mistrust of country monitoring and evaluation systems when engaging in CPDEs is increased by a range of issues (internal as well as external), including: the low demand for evaluation; the lack of citizen empowerment to request better performance in public management; the weak capacity to attract qualified evaluation staff at all levels; lack of incentives and rewards and sanctions systems; lack of accountability for results and value for money.

Furthermore, the emergence of non-traditional donors/development partners and investors poses a challenge to future CPDEs in a context of uncertainty around aid effectiveness and the sustainability of external flows and aid resources.

6.4.1 Proposed risk mitigation actions

Proposed risk mitigation actions include strong political and donor support to partner country-led evaluations. More support to M&E within CSOs and other stakeholders can enhance accountability for results and development effectiveness. Furthermore, universities, research centres and civil society actors – including evaluation networks – are seen as potential suppliers of evaluation services and are well informed about the local situation and political context.

Streamlining M&E and results-orientation in a coherent system across government bodies and national structures is critical to ensure progress towards reporting on development results to political decision-making bodies and donors.

With regard to the alignment and harmonisation agenda for a comprehensive development framework for more co-ordination mechanisms between partner countries and donors, the international commitments for Development effectiveness (Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation) may increase the opportunities for a greater engagement in CPDEs.

Nurturing demand and advocacy for development evaluation is seen as the new role for VOPEs, M&E networks22 and CoPs. However, this role needs to be assessed and lessons learned with regard to their

---

real contribution in enhancing evaluation capacity development and promoting the evaluation culture in the partner countries.

6.5 Conclusions and Way Forward

The country studies offered a wide range of collaborative work experience, with different capacity-friendly features ranging from a totally donor-led evaluation with light involvement of country capacities to a strong involvement of country organisations and government leadership. Country ownership with a stronger involvement of country government organisations seems to be facilitated by countries confirming their commitments through signed MOUs, specifying responsibilities in decision-making, co-ordinating and managing the evaluation. Involvement of relevant national organisations – including CSOs, the private sector, CBOs – indicates the degree of country ownership and engagement. This has increased the usefulness of the CPDE experience, and has worked towards increasing the legitimacy of country M&E systems, processes and procedures.

The timing factor increases the relevance of the exercise, particularly when the CPDE is linked to country planning and budget allocation cycles or to the renewal of a bilateral or multilateral programme. Most of the reported CPDEs were funded by donors through grants and technical assistance funds, with limited contribution from countries to logistical and administrative costs. However, there were a few exceptions – in Uganda, for example, where the government used its financial and technical resources, and allocated a dedicated budget line for conducting evaluations, including CPDEs. Capacity strengthening of individuals, organisations and networks through learning by doing was the preferred approach in implementing CPDE, and paved the way for the formulation of an action plan for intensified national evaluation capacity building. Because of the preferred learning-by-doing approach to CPDEs, only a few systematic capacity-building initiatives with formal training and skills development took place around or parallel to CPDE interventions. Evaluation knowledge sharing and learning were not sufficiently considered as a priority in the collaborative evaluation and the support to NGOs, CSOs and private sector evaluations did not happen systematically. The PDE and other partner-donor collaborative evaluations were seen as real opportunities to strengthen the evaluation culture and the capacity of national structures and organisations, as well as individuals. They formed the basis for a conceptualisation of a collaborative partner-donor evaluation framework in the future.

Internal factors that have negatively or positively affected the smooth implementation of the collaborative partner-donor evaluation work, as reported in the country studies, resulted from the level of ownership and involvement of partner country organisations. Facilitating wider stakeholder understanding of key policy issues raised by partner-donor evaluations with regard to the multi-donor reviews of the international co-operation has not helped to improve national public policies and strategies. There were positive factors around the country leadership and ownership, and the clarity of government priorities and needs in embarking on such collaborative evaluation exercises where incremental policy changes need to be seen.

Pilot CPDEs have been proposed. These are still preliminary indications/proposals and country, evaluation capacities and resources for conducting collaborative evaluations should be further assessed. The main entry points for future CPDEs would be the existence of:

- A monitoring and evaluation framework of sector plans;
- Working arrangements with presidential and cabinet offices and with parliaments;
- Strong support and capacity-building initiatives for CSOs, evaluation networks and the private sector; and
- The creation of an enabling environment for evaluation networks to become more self-sufficient and better-regulated organisations equipped to promote evaluation standards, sharing and discussion platforms of best practices and quality evaluation standards.

The main policy areas of interest to partner countries relate to accountability for results in sector and poverty reduction programmes and MDGs, as well as public policy management. Development effectiveness of external aid and the quality of the international co-operation are also areas of interest.

Promoting a legal and institutional framework for the CES, and deepening transparency and demand for social responsibility and for the creation of a national structure for co-ordinating CPDE initiatives and dissemination of evaluation results, was suggested as an area for policy enhancement. The external and risk factors from CPDE or donor-led evaluations relate predominantly to the increasingly complex issue of scarcity of external aid, limited partner country resources and capacities, and insufficient synergies between national organisations and donor structures.
7 How can CPDE contribute towards strengthening country evaluation systems

Please refer to section 4.3 for the executive summary.

7.1 Eliciting the assumptions to be tested

This first section presents and justifies a series of assumptions on how collaborative partner-donor evaluations may contribute to a strengthened evaluation system for partner countries, and complement parallel capacity development efforts. These assumptions are tested further on in the second section.

7.1.1 Country evaluation systems

The OECD-DAC framework on ECD (OECD 2012) defines a “country system” as a set of individuals and institutions interacting within an enabling environment\(^\text{23}\). The present paper refines the above definition and describes a country evaluation system as a web of virtuous loops involving:

- Individuals (such as planners, policy-makers, parliamentarians, evaluators, experts, journalists);
- Organisations and institutions (horizontal and line ministries, parliaments, regional authorities, watchdog agencies, universities, private consultancies, media, CSOs, NGOs);
- Professional networks (evaluation associations, communities of practice).

These feedback loops apply to:

- Demand and supply of evaluation services in a context of fair competition and open public procurement;
- Demand and utilisation of evaluation results within the framework of evaluation policies and programmes;
- The checks and balances that ensure confidence in evaluation results with regard to evaluation standards.

Country evaluation systems tend to emanate from evaluation champions − often within the Ministry of Finance or Planning − and then to extend more widely in the public sector and society as a whole. A mature evaluation system is sustainable in the sense that it no longer depends on a specific champion. South Africa is an example of a country system that has progressed quite fast under the effective leadership of an evaluation champion, while showing early signs of maturity − such as the increasing commitment of lines ministries and provinces, and the emergence of a sustainable pro-evaluation coalition within ad hoc networks. In Sri Lanka, the evaluation system seems to have reached the stage of maturity as defined above. The country launched its evaluation policy almost a decade earlier than South Africa. An evaluation champion also played a key role in the first years, but the practice of evaluation is now widespread throughout the public sector, as well as in universities, consultancies and CSOs. Independence and dissemination are secured by specific arrangements. It is probable that the practice of evaluation would survive on a large scale in the absence of an evaluation champion.

\(^{23}\) In South Africa, the term ‘system’ is understood as just the enabling environment. Systems are said to include standards, guidelines, training, etc. which are framing the interactions between people and organisations (DPME, 2014).
Box 3  Evaluation systems in South Africa and Sri Lanka (as from the Synthesis Workshop)

**South Africa**

There had been some evaluation practice in South Africa for years, but a major change occurred in 2009, when monitoring and evaluation (M&E) were given high-level support. An Evaluation Policy Framework was set up in November 2011 and an Evaluation & Research Unit was established in the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (at Presidency level). Thanks to this evaluation champion, the country is now equipped with evaluation guidelines and standards. Hundreds of people have been trained in M&E, and 119 evaluations are available in a repository of evaluation reports.

After three years, 15 national departments (out of a total of 46) are engaged in evaluation activities, and many of them have created M&E units. Three evaluation plans have been launched – some by national departments, some by provincial authorities. Already, eight evaluations have led to improvement plans that are under way. Several success stories of useful evaluations are widely disseminated.

A cross-government Evaluation Technical Working Group and other less formal networks have promoted a feeling of ownership and given birth to an evaluation coalition, progressively making the evaluation system less dependent on the evaluation champion (DPME, 2014).

**Sri Lanka**

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) supported the development of evaluation capacity in Sri Lanka throughout the whole of the 1990s. In 2003, the Government launched a comprehensive evaluation policy, making line ministries responsible for the development and implementation of evaluation plans in their respective policy areas. This policy established an evaluation champion: the Central Performance Evaluation Unit in the Ministry of Policy Development and Implementation. In addition, the policy promoted partnerships with CSOs, including the Sri Lanka Evaluation Association. It encouraged universities and public sector training institutions to disseminate knowledge on evaluation techniques and methods. It recommended that large evaluations be outsourced to country-based consultants.

Ten years later, this policy has generated a wide range of evaluation practices, involving all line ministries, the Audit Office and other watchdog agencies, parliamentarians, universities, consultants, media, CSOs and NGOs. Specific arrangements and mechanisms secure the independence of evaluators and the dissemination of evaluation results (Sivagnanasothy 2010, and presentation at the Synthesis Workshop held in Manila).

7.1.2 Strengthening evaluation systems

As exemplified by the case of Sri-Lanka, donors contribute to developing and strengthening country evaluation systems by training professionals, convening workshops, supplying technical or financial support, and advocating evaluation in their dialogue with partner countries’ governments (Dabelstein 2013, p. 30; Tarsilla 2014). These ECD efforts are encapsulated in the left branch of the following figure in terms of direct support to building capacities.

---

24 See “Question 3”.
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One of the potential risks of the current ECD approach is that newly-built capacities are sustainable only if they are used and implemented promptly. In other words, trained professionals may quickly lose what they have learned if they have insufficient opportunities to put their new skills into practice. Similarly, institutional memory may vanish in a few years if new organisational arrangements are not used routinely. These risks are highlighted by the red question marks in the figure above.

Vietnam experienced that risk, which is expressed in the country study as: “...some government officials, who were trained in monitoring and evaluation in the country and overseas, may lose their expertise because of low chance for practising it”\(^{25}\). The same applies in the case of Ghana, where donors have made lasting efforts to develop evaluation capacity at several levels (parliament, ministries, and regions). The Government of Ghana has established a national evaluation strategy, and an M&E Plan was drafted in 2012. The country has a policy, an M&E Manual, and M&E Guidelines. However, the country study found that practically all of the evaluation work done in Ghana so far has been donor-led, with little involvement of Ghanaian organisations and professionals\(^{26}\).

The above examples suggest that a more sustainable approach to ECD should be sought. Donors and partner countries should pay equal attention to developing capacities and to using the newly-built capacities. This could be achieved by initiating a growing number of country-led evaluations, possibly with some donor support. Country-led evaluations make a twofold contribution to ECD by: 1) using newly-built capacities and keeping them alive; 2) opening an alternative capacity development channel namely, “learning-by-doing” (see Figure 3, right branch).

The term “learning-by-doing” speaks for itself in the context of, for example, a policy-maker launching a first evaluation and then having to deal with the results, or of an expert enrolled in an evaluation team and then understanding how far the job differs from monitoring or audit\(^{27}\).

However, organisations, institutions and networks can, in effect, also “learn by doing”. For example, an institution “learns by doing” evaluations if it enshrines the lessons drawn from its first evaluation experiences in new organisational routines, such as: incorporating an evaluation unit in its organisational chart; including evaluation competencies in staff recruitment criteria; gathering periodic co-ordination meetings focused on evaluation; including an evaluation chapter in its annual activity report. Similarly, a network “learns by doing” if some of its members reshape their social connections by being involved in an evaluation process – for example, by building evaluation partnerships, connecting with the users of evaluation results, or sharing evaluative lessons in a community of practice.

---

\(^{25}\) Vietnam Country Case Study, p. 10.

\(^{26}\) Confirmed by Tarsilla (2014).

\(^{27}\) See OECD (2010a), p. 6: “Many field experiences confirm that one of the most effective learning techniques is through hands-on learning by doing. Directly involving staff and officials in evaluation work can help to improve both individual capacities and the management capacities within relevant institutions, while also convincing them of the value and usefulness of evaluation.”
Finally, it is assumed that country-led evaluations:

- Enable newly-built capacities to be used and to become sustainable;
- Open an alternative ECD avenue in the form of “learning-by-doing”.

Moreover, these two factors are assumed to apply at the three levels of country evaluation systems – that is, individuals, organisations/institutions, and networks.

### 7.1.3 Strengthening systems by partner-donor collaborations

As seen earlier, newly-developed evaluation capacities are at risk of being lost if they are left unused\(^{28}\). Such a risk might be worsened in some partner countries in which evaluation practices are mainly donor-led and make little or no use of country capacities. This problem was identified more than 15 years ago in the following terms: “Rarely are the recipient countries involved until an evaluation is initiated by the donor, and mostly the recipient government is involved in providing information to the donor but not in the analyses and final assessment of performance.” (Dabelstein 1997) At present, there is still a recognised need for better use of regular donor evaluation work to support capacity development in the partner countries (OECD 2010b; Dabelstein 2013, p. 31).

Why have donors been so slow to address this need? A part of the answer may be heard from donor agencies, although it is seldom written down\(^{29}\): donor evaluations are mainly done for accountability reasons; accountability requires the best possible degree of credibility; and credibility would be undermined if evaluations had close ties with a nascent and fragile country system. The overall picture looks like a vicious circle, whereby donors hesitate to collaborate with partner countries since their country systems are not mature enough. This, in turn, slows down or even blocks the maturing of these systems.

Such a vicious circle could be broken by undertaking at least a few evaluations of partner-donor cooperation activities in a collaborative manner. The merit of partner-donor evaluations might be similar to that of country-led ones – that is, enabling newly-built capacities to be used, and making room for learning-by-doing. Collaborative evaluations could even pave the way to country-led evaluations. Of course, these are assumptions in need of being tested, but it is worth noting that a very similar mechanism has given birth to evaluation systems in many member states of the European Union (see Box 4).

**Box 4** _Evaluation systems in EU Member States: The role of collaborative evaluations_

Several policies of the European Union (EU) are implemented by providing member states (MS) with targeted financial support – an approach that has some similarities with partner-donor co-operation. In these policy areas, the EU shifted from donor-led to collaborative evaluations at the beginning of the 1990s. Ten years later, an international research project (Furubo et al., 2002) called on experts from a dozen EU member states to review the evaluation systems of their respective countries. During the process of synthesising the country studies, it came as a surprise that collaborative MS-EU evaluation had often been among the main driving forces behind the development of country evaluation systems.

### 7.1.4 Including a capacity development objective in collaborative evaluations

In the case of the EU, the main purpose of collaborative evaluations was to improve the effectiveness of EU subsidies. The strengthening of country systems was just an unintended side-effect. Most donor agencies tend to adopt a similar low priority to capacity development when they carry out evaluations jointly. Even Denmark, which has been a forerunner in undertaking collaborative partner-donor evaluations over the last decade, has seldom established capacity development as an explicit objective (see Box 5).

**Box 5** _Danish experience with collaborative partner-donor evaluations_

In 2006, the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) had already led or participated in nine collaborative evaluations – each one involving several donor agencies and the partner country. By this time, the benefits of joint evaluations were listed in seven points, of which only one related in part to capacity development in the partner country (DANIDA, 2006).

---

\(^{28}\) See red question marks in Figure 2.

\(^{29}\) An exception is the review of joint evaluations in the area of humanitarian aid by Beck et al (2008), p. 108, who note some “suspicion and lack of trust between international agencies and governments and a perceived need for independence”, especially where evaluation capacity is limited.
During the following years, several collaborative evaluations were launched, of which three had an explicit capacity development purpose: Bhutan, Tanzania, Uganda (DANIDA, 2009). DANIDA then introduced a number of tools aimed at anchoring the evaluation process in the partner country. These tools included: memoranda of understanding; mixed committees to select the evaluation team; mixed reference groups to approve draft evaluation outputs; and country-based peer reviewers to comment on draft evaluation reports. However, for the majority of partner-donor evaluations, and in spite of the measures taken, the partnerships were seen as not being fully balanced. In particular, the leadership of evaluation teams and the dissemination efforts remained donor-oriented.

The biggest step towards collaborating with the partner country was the evaluation of Danish assistance to Uganda, undertaken in 2006 together with the Office of the Prime Minister. This evaluation was steered by a fully-mixed management group chaired by a neutral researcher, who facilitated the resolution of disagreements between partner and donor representatives. These arrangements achieved a very high level of ownership on both sides.

In the future, capacity development could become an explicit objective of a larger number of collaborative evaluations. This new priority would justify a number of innovative capacity-friendly arrangements, such as: issuing a memorandum of understanding to ensure that the evaluation is timely and relevant with respect to the partner country’s own needs; issuing terms of reference (ToR) free of donor-specific methods and standards; using a partner country’s public procurement procedures, involving country institutions in a reference group chaired by a neutral expert; hiring a country professional as evaluation team leader or co-leader; and designing a shared dissemination plan of evaluation findings (DANIDA 2009, OECD 2010b).

If capacity development becomes an explicit objective of some collaborative evaluations, this would justify an extra budget being allocated, and the relaxation of time constraints in order to deal with the specific difficulties of such collaborative arrangements (e.g. co-ordination costs, international meetings, briefings and debriefings).

7.1.5 Adapting collaborative efforts to the state of the country system

Donors may not be willing to share all evaluation responsibilities with a partner country if the country system does not provide for sufficient credibility. As said above, this fear is often taken as an excuse for not collaborating, rather than as an opportunity for raising the partner country system to a higher degree of maturity in a dynamic manner.

Where the evaluation system is nascent, partner-donor collaborations could take the form of pilots involving country professionals and institutions. For example: by inviting country institutions in a reference group; by involving country professional at the stages of designing the evaluation method, formulating draft conclusions, assessing quality, and designing dissemination plans\(^3\). Moreover, collaborations could contribute to the emergence of country networks by, for example: presenting the evaluation results at a meeting of the country evaluation association; or designing country-specific evaluation mechanisms – such as by undertaking a small comparative study of the public procurement mechanisms of donor and partner (see first column in Table 5).

Where the evaluation system is maturing, collaborations could become more frequent and more balanced. Country professionals and institutions could play a co-piloting role in reference groups, evaluation teams, quality assessments, and dissemination plans. Country networks and evaluation mechanisms could be used as far as possible (see second column in Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Shaping collaborations in a dynamic manner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner country evaluation system</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nascent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated interventions</td>
<td>Development aid mainly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner-donor collaborations</td>
<td>Pilots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of country professionals and institutions</td>
<td>Passenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country networks and mechanisms</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a mature system, evaluations tend to focus on national policies, rather than on donor interventions. However, some collaborative evaluations could be initiated and shaped on a case-by-case basis. Moreover, donors could increasingly rely on the partner country system for their own evaluations, as suggested in the South African presentation at the Synthesis Workshop (see third Column in Table 5).

\(^{3}\) Beck et al. (2008), p. 109, suggest that a sensible start would consist of small, manageable initiatives, such as pre-evaluation briefings on focus, methodology and evaluation-team composition.
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7.1.6 Final set of assumptions to be tested

This section has introduced a series of assumptions that can be summarised by saying that at least some partner-donor evaluations:

- Have used the country evaluation system;
- Were intended to strengthen that system;
- Have induced learning-by-doing mechanisms;
- Have complemented other capacity development efforts;
- Were adapted to the state of the country system.

These assumptions are tested in the following section against evidence stemming from the Country Studies and the debates of the Synthesis Workshop held in Manila, in order to draw lessons that could be used in future collaborative evaluations.

7.2 The CPDE Study experience

The test of the above assumptions was undertaken through an approach that has nothing to do with a statistical analysis. Rather than seeking “regularities” across all country studies, the analysis puts a deliberate emphasis on a few instances of collaborative evaluations that had a learning-by-doing potential. As they were available in January 2015 the country studies included 11 collaborative evaluations having such a potential. As regards partner countries, they involved: Benin (2 evaluations), Columbia, Ghana, Mali, Mozambique, Philippines, Samoa, Vietnam (2 evaluations), and Zambia. As regards donors, they involved: AfDB, Australia (2 evaluations), Denmark, Japan (2 evaluations), Spain, UNICEF, and World Bank, plus two evaluations led by several donors jointly.

7.2.1 Have collaborative evaluations used country systems?

7.2.1.1 Moderate use of the country system in typical collaborative evaluations

Across the 11 collaborative evaluations that have been reviewed, the typical process is as follows:

- The evaluation demand originates from the donor agency, mainly for its own accountability needs. The timing, scope and objectives of the evaluation are discussed with the lead institution in the partner country, and then formalised in a MoU.
- A mixed management group is created, including donor agency staff and representatives from several relevant country institutions. The group is chaired by a donor-side professional. Participants discuss and approve the evaluation questions, criteria and the work plan within the donor’s methodological framework.
- An external evaluation team is recruited through a donor procurement procedure, and paid by donor finance. The contract is signed with an international organisation (academic/private), and the team leader is an international professional. The team includes one or more individual country professionals, who are involved mainly in data collection and in writing parts of the evaluation report.
- Field works are co-ordinated by the lead country institution.
- Draft evaluation outputs are discussed in the management group, and quality is assessed by senior professionals on the donor side.
- The dissemination plan includes one or more presentations to country stakeholders. Follow-up action plans are designed and implemented on the donor side only.

The above typical collaborative process makes use of the country system at some stages: 1) discussing the time, scope, and objectives of the evaluation; 2) discussing questions, criteria, and method; 3) collecting data and writing parts of the evaluation report; 4) presenting results to country stakeholders. The country system is mainly used at the level of individuals. Only the lead country institution is involved at organisational level, by signing the MoU, co-ordinating field work, and convening presentation events.

In contrast, the typical collaborative process makes limited use of the country system, with regard to: 1) initial evaluation demand; 2) chairing the management group; 3) procurement of evaluation services, and financing of evaluation tasks; 4) competing through evaluation proposals; 5) designing evaluation methods; 6) formulating evaluation conclusions and recommendations; 7) assessing professional quality; 8) dealing with follow-up action plans.

---

31 See previous chapter for an introduction to the term “country system”.
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Moreover, the country system is poorly used at the level of organisations such as public institutions, other than the lead institution, private firms, research centres, civil society organisations (CSOs), and is not used at all as far as networks and checks-and-balances-mechanisms are concerned. The priority given to involving country individuals is well illustrated by the collaboration on evaluation service procurement. In the best cases, representatives of the partner country’s relevant institutions were invited to take part in the selection process, but they were involved on an individual basis – which did not affect any organisational arrangement in their institution or any checks-and-balances mechanism in the country.

**Lesson A**

Collaborative evaluations tend to make limited use of country systems, with regard to initial evaluation demand, chairing of the management group, procurement and financing of evaluation services, methodological design, formulating and quality-assessing conclusions and recommendations, and follow-up action plans.

**Lesson B**

Collaborative evaluations tend to involve country individual professionals much more than country organisations, institutions and networks. Moreover, they tend to ignore checks-and-balances mechanisms that may exist in the country.

### 7.2.1.2 Some advanced collaborative arrangements have been found

Some of the reviewed country studies show collaborative arrangements that tap deeper than usual into country evaluation systems:

- Mixed management group that is chaired by a country official (Samoa-Australia).
- Country finance has been used most often in the CPDEs, and exceptionally in other collaborative evaluations (Benin-UN).
- Country procurement procedures have been used in a few instances (Ghana-World Bank, Mali-AfDB, Vietnam-Japan).
- CSOs have often been involved in the management of PDEs, and also in some other collaborations (Benin-Denmark, Samoa-Australia).
- Country-led evaluation teams have been hired to carry out most of the PDEs, plus some other collaborative evaluations (Ghana-World Bank, Vietnam-Japan).
- In the Zambia-UNICEF case, the lead country institution developed a robust communication strategy targeted at important country stakeholders, including civil society, media, members of the Parliament, and other policymakers. This contributed to a remarkable in-country utilisation of the evaluation results.

No advanced collaborative arrangement has been identified with regard to evaluation demand, methodological design, professional quality assessment, and follow-up action plans.

**Lesson C**

A wide range of advanced collaborative arrangements have been tested successfully throughout the world, offering good prospects for mutual learning about the use of country evaluation systems.

### 7.2.1.3 Accountability may constrain collaboration

The Samoa country study points out a tension between donor agencies’ need to use evaluation for being accountable to their own constituency and their commitment, under the Paris Declaration, to ensure country ownership. This problem is part of the issue of “donorship” versus “ownership”, which may be a challenge for collaborative evaluations. A look at the above findings seems to confirm the Samoan view. Indeed, some of the most lasting collaboration imbalances have strong roots in the donor priority given to accountability:

- All evaluation demands originate from donor agencies, and most of these demands are relevant and time-related to their own accountability needs.
- Most of the key functions (chair of management group, evaluation team leader, professional quality assessors) remain in the hands of donors or international experts – something that may be explained by credibility needs on the donor side, and thus by the accountability challenge.
- Donor agencies apply all or part of their methodological guidelines, which tend to be accountability-oriented.
The Philippines-Japan case shows an advanced and clear example of this accountability challenge. In this case, a series of successive evaluations were jointly conducted over a number of years. All used a Japanese rating system, which is typical of accountability-oriented evaluations. Progressively, country professionals and institutions developed their evaluation capacity, created their own rating system, and started to use this rating system in collaborative evaluations. In consequence, the practice turned into a competition on accountability ground, rather than mutual accountability.

These findings are in line with a statement made almost two decades ago (Dabelstein, 1997) that “the advantages of carrying out evaluations jointly in terms of ownership and shared lessons learning are far greater than the disadvantage in terms of reduction of donors' individual accountability”. The same view was expressed at the Synthesis Workshop in the Sri Lanka presentation: if the main purpose is accountability, then it would be better if donors and partners evaluated in an independent and separate manner, while collaboration works well if learning is the main evaluation purpose.

**Lesson D**

Using the country evaluation system makes more sense if the main evaluation purpose is learning, rather than accountability vis-à-vis donor agencies’ constituencies.

### 7.2.1.4 Country systems may or may not be open to ODA evaluations

In a first group of countries, evaluation systems are closely connected to development aid (e.g. Philippines, Samoa, Senegal). Typical features of such systems are:

- Major monitoring and evaluation commitments taken in partner-donor co-operation documents, budget support programmes, public finance management projects.
- Donor support to evaluation capacity development.
- Evaluation championship anchored in aid co-ordination institutions.

In contrast, the evaluation systems in a second group of countries are mainly geared at national policies and have just slender ties with donor activities. For instance, Colombia has a national evaluation policy that has almost no bridge with international co-operation. It is clear that collaborative evaluations may easily use the country system in the first group, but not in the second group. This point is illustrated in the Colombia Country Study, and is confirmed by the fact that most collaboration cases have been found in the first group of countries.

**Lesson E**

A collaborative evaluation may easily use the country system if that system is closely connected to development aid. It is more difficult if the system is mainly geared to national policies and has only slender ties with donor activities.

### 7.2.2 Were collaborative evaluations intended to strengthen country systems?

#### 7.2.2.1 Only a part of collaborative evaluations have capacity expectations

During Phase 2 of the Paris Declaration Evaluation (PDE), most country studies relied on country systems primarily, but this was not done with a capacity development purpose – at least, not an explicit one that would have been mentioned in the main PDE report (DIIS 2011). Among the reviewed cases of collaborative evaluations, only a few had some explicit capacity intent (Benin-UN, Ghana-World Bank) or were part of a deliberate capacity development strategy (Philippines-Japan, Samoa-Australia, Vietnam-Japan, Vietnam-Australia). Interesting to note is the case of the Philippines-Japan collaboration, in which the partner country expressed clear demands in terms of capacity development, whereas this objective was attributed to the donor in most other instances.

**Lesson F**

If collaborative evaluation makes little use of country systems, this is partly due to the fact that only a few of them include an explicit capacity intent.

#### 7.2.2.2 Some collaborative evaluations aim at learning-by-doing

Japan (with the Philippines and Vietnam) and Australia (with Samoa and Vietnam) have gone quite far in using collaborative evaluation as a learning-by-doing instrument within a long-term capacity development strategy.

---

32 This is also the case in South Africa as shown in the previous section. Similarly Benin and Uganda have evaluation policies applying to their own country policies.
The most comprehensive example of such a capacity development strategy is the four-year collaboration between the Japanese development agency (JICA) and Vietnam. The first collaborative evaluations of investment projects were initiated before 2005 (Breier 2005, p. 33). Being satisfied with that first step, both partners signed a MoU to promote a joint evaluation programme (2007-2009), which was continued in 2010. The programme included a capacity development component (drafting a Vietnamese evaluation manual, designing methods and tools for joint evaluations, training, and visits) and a learning-by-doing component. As shown by Table 6, the responsibility of the Vietnamese participants has changed gradually from attending to leading/managing the various steps of the evaluations. The MoU introduced an innovative collaboration approach, formulating a good compromise between the somewhat contradictory objectives of learning-by-doing in the country and accounting to Japanese constituencies. This approach consisted of two evaluation phases:

- A “primary evaluation”, which is progressively transferred under the full responsibility of Vietnamese participants, and which covers all steps of the evaluation process – from planning to writing reports.
- A “secondary evaluation”, which remains under full responsibility of Japanese participants (institutions, advisers, consultants). This second phase does not duplicate Vietnamese work on methodological design, data collection and analysis, but it includes a quality assessment and the production of specific evaluation outputs targeted at Japanese users.

### Table 6  Japan and Vietnam: a four-year learning-by-doing strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of country-based players at successive evaluation steps</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design evaluation</td>
<td>Join</td>
<td>Join</td>
<td>Join</td>
<td>Lead/Manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare tools</td>
<td>Join</td>
<td>Join</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead/Manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do fieldwork</td>
<td>Join</td>
<td>Join</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead/Manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process data</td>
<td>Join</td>
<td>Join</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead/Manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write reports</td>
<td>Join</td>
<td>Join</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead/Manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved country-based players</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant public institutions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological adviser</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Philippines-Japan collaboration was structured in a very similar manner. In the cases of Australia and Samoa and Vietnam respectively, the capacity development component is by far the largest one, and collaborative evaluation work plays a complementary role. The same applies to the case of AfDB and Mali.

**Lesson G**

There are some interesting examples of including collaborative evaluations as learning-by-doing opportunities within a multi-year capacity development strategy.

### 7.2.3  Have learning-by-doing effects occurred?

#### 7.2.3.1  Learning-by-doing effects occur at all levels of country systems

Clearly, the authors of the country studies faced difficulties in identifying evidence of learning-by-doing that would have stemmed from collaborative evaluations. Although this was a challenging methodological endeavour, some country studies came up with interesting findings. In the case of the Philippines-Japan collaboration, joint exercises provided all involved country staff with an opportunity to gain first-hand experience of evaluation, which resulted in a deeper understanding of evaluation concepts and processes. Moreover, collaborations pushed the lead country institution – the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) – to further strengthening and retooling of its in-house evaluation capacity. Participation in evaluation missions with Japan and other donors exposed the institution to various donor evaluation methodologies and revealed a need to come up with a country-based evaluation approach, which was developed and tested in further collaborative works with Japan.
The Senegal country study states that country service suppliers have progressively strengthened and highlighted their evaluation capabilities. However, they had difficulties in gaining a share of the national market until their participation in collaborative evaluations established their credibility.

In Benin, the country study of the PDE Phase 2 has involved country participants in exchanges of views in questionnaires, interim reports, field work reports, and draft reports. Country participants also took part in the final quality assessment. These learning-by-doing opportunities have strengthened the units in charge of evaluation in several ministries, and have boosted some country evaluation networks. In particular, country participants have reached a better level of common understanding of evaluation criteria.

What these three stories have in common is that some learning-by-doing occurred – at the level of public institutions (Philippines), private organisations (Senegal), and professional networks (Benin). This finding is surprising as reviewed collaborative evaluations have been rather weak at involving country institutions and networks.

Lesson H

It is clear that collaborative evaluations have had learning-by-doing effects on involved individuals. Moreover, the study has identified interesting examples of learning-by-doing at the level of country institutions and networks, even if partner-donor collaborations are rather weak at involving such institutions and networks.

7.2.3.2 Learning-by-doing effects may occur rapidly

The above-quoted case of collaboration between Vietnam and Japan shows that the learning-by-doing effect may change the country evaluation system within a few years. In that example, the first collaborative evaluation was undertaken in 2005, and the partner country system had reached a good enough level of maturity in 2010. In just five years, the role of Vietnamese participants changed from participation to leadership. Collaboration between the Philippines and Japan offers a very similar picture. Can this transition be described as fast? The answer is definitely “yes” if a comparison is made with traditional ECD approaches, where evaluation systems may still exist only on paper after years of training and technical assistance.

Lesson I

In the framework of a well-designed capacity development strategy, the learning-by-doing mechanisms may strengthen the country evaluation system within five years – a development that can be assessed as being fast.

7.2.3.3 Success stories may play a key role

At the Synthesis Workshop, South Africa presented three stories illustrating how evaluation has been used in subsequent programme changes or policy reforms, and made clear that such success stories are a powerful means to increase evaluation demand and strengthen the country system. Could partner-donor collaborations be the catalyst for the showcasing of successfully-used evaluations, and then strengthen evaluation systems through that alternative channel?

There is at least one example confirming this assumption: Zambia-UNICEF. In this case, a partner-donor evaluation was implemented despite the fact that the country system was still embryonic. The evaluation findings were then used, among other contributions, to scale-up a pilot programme into a country-wide policy, and to shift responsibilities from donor to country. This success story is now used by the country evaluation champion for advocacy purposes.

Lesson J

If the results of a collaborative evaluation are visibly used in the country, then this success story may be used for strengthening the country system.

7.2.4 Have collaborations complemented other capacity development efforts?

7.2.4.1 Collaborations are not a prerequisite for capacity development

The case of Ghana is a story of long-running capacity development efforts that have as yet failed to install an active country evaluation system. Does this mean that donor support to capacity development needs to include collaborative evaluations in order to enable newly-created capacities to be used and

---

33 Success stories have played a major role in the development of the Swiss evaluation system (Toulemonde, 1999).
to become sustainable? The answer is “no”, and this is supported by convincing counter-examples, as explained below.

Uganda also has a long-running record of capacity development efforts initiated through a UNDP-funded project. In this context, the country has created an active evaluation system, including, among other things: a Government Evaluation Facility; an online tracking of evaluation findings and recommendations; an annual evaluation week; a Parliamentary forum on evaluation; and a Government annual performance retreat. This evaluation system deals with country-funded and donor-funded policies and programmes, but it has not yet been connected to collaborative evaluations34. In fact, the country evaluation system is increasingly used through country-led evaluations. Similarly, the Sri Lanka system has reached a mature state after years of capacity development support, and with no significant record of collaborative evaluation.

Australia has applied an approach relying upon the same principle in an innovative capacity development project in Vietnam35. The project provided a number of country professionals with evaluation training, and then a small amount of funds was earmarked to help Vietnamese institutions carry out four country-led evaluations – the demand for which originated from the country. Country-based management groups gathered together representatives from relevant horizontal and line ministries, plus project owners. Individuals who were involved in those evaluations state that there has been a lot of learning-by-doing.

**Lesson K**

Capacity development efforts may succeed in building lively country systems by supporting country-led evaluations, rather than collaborative works.

7.2.4.2 Collaborations may complement, but not replace, other capacity efforts

In the above-quoted cases of collaboration between Japan and the Philippines and Vietnam, the main emphasis was on learning-by-doing. However, those involved on the country side have also benefited from training, assistance, advice, and visits to Japan. It is clear that they have learned through both channels, and not just by doing evaluation tasks.

More generally, there is no example of a collaboration that would have strengthened the country evaluation system in the absence of previous capacity development support.

**Lesson L**

Collaborative evaluations may complement previous or parallel capacity development efforts – such as training, advice, assistance, or policy dialogue – but they cannot replace such efforts.

7.2.5 Considering the regional level

Country evaluation systems need to be connected to the international evaluation community and to regional evaluation networks. Participants in an emerging country system may also benefit from being part of a regional community of practice, from benchmarking with other regional institutions, or from engaging in mutual learning projects at regional level – such as the collaboration between Benin, South Africa and Uganda (with the support of the UK, CLEAR and 3IE).

However, the study does not show evidence of whether collaborative evaluations may or may not complement regional capacity development efforts. Hence, no lesson is learned on that issue.

---

34 In spite of some past experience (see Box 5).
35 Both Australia and Japan are quoted in this text as having contributed to strengthening the Vietnamese evaluation system. These contributions were complementary, in that they both involved the same lead institution – the Ministry of Planning and Investment.
Box 6  
An example of mutual learning at regional level

In 2011, seven African countries started exploring what each was doing in the area of evaluation and where there were lessons to learn from one another (Benin, Burundi, Ghana, Kenya, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda). The process benefited from the support of the Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR) and GIZ. In the end there proved to be a lot to share on evaluation between Benin, Uganda and South Africa, and that relationship has been taken forward since then. Some activities undertaken have been:

- Sharing examples of guidelines;
- Participate in training across borders;
- Attending one another’s evaluation week;
- Running a joint session on country evaluation systems at the African Evaluation Association conference;
- Networking within 3iE.

7.2.6 Were collaborations adapted to the state of the country systems?

7.2.6.1 Shaping collaborations dynamically

The study sheds light upon a number of country systems that range from nascent (Ghana, Samoa, Vietnam, Zambia) to maturing (Benin, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda), or already mature (Sri Lanka)\(^\text{36}\). It could be assumed that collaborations are shaped in a way that matches the degree of maturity of the country system with country participants starting out in the backseat, if the country system is nascent, or in the driver’s seat, if the country system is mature.

In fact, the study does not show any evidence of adapting collaborations to the progress of country systems, except in the above quoted cases of Japan with the Philippines and with Vietnam, respectively. In these two cases, collaboration was progressively adapted to an evolving country evaluation system in the framework of a multi-annual strategy. In fact, it was even planned from the outset. Evidence suggests that such an adaptation is more difficult if collaborations are established on a case-by-case basis, but there is nothing to indicate that it would be impossible. Hence, no lesson is learned on that general issue, but more specific issues are considered hereafter.

7.2.6.2 Strengthening the evaluation champion’s role

Most countries have established an “evaluation champion” at the level of the presidency (South Africa), prime minister (Uganda), horizontal ministry (Benin, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Zambia) or planning agency (Ghana, Philippines, Samoa).

In the case of an emerging or maturing evaluation system, the champion plays an essential role in many areas – such as advocacy, co-ordination, advice, training, quality assurance, networking, and/or capitalisation. Donors involved in capacity development have an obvious interest in supporting and strengthening the country champion, with the aim of generating indirect capacity impacts across the whole evaluation system. This is why many collaborative evaluations rely on the country champion primarily for such aspects as signing the MoU, co-ordinating involved country institutions, liaising with country CSOs, and disseminating results to country stakeholders. This was the case in many reviewed collaborative evaluations (Benin-UN, Ghana-World Bank, Mozambique-EC, Philippines-Japan, Samoa-Australia, Vietnam-Australia, Vietnam-Japan, and Zambia-UNICEF).

While maintaining a strong alliance with the evaluation champion, donors are at risk of being trapped in that coalition, and of missing opportunities to involve line ministries, regional authorities and/or CSOs in their collaborative arrangements. In turn, missing such opportunities could slow down the progress of the country system towards becoming mature\(^\text{37}\). The study has not shown any occurrence of that risk becoming reality, but several presentations at the Synthesis Workshop show that the risk does exist. Indeed, several country evaluation champions said that they wanted to play a co-ordination role in collaborative evaluations and it could be understood that co-ordination might turn into control. In contrast, the impressive South Africa presentation did not indicate that the country system is about to reach a degree of maturity that would make it sustainable in the absence of the evaluation champion.

Lesson M

Collaborative arrangements tend to give a key role to the country evaluation champion, with the aim of generating indirect capacity impacts across the whole country system. However, partner-donor

\(^{36}\) See 7.1.1 for a definition of “maturity”. No country studies were carried out in South Africa and Sri Lanka but both evaluation systems were presented at the Synthesis Workshop in Manila.

\(^{37}\) It has been said at 7.1.1 that a mature evaluation system does not depend on a national champion.
collaborations are at risk of being trapped in a narrow coalition with the country champion, and of missing opportunities to involve line ministries, regional authorities, and/or CSOs. In turn, the missing of such opportunities could slow down the country system’s progress towards maturity.

7.2.6.3 Making room for collaborations in the national evaluation policy

The study confirms that many countries now have a national evaluation policy – often embedded in an M&E policy. Evidence of this is provided by the cases of Benin, Colombia, the Philippines, Samoa, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Vietnam, and Zambia.

At the Synthesis Workshop, several voices claimed that these policies, and the evaluation work plans derived from them, should make room for capacity-oriented collaborative evaluations. Such an approach would have the merit of bridging one of the current problems with collaborative arrangements – that is, the continuing imbalance in evaluation demand still driven by donors’ accountability needs.

The 11 evaluations that have been reviewed for writing this paper did not include any evidence of collaborations initiated in the framework of a country evaluation policy. The closest example is that of the Vietnam-Australia capacity building project, which earmarked donor resources to be used for country-led evaluations initiated within the framework of the national policy. Hence, there is as yet no evidence base for learning lessons in this area.

7.3 Guidance for future capacity-oriented collaborations

Would it be possible to convert the lessons drawn at the previous section into some guidelines for undertaking collaborative partner-donor evaluations? Participants in the Synthesis Workshop considered that they would need such guidelines but these would be hard to produce because each collaborative evaluation has to be designed in an ad hoc manner related to its specific context, and paying attention to:

- Whether the country system is geared mainly for development aid or mainly in for national policies (Lesson E).
- Previous and current capacity development efforts (Lesson L).
- Degree of maturity of the country system.
- Existence and strength of an evaluation champion (Lesson M).
- Existence and nature of a country evaluation policy.

Instead of drafting guidelines, it is possible to set out a series of principles, and to propose guidance on what works and what does not work in terms of collaborative evaluation. Among the principles to be set out, this paper suggests the following ones:

- Initiate collaborative evaluations where both partners may put priority on learning, rather than accountability vis-à-vis donor agency’s constituencies (Lesson D).
- Initiate collaborative evaluations where the country system is geared mainly at development aid, and promote country-led evaluations otherwise (Lesson E).
- Include a learning-by-doing objective in collaborative evaluations (Lesson F).
- Consider a multi-annual collaboration plan, rather than a one-off collaborative evaluation (Lesson G and Lesson I).
- Seek to highlight success stories of collaborative evaluations used in the partner country and disseminate these good practices (Lesson J).
- Ensure that capacity-oriented collaborations complement previous or parallel capacity building activities – such as training, advice, assistance, advocacy, or dialogue (Lesson L).
- Design collaboration arrangements that strengthen the country evaluation champion, while remaining open to other stakeholders (Lesson M).
- Anchor collaborative evaluations in the national evaluation policy as far as possible.

In terms of practical guidance, this paper suggests the following tips to be considered, if the context permits:

- Initiate collaborative evaluations in the framework of a multi-annual collaborative framework.
- Gather a mixed management group, chaired or co-chaired by a senior country professional.
- Involve country stakeholders as widely as relevant.
- Provide the lead country institution with financial support, and then use country procurement and payment systems.
• Ensure that at least a part of the services are supplied by country organisations specialising in evaluation, and that country professionals take part in the methodological design, analysis of information, and in drafting conclusions and recommendations.
• Use country evaluation guidelines and standards, where relevant ones exist.
• Use senior country experts as professional quality assessors.
• Develop a specific in-country communication strategy targeted at relevant stakeholders, including civil society, media, and other policymakers.
• Present the evaluation results in country network meetings.

The above principles are probably applicable in all instances of capacity-oriented collaborations, but the same does not apply to some of the subsequent tips, which may require strong behavioural changes on donors’ side. For instance, it may be challenging for a donor agency to set up a mixed management group chaired by a country expert, to use country procurement and payment procedures, to refer to country evaluation guidelines and standards, or to rely on country-based quality assessors.

Finally, the lessons learned in the above pages and the derived guidance do not address the question of how several donors could best take part in capacity-oriented collaborations. In the example of Vietnam, both Australia and Japan made complementary efforts that were co-ordinated by the Vietnamese Ministry of Planning and Investment. In this case, donor efforts benefited from being harmonised in collaboration with the country evaluation champion. Should it always be the case? This issue calls for a broader reflection on the geometry of collaborations.

8 Multiple partnership dimensions under CPDE

Please refer to section 4.4 for the executive summary.

8.1 Introduction

Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation (CPDE) work involves at least two institutions/organisations agreeing to co-operate in order to advance their mutual interest. Such collaborations may be either informal or occasional (e.g. inviting an organisation to attend an evaluation workshop), or may be established as formal partnerships, which are the subject of this thematic paper.

Partners may agree to collaborate on various types of work, such as a specific evaluation, a series of evaluations, or an evaluation work plan. Collaboration may cover the whole undertaking, from initiation to utilisation. It may also take place at just some stages of the work, depending on the agreed collaboration profile. In the context of CPDEs, the formal dimension of partnerships is often enshrined in a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU).

The term “partnership” is used in this thematic paper to apply to the public bodies or foundations that may jointly engage in launching, funding, and/or managing an evaluation. If country stakeholders − local authorities, and civil society organisations (CSOs) − are involved in an evaluation reference group, this does not mean that they should be counted as partners, as they do not sign the MoU.

This thematic paper addresses the question: “What are efficient partnership configurations for carrying out CPDE works?”

The term “partnership configuration” can be applied to the geometry of partnerships − that is, collaborating institutions/organisations and the sharing of roles among them. On the side of the partner country, collaborating institutions may include the public body in charge of co-ordinating development co-operation, the institution in charge of the evaluation policy, other horizontal ministries or agencies (e.g. planning, finance, management, and evaluation), line ministries or sector-based agencies. On the donor side, collaborating institutions typically include aid agencies, and sometimes foundations.

The issue of efficiency is important with regard to the costs partnerships have, in terms of co-ordination tasks, managing over a long timeframe, and dilution of priorities. A given partnership configuration is efficient if its cost is compensated for by sufficient benefits in terms of, for example, more relevant results, better ownership and use of results, and/or learning by doing. The next three sections will address the above main question from three complementary standpoints:

• What are the costs and benefits arising from various partnership configurations?
• What are the drivers to partnering in one or another configuration?
• What contextual factors shape partnership configurations?

Finally, the last section concludes on how partnership configurations could be optimised in the case of CPDEs.
8.2 Merits of various partnership configurations

8.2.1 CPDE configurations

8.2.1.1 Basic bilateral partnership

The basic bilateral partnership can involve one donor agency and the relevant line department. Some examples include Senegal and the European Union (EU), Benin and the African Development Bank (AfDB), Uganda and AfDB, or Mali and the EU. In all cases, the partnership management may be cost-effective as far as collaboration mechanisms are already in place for implementing and monitoring the intervention. The intervention can be evaluated collaboratively with an explicit description of roles and responsibilities, stakeholders, possible benefits and limitations.

8.2.1.2 Triangular partnership involving several country institutions

This configuration can bring together one donor agency and the relevant line department(s), plus the institution in charge of the country evaluation policy. In this case, the cost is significant because collaboration mechanisms involve all relevant stakeholders in charge of the implementation and evaluation, from partner and donor sides.

Potential conflicts can arise between the requirement to satisfy information needs of stakeholders and the willingness to do a high-quality evaluation. Benefits may also be significant – for example, in terms of better evaluation results, strengthening the evaluation champion, and/or learning by doing. Examples identified of this configuration include Vietnam and Japan, and the Philippines and Japan.

8.2.1.3 Triangular partnership involving several donors

This configuration involves several donor agencies and the most relevant institution in the country – such as the ministry of finance in the case of multiple-donor budget support (Mozambique-EC), the relevant line ministry in the case of a multiple-donor, sector-wide programme (Benin-Denmark), or the ministry in charge of aid co-ordination.

The costs of this type of configuration are known to be important as co-ordination arrangements need to match the many administrative constraints of multiple donors. Priorities may also be at risk of being diluted if all involved donors define clearly their information needs. However, these costs might be significantly reduced if donor agencies have pre-established co-ordination arrangements, such as in the cases of Benin and the UN, Mali and the EU, or Zambia and the EU.

Benefits can be expected in terms of reducing the evaluation pressure on the partner country administration. Examples of this configuration are emerging, such as: the UN (gathering funds from donor agencies for several country partners) with Benin, Mali and Ghana; and the EU with Senegal and Uganda.

8.2.2 Other configurations

During the Manila workshop, participants mentioned several partnerships involving local-level stakeholders. However, these had only a marginal connection with partner-donor evaluation. Nevertheless, such initiatives focused on evaluation capacity development (ECD) help more or less in mainstreaming both country and partner capacities on facilitative and collaborative evaluation development. Most of the time, the terms of engagement as well as roles and responsibilities within the design and implementation process of partnerships are not well understood by both parties. ECD may reduce the level of misunderstanding and therefore increase the level of collaborative achievements.

Interesting practices are South-South partnerships supported by North donors. For instance, the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) of the African Union is an inclusive process focused on topics of governance, transparency, and economic management of the participating countries. The APRM Secretariat provides distinguished experts to ensure adherence to certain agreed standards. It is supported by UNDP, the EU, and other international organisations. South-South collaboration is increasing in Benin, South Africa and Uganda. Their mutual learning in the area of evaluation is supported by the UK. However, in these cases, partners and donors are not working together on any collaborative evaluation undertakings.

The case of the Regional Centres for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR) initiative, with centres in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, was identified as a partnership with great potential to facilitate productive links between donors, partner governments and CSOs. The exchanges between these CLEAR centres are also examples of South-South partnerships. Again, this is not CPDE, as donors are funding CLEAR but are not involved in any joint evaluation undertaking.

The EvalPartners initiative is helping to link Voluntary Organisations for Professional Evaluation (VOPEs) from around the world, and to strengthen CSO links with parliamentarians. It is also supporting
Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD) directly (for example, through peer-to-peer collaboration projects) and indirectly (through the collaborative development of the 2016-2020 evaluation agenda). With regard to VOPEs, it was indicated during the Manila Workshop that they could play a very useful networking role, but that they don’t have the institutional and human resources required to be partners in joint evaluation works. The increasingly important role of foundations in development was also cited in Manila. Some of them have made significant contributions to ECD. The work of the African Capacity Building Foundation is an example.

8.2.3 Costs and benefits of partnerships

Partnerships involve both costs and expectations, and are aimed at generating sufficient benefits to parties engaged. In terms of costs and risks, the following items can be considered:

- Cost and time of a mixed management process (meetings, translations, and other logistic needs) – these costs can be lower if there are pre-established co-ordination arrangements.
- Cost of matching the administrative constraints of various partners – can be higher if multiple donors are involved in the partnership.
- Conflicts between the need to satisfy information needs of line ministries as well as donors’ needs and the willingness to do a state-of-art evaluation – can be greater if the evaluation champion is involved in the partnership.
- Diluted priorities if various partners define their information needs – can be greater if multiple donors are involved in the partnership.
- Risk of disagreement on evaluation conclusions – as happened in the case of the partnership between Philippines and Japan;
- Risk of disruption of the evaluation process in the case of staff change or internal restructuring – this risk exists in every evaluation, but it is increased in case of partnership if a clear description of roles and responsibilities is not defined.

In terms of benefits, parties engaged in partnerships may expect several types, such as:

- Mutual accountability – higher if the evaluation matches the needs of all parties involved.
- Better evaluation results – if they are in line with country and donor priorities.
- Strengthening the evaluation champion as far as it remains in the partnership.
- Learning by doing – higher if the evaluation champion is involved in the partnership.
- Reduced evaluation pressure on the partner country administration – if several donors are involved, and if they reduce their own evaluation activities in parallel.

8.3 Emerging trends and drivers shaping partnerships

8.3.1 Drivers towards collaborative evaluations

The results and mutual learning agenda includes a general commitment to use partner country systems. In principle, donors should be keen to engage in evaluation partnerships to show that they fulfill their commitments. This might lead donors to initiate collaborations on a bilateral or multilateral basis (one partner country and several donors).

The trend towards budget support is a major driver of collaborative evaluation because one-sided evaluations are meaningless within this framework. At some point in the future, this may lead to the inclusion of collaborative evaluations in an evaluation work plan associated with the budget support programme (one partner country and several donors).

There are an increasing number of international arenas in which evaluation professionals from countries meet across donor and partner spheres, and could gather into coalitions supporting collaborative work and facilitating large partnerships involving several donors.

At regional level – such as in Africa (e.g. the Economic Community of Central African States – ECCAS, or the Economic Community of West African States – ECOWAS), there is the prospect of collaborations involving one or more donors and multiple partners, who could benefit from lessons pertaining to their needs and South-South benchmarking opportunities. However, the co-ordination cost might be large, as such collaborations would involve many partners.

8.3.2 Challenges for collaborative evaluations

The interest in collaborative evaluations might be weakened by the idea that capacity development is ultimately aimed at enabling partner countries to do country-led evaluations, to establish an evaluation policy, and to place priority on evaluating their own policies, rather than engaging in collaborative works.
Donors’ willingness to enter into balanced partnerships might be limited, as they tend to use evaluation for the purpose of being accountable to their own constituencies. Their evaluation demand is time-related and relevant to their own accountability needs. Most of the key functions remain in their hands in order to meet their own credibility needs, and they apply their methodological guidelines, which tend to be accountability-oriented.

Moreover, collaborative evaluations would not be fostered if the experience of partnerships is cumbersome, a clear sharing of roles is not set in advance, or if ownership and follow-up are disappointing.

### 8.4 Factors shaping partnership configurations

Factors that could shape partnerships vary from one configuration to another, and affect participants from the partner country, the donor, or both. On the partner country side, major influencing factors are the evaluation capacity in the relevant institutions, the existence and strength of an evaluation champion, and the existence of a national evaluation policy.

On the donor side, various factors can be cited, such as the degree of autonomy/responsibility of the donor mission in the country, its evaluation capacity, the existence of donor co-ordination arrangements in the country, and the donor commitment to developing evaluation capacity.

On both partner and donor sides, it is important to consider several factors that might affect partnership configurations, such as the existence (if any) of budget support programme(s) involving multiple donors, the personal contacts between donor missions and the evaluation champion, the connection between aid co-ordination framework and country evaluation policy, and even the trust or mistrust in each other’s integrity.

### 8.5 Possible pathways for setting up efficient partnerships in the case of CPDEs

Based on the insights of the previous sections, it might be difficult to identify a set of general rules for setting up efficient partnerships in the case of CPDEs. However, a few scenarios can be developed after the Synthesis Workshop in Manila in order to figure out which configurations would be efficient in which contexts. In this Paper, the context of a partner-donor evaluation is characterised by the evaluation capacity of the partner country, and by the opportunities for partner-donor collaborations. Four scenarios are presented:

- No capacity and no opportunities;
- No capacity, but some opportunities;
- Some capacity and some opportunities;
- Strong capacity and limited opportunities.

#### 8.5.1 No capacity and no opportunities

This first scenario can occur where there is a weak evaluation champion or none at all, no or ineffective evaluation policy, or heavy dependence on development aid, as well as limited capacity-building efforts – especially at country level.

In this case, an efficient way of partnering could be to establish a multi-annual collaborative work plan involving a donor and the (potential) evaluation champion. Successive evaluations would be undertaken in this framework, with an increasingly balanced collaboration profile. Evaluation capacity development activities would run in parallel.

This approach has been successfully applied in the case of the Vietnam-Japan collaboration. The cost of that partnership was limited because collaboration arrangements were established at the outset, and remained unchanged. The benefits were substantial, in terms of the partner country acquiring hands-on evaluation experience, and the country evaluation champion being strengthened.

#### 8.5.2 No capacity, but some opportunities

Evaluation capacity is still limited in this second scenario. The evaluation champion is absent or weak, and there is no effective evaluation policy. However, there is at least one multiple donor budget support programme that can serve as an opportunity for a collaborative evaluation, and there are capacity development efforts in several areas.

In such a context, the issue of collaborative evaluation could be included in the policy dialogue related to the budget support programme, in order to check whether preconditions are met (time for mutual accountability, willingness of relevant institutions on both sides). Then a MoU would be signed between
the (potential) evaluation champion and the relevant donors. The evaluation would be carried out with the purpose of mutual accountability and learning by doing.

This approach has been partly applied in the collaboration between Mozambique and EU. The cost of that partnership was limited because the EU and its Member States had their own pre-established co-ordination arrangements. Unfortunately, no attention was paid to balancing partner and donor accountability needs, and the evaluation was not used for developing capacity. Otherwise, the benefits of the partnership might have been substantial on both sides.

8.5.3 Some capacity and some opportunities

This scenario can arise where the following conditions are met: dynamic evaluation champion; effective evaluation policy well connected with development co-operation; medium dependence on development aid; at least one multiple donor budget support programme; and capacity development efforts in several areas.

In such a context, an efficient partnership could be set up as follows:

- Opening a window for CPDEs in the country evaluation policy;
- Discussing the issue of CPDEs in aid co-ordination meetings;
- Including some collaborations in the evaluation work plan of donors and partner country institutions;
- Setting an ad hoc partnership for each evaluation involving the relevant country institutions and the evaluation champion;
- Carrying out collaborative evaluations with an explicit objective of learning by doing;
- Connecting collaborative evaluations with capacity development efforts.

At the Synthesis Workshop in Manila, this approach was considered by Benin and Uganda, among others. If collaborative evaluations are planned in advance on both sides (country and donors), this might reduce co-ordination costs slightly. Benefits might be worth the costs if collaborations bring new national institutions into learn-by-doing evaluation, and thus develop their evaluation culture.

8.5.4 Strong capacity and limited opportunities

A fourth scenario is characterised by a well-developed capacity in the partner country, but limited collaboration opportunities. There would be a dynamic evaluation champion in place, and an effective evaluation policy. However, due to a limited dependence on development aid, the evaluation system would focus on a partner country's own policies. It would have no – or only loose – connections with donor co-operation, and limited prospects for collaborative evaluations.

In such a context, an efficient partnership could be set up as follows:

- Creating an informal evaluation coalition with donors and the evaluation champion;
- Exploring the potential for CPDEs within that coalition;
- Launching some CPDEs on a case-by-case basis;
- Setting up an ad hoc partnership for each evaluation, involving the relevant donor and country institutions and the evaluation champion;
- Carrying out collaborative evaluations with an objective of mutual learning.

At the Synthesis Workshop in Manila, Colombia described a context similar to that scenario, and considered that the establishment of a partnership was difficult. If feasible and successful, the above scenario would result in launching a few bilateral partnerships. However, co-ordination arrangements would have to be made at their full cost, and there would be little or no benefits in terms of learning by doing. Such a partnership would be efficient only if there is a strong potential of (and interest in) mutual learning, ownership and follow-up.
9 Setting up a lasting CPDE initiative

9.1 Why a lasting initiative?
The Synthesis Workshop and the Thematic Papers open the door for a lasting CPDE initiative with the following rationale:

- **Problem to be addressed** - In some partner countries at present, and maybe in other countries in the future, the national evaluation system is weak, actors and organizations are not familiar enough with evaluation, country led evaluations are scarce, evaluation champions are fragile, and checks and balances are not sufficient for securing the credibility of evaluation works. In such instances, donor agencies tend to carry out their evaluation aside of the country system, thus depriving actors and stakeholders from learning-by-doing opportunities, something which in turn slows down the progress of evaluation. The problem to be addressed by a lasting CPDE initiative is to break that vicious circle.

- **Time frame** - The initiative will respond to temporary needs since country evaluation systems may reach a reasonably mature stage in a decade or even less if the context is enabling. At a mature stage, country led evaluations become mainstream and donor agencies could even rely on the country systems for their own evaluations.

- **Specific contribution** – Because current ECD efforts are primarily targeting the supply side of evaluations activities, they may not suffice to break the vicious circle which keep country evaluation systems underutilized. CPDEs can make a difference as far as they provide learning-by-doing opportunities. They may also demonstrate the learning benefits of evaluations, not only for donors but also for country system actors.

- **Part of a broader ECD strategy** – Within a lasting initiative CPDEs will be one of the components of a structured ECD strategy. Synergies will unfold and benefit country evaluation systems.

Overall, the Study concludes that there is a clear rationale for a lasting initiative under the condition that it is carefully targeted and integrated in a broad ECD strategy.

9.2 Challenges and building blocks
In the light of the present Study, it appears that any specific collaborative evaluation requires a number of preconditions including: readiness of at least one donor agency, demand from clearly identified interlocutors in the partner country, support from a strong enough coalition of country stakeholders, and last but not least, an arena where donors and partners can match their evaluation projects. A first challenge is to match all preconditions at a time in order to give birth to collaborations. In that respect, the initiative should make room for expression of donors’ interests and partner countries’ demands and offer a lively ‘market place’ where collaborations can be encouraged, brokered, monitored, and capitalized as this was successfully achieved during the present Study and also during the PDE process.

The present Study also found that collaborations cannot apply a one-size-fits-all model. The Study refutes the idea of a standard ‘to-do-list’ that would be applicable to any CPDE but it teaches collaborations. However, a second challenge is to further understand how to optimize CPDEs in order to reap mutual benefits in each specific context.

Having the two above challenges in mind, the coordinators of the Study developed a list of potential actions to be proposed to volunteering donor agencies, to volunteering partner countries, and to both groups jointly. In Table 7 below actions are categorized in short term and medium term ones.
Table 7  Building blocks of a lasting CPDE initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible short term actions</th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>Partner countries</th>
<th>Donors and partner countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include collaborative evaluations in their ECD strategy and entrust their central evaluation function with a responsibility to promote learning-by-doing in partner countries to the greatest possible extent (D1).</td>
<td>Identify an evaluation champion, ensure good connection between that body and aid co-ordination, and entrust that body with a responsibility to promote learning-by-doing through collaboration with donor agencies where possible (C1).</td>
<td>Maintain an informal working group of development assistance evaluation functions from donor agencies and partner countries, on a voluntary basis with an aim to promote collaborations (DC1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize a few partner countries with opportunities for collaborations complementing ECD efforts (D2).</td>
<td>Include collaborative works in the country evaluation policy where such a policy exists (C2).</td>
<td>Convert the above mentioned group into a formal working group under the umbrella of an existing international institution (DC2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be open to use the partner country system instead of (or in addition to) the agency’s own system (for e.g. planning, design, purchasing, steering, using evaluations) (D3).</td>
<td>Identify potential collaborations with one or more donor agencies (C3).</td>
<td>Maintain the on-line repository used by the CPDE Study (DC3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise the issue of collaborative evaluation through the policy dialogue (D4).</td>
<td>Engage in a few collaborations and maximise the learning-by-doing benefits for as many stakeholders as relevant (line ministries, regional authorities, evaluation professionals-VOPE, civil society, parliamentarians, etc.) (C4).</td>
<td>Publish news from collaborative works on a regular basis through relevant other channel(s) (DC4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a few CPDEs in the agency’s work plan and maximise the learning-by-doing benefits of these works (D5).</td>
<td>Strive to arrive at success stories of evaluation use, and disseminate these stories widely in the country (C5).</td>
<td>Convene physical gatherings of working group members at least every two years (DC5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible medium actions</th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>Partner countries</th>
<th>Donors and partner countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitor collaborative evaluations efforts and the learning-by-doing benefits stemming from them in the partner countries (D6).</td>
<td>Monitor the progress of their evaluation system with a focus on actual practice and use of evaluation rather than mere capacity (C6).</td>
<td>Accumulate and disseminate knowledge on the preconditions and mutual benefits of collaborations, for both partner countries and donor agencies (DC8).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on the positive effects and possible negative side effects of donor-led evaluations on the partner country evaluation systems and adjust evaluation policy if relevant (D7).</td>
<td>Reflect on the prospect for country-led evaluations and adjust evaluation policy if relevant (C7).</td>
<td>Explore the transition from donor-led and collaborative evaluations to country-led evaluations (DC9).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.3 Expressions of interest

The progress of this Study revealed a wide enough interest for CPDEs, which is evidenced by the financial contributions of sixteen donor agencies and the finalization of fourteen partner country studies carried out by volunteering institutions (out of the eighteen envisaged ones initially). There were also other expressions of interest from new players willing to join the study process, e.g. Togo, Turkey, and South Korea.

In order to confirm the above expressions of interest, a survey was launched in fall 2015. The questions (see Annex 10.7) addressed the issue of a lasting CPDE initiative and reflected the proposed building blocks of such an initiative as listed in Table 7. The questionnaire was emailed to all members of the Evaluation Network of the OECD–DAC (EvalNet) plus CPDE partner country coordinators (72 institutions in total). The response rate was 50% for donor institutions and 60% for partner countries. The survey results are displayed in Annex 10.8.

Most responding donor institutions (81%) are ready to engage in collaborative evaluations using country systems, but preferably through a few pilot collaborations. Only a small minority of responding donor institutions (12%) would carry out collaborative evaluations on a frequent basis. An interesting point is that a majority of respondents (54%) would consider collaborations if the partner country evaluation system is weak, although in a prudent manner. Most respondents are ready or may be ready to implement the actions proposed in the first column of Table 7, i.e.

- Prioritize a few partner countries with opportunities for collaborations complementing ECD efforts (95%),
- Use the partner country system instead of (or in addition to) the agency’s own system (90%),
• Include a few CPDEs in the agency’s work plan with a learning-by-doing intent (85%),
• Include collaborative evaluations in their ECD strategy (80%),
• Monitor collaborative evaluations efforts and their benefits (85%).

Most responding partner country institutions are ready or may be ready to implement the actions proposed in the second column of Table 7, i.e.
• Identify potential collaborations with one or more donor agencies (100%),
• Include collaborative works in the country evaluation policy where such a policy exists (90%),
• Engage in a few collaborations designed for maximizing the learning-by-doing benefits for as many stakeholders as relevant (100%),
• Monitor the progress of their evaluation system with a focus on actual practice and use of evaluation rather than mere capacity (90%).

Altogether, respondents from donor institutions and partner countries are ready to participate in a lasting CPDE initiative through a working group gathering development assistance evaluation functions from donor agencies and partner countries (87%). A wide share of respondents (69%) would agree to establish that working group in a formal manner within an existing international institution. Respondents prioritize the tasks of the working group as follows:
• Exchange news and lessons and accumulate knowledge (about 60%, mainly donor institutions),
• Promote capacity oriented collaborations (about 50%; mainly partner countries),
• Explore the transition from donor-led and collaborative evaluations to country-led evaluations (about 50%; shared interest).

In the longer term, most respondents consider that the working group should or might become a permanent arena where all evaluation functions from donors and partner countries can exchange views and collaborate.

Only one respondent out of three agrees that the working group members should gather in physical meetings, even if the question mentioned biennial meetings only. More than half of the respondents (56%) said their institution would be or might be ready to provide the working group with some institutional, human and/or financial resources.

Finally, there would be a sufficient number of candidate institutions for joining a management group in charge of steering a lasting CPDE initiative and keeping participants at work. The question mentioned a light structured management group with three meetings a year, mostly online plus email interaction. Positive answers came from five donor institutions and nine partner countries. Thirteen other respondents said they might be candidates.

Overall, the survey confirms the interest and feasibility of a lasting CPDE initiative.

9.4 Designing a lasting CPDE initiative

Who will keep the momentum of a lasting CPDE initiative once this Study comes to an end? The current Management Group includes Finland, France, Uganda, and Vietnam, but Vietnam has opted-out early in the process and France will be stepping-down. It is suggested to renew the Management Group with at least two donor institutions and at least one or two partner countries joining Uganda, on a voluntary basis.

As soon as the renewal of the Management Group is secured, its members would invite all institutions involved in the CPDE Study, plus any interested newcomer institution to be part of an informal Working Group, exchange news and lessons about capacity oriented collaborations, promote such collaborations throughout their respective networks, and match their collaborations prospects. The Management Group would also contribute to organising regional sharing events (e.g. Francophone and Anglophone Africa, Asia, Latin America), building on the opportunity of evaluation events.

In parallel, the Management Group would seek an umbrella under which a more formal CPDE Working Group could be established. OECD-EvalNet might be the logical host of such a group if participants from not OECD countries could be given an observer status. Other options might be also considered, such as UNEG for example who issued in 2013 a resource pack on joint evaluations38, yet UNEG’s membership is restricted to the evaluation offices within the UN system and the majority of participants would need to be given an observer status. However, UNEG is co-chairing the EvalPartners initiative since September 2015, which makes it possible to use EvalPartners as an umbrella for a formal CPDE Working Group besides the Parliamentarian Forum on Development Evaluation also set up under the

38 http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1620
EvalPartners$^{39}$ umbrella. Another option could be to convene as a topical interest group within the International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS) but this needs also a special arrangement since IDEAS is mainly the global platform for individual evaluators.

Still in parallel, the Management Group would liaise with relevant international institutions and networks as to raise capacity oriented CPDEs on their agenda. In particular, the UN resolution on Capacity Building for the Evaluation of Development Activities at the Country Level$^{40}$ calls for the UN system to become more involved in country evaluation capacity. This provides a further opening for advocacy with individual UN organisations (such as UNDP, UNWOMEN, UNICEF, or UNEG at large) as well as multilateral and international organisations to embrace a more collaborative approach to evaluation. Engaging with regional development banks and other initiatives – e.g. CLEAR, IOCE/EvalPartners and others – and advocacy/lobbying to include CPDE on their agendas would be another relevant entry point. Links and synergies between the CPDE initiative and the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC) are very important in this regard, especially as the CPDE initiative is one of the 39 voluntary initiatives annexed to the Mexico Communiqué of the High Level Meeting of GPEDC in Mexico in April 2014.

International bodies committed to evaluation capacity development could provide in-kind support and seek to improve the impact of their current ECD efforts (e.g. CLEAR, IPDET) by bridging the supply of evaluation competencies and the use of these competencies in the partner countries. Similarly, Regional Development Banks and CLEAR regional centers could provide in-kind support in the case of regional events, in particular those which sponsor the CLEAR network (e.g. AfDB, AsDB, and IADB) could closely co-ordinate the building of evaluation competencies and the use of these competencies in the partner countries.

---

$^{39}$ EvalPartners was launched in 2012 by the International Organisation for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE) and UNICEF, in partnership with several major organisations to enhance the capacities of CSOs to influence policy makers, public opinion and other key stakeholders so that public policies are based on evidence, and incorporate considerations of equity and effectiveness. The objective of the Initiative is to enhance the capacities of CSOs to engage in a strategic and meaningful manner in national evaluation processes, contributing to improved country-led evaluation systems and policies that are equity-focused and gender equality responsive.

$^{40}$ UNGA Resolution A/RES/69/237 “Capacity building for the evaluation of development activities at the country level” [http://www.unevaluation.org/mediacenter/newscenter/newsdetail/105](http://www.unevaluation.org/mediacenter/newscenter/newsdetail/105)
## 10 Annexes

### 10.1 CPDE – Content of country studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Study</th>
<th>Evaluation subject</th>
<th>Development assistance type/modality</th>
<th>Intervention domain/sector</th>
<th>Donor(s) as ODA providers</th>
<th>Evaluation period</th>
<th>Evaluation approach</th>
<th>Donor(s) as evaluation leader(s)</th>
<th>Partner country counterpart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the 2010-2012 work program of the Social Change Observatory (OCS)</td>
<td>Country work programme</td>
<td>Social sector</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
<td>Ex-post</td>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>OCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bolivia</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of Netherlands cooperation (Lessons learned of 25 years of bilateral cooperation)</td>
<td>Country assistance programme</td>
<td>Macro/national</td>
<td>Dutch Co-operation (The Netherlands)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Dutch Co-operation (The Netherlands)</td>
<td>Government central and sectoral ministries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multisector Program for Zero Malnutrition (PMDC) Interagency committee for evaluation with joint field mission (national initiative with national resources and cooperation funds).</td>
<td>Multi-sector programme</td>
<td>Malnutrition</td>
<td>Canada, Belgium, Unicef, WFP, IDB?</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Canada, Belgium, Unicef, WFP, IDB</td>
<td>Interagency committee for evaluation. Local councils for food and nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint CIDA evaluation of Multisector Program for Zero Malnutrition (PMDC)-Evaluation of Sectoral approaches questioning the project models, promoting attention to Bolivian institutions of the Bolivian State, with a view of revising State policies.</td>
<td>Multi-sector programme</td>
<td>Malnutrition</td>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>2007-2011</td>
<td>Ex-post</td>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Interagency committee for evaluation. Local councils for food and nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Study</td>
<td>Evaluation subject</td>
<td>Development assistance type/modality</td>
<td>Intervention domain/sector</td>
<td>Donor(s) as ODA providers</td>
<td>Evaluation period</td>
<td>Evaluation approach</td>
<td>Donor(s) as evaluation leader(s)</td>
<td>Partner country counterpart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cameroon</strong></td>
<td>Japan Primary School Construction Program (1997-2014)</td>
<td>Sector programme</td>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>Japan Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>1997-2014</td>
<td>Ex-post</td>
<td>Japan Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Ministry of Basic Education (MINUB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colombia</strong></td>
<td>M&amp;E decision making process between the Spanish Agency for international cooperation and development and the Presidential Agency for International Cooperation (APC)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Macro/national</td>
<td>Spanish Agency for International Cooperation</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Spanish Agency for International Cooperation</td>
<td>Presidential Agency for International Cooperation (APC), Ministry of Foreign Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint work with USAID and APC: post conflict for a sustainable and inclusive peace</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Post conflict for a sustainable and inclusive peace</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International cooperation coordination mechanism devoted to the comprehensive assistance and reparation to victims</td>
<td>Sector programme</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Management</td>
<td>International NGOs</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>International NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cook Islands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Study</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation subject</strong></td>
<td><strong>Development assistance type/modality</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intervention domain/sector</strong></td>
<td><strong>Donor(s) as ODA providers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation period</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation approach</strong></td>
<td><strong>Donor(s) as evaluation leader(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Partner country counterpart</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghana</strong></td>
<td>Ghana (NDPC)-Denmark Joint Development Co-operation under Denmark funding resources and covering the totality of the development co-operation 1990-2006.</td>
<td>Country assistance programme</td>
<td>Macro/national</td>
<td>DANIDA</td>
<td>1990-2006</td>
<td>Ex-post</td>
<td>DANIDA</td>
<td>National Development Planning Commission (NDPC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malawi</strong></td>
<td>Joint AfDB Mali project evaluation of the rural plains (PADR-PDHK)</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Rural development</td>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Ex-post</td>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The joint evaluation of budgetary support operations in Mali from 2003 to 2009</td>
<td>Budget Support</td>
<td>Macro/Multisectors</td>
<td>European Commission with Canada and Belgium</td>
<td>2003-2009</td>
<td>Ex-post</td>
<td>European Commission with Canada and Belgium</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mozambique</strong></td>
<td>General Budget Support Evaluation conducted through consultative process</td>
<td>Budget Support</td>
<td>Macro/Multisectors</td>
<td>European Commission and evaluation offices of Ireland, Germany, Belgium, Italy, Finland, the Netherlands and France</td>
<td>2004-2012</td>
<td>Ex-post</td>
<td>European Commission and evaluation offices of Ireland, Germany, Belgium, Italy, Finland, the Netherlands and France</td>
<td>External Aid Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepal</strong></td>
<td>Joint ex post evaluation of selected projects by the GPH (NEDA) and GOJ-JICA41</td>
<td>Projects (various)</td>
<td>Agriculture and infrastructure</td>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>2006-2012</td>
<td>Ex-post</td>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>NEDA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Study</th>
<th>Evaluation subject</th>
<th>Development assistance type/modality</th>
<th>Intervention domain/sector</th>
<th>Donor(s) as ODA providers</th>
<th>Evaluation period</th>
<th>Evaluation approach</th>
<th>Donor(s) as evaluation leader(s)</th>
<th>Partner country counterpart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Joint supervision missions GPH-IFAD carried out 6 months after completion and focused on sustainability of projects results</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Agriculture and Rural development</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>NEDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Tropical Cyclone Evan-Samoa Australian DFAT collaborative evaluation work for health and education</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Management</td>
<td>DFAT-Australian Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>DFAT-Australian Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance, Policy and Planning unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Joint Annual Review of economic and social policies (of 2 PRSPs, PRGS, …). Joint and participatory evaluations, involving all sectors, using results oriented approach, focused on HIPC resources and budget utilisation control mechanisms. Monitoring of public policies articulated towards reduction of extreme poverty and sustainable human development.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Macro/national</td>
<td>UNDP, UNICEF, GIZ, EC, WB</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>UNDP, UNICEF, GIZ, EC, WB</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning and Economic Development and Sector ministries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri-Lanka</td>
<td>Joint Annual Sector Review of the Millennium Water Supply and Sanitation Program (PEPAM)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Water and Sanitation</td>
<td>AFDB (35%) and other bilateral donors</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>AFDB (35%) and other bilateral donors</td>
<td>Ministry of Water and Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri-Lanka</td>
<td>Joint GEF – Sri Lanka Country Portfolio Evaluation</td>
<td>Country assistance programme</td>
<td>Macro/national</td>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management Project, Metro Manila Strategic Mass Rail Transit Development Project (Line 2), Lower Agusan Development Project, Rural Road Network Development Project Phase II, Cordillera Road Improvement Project, Metro Manila Flood Control Project – West of Mangahan Floodway, Batangas Port Development Project II, Pampanga Delta Development Project (Irrigation Component).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Study</th>
<th>Evaluation subject</th>
<th>Development assistance type/modalities</th>
<th>Intervention domain/sector</th>
<th>Donor(s) as ODA providers</th>
<th>Evaluation period</th>
<th>Evaluation approach</th>
<th>Donor(s) as evaluation leader(s)</th>
<th>Partner country counterpart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>covered in a lighter manner)</td>
<td>Country assistance programme</td>
<td>Macro/national</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP Country Portfolio Evaluation (Assessment of Development Results)</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Management</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP supported Landslide Hazard Mapping Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA funded Baseline Road Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Water and Sanitation</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID funded Biodiversity and Watershed Management Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Country assistance programme</td>
<td>Macro/national</td>
<td>UNFAO</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>UNFAO</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFAO Country Portfolio Evaluation</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Indian Government</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Indian Government</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the Indian Government Supported Development Projects</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>KOICA</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>KOICA</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOICA Funded Valachchenai Strom Water Drainage Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Water and Sanitation</td>
<td>KOICA</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>KOICA</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Independent evaluation of Uganda’s poverty eradication plan (PEAP)</td>
<td>Country Development Strategy</td>
<td>Macro/National</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>The Netherlands, UNDP, UK (DFID)</td>
<td>National Evaluation Committee (Office of the Prime Minister)</td>
<td>National Evaluation Committee (Office of the Prime Minister)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Joint mid-term review of the Northern Uganda Malaria, aids and tuberculosis (Numat program)</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Malaria, aids and tuberculosis</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>2006-2008</td>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Local government representatives and key social partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Study</td>
<td>Evaluation subject</td>
<td>Development assistance type/modality</td>
<td>Intervention domain/sector</td>
<td>Donor(s) as ODA providers</td>
<td>Evaluation period</td>
<td>Evaluation approach</td>
<td>Donor(s) as evaluation leader(s)</td>
<td>Partner country counterpart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japan’s ODA to the health sector-Partner-led Evaluation</td>
<td>Sector assistance programme</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Japan- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA)</td>
<td>2000-2010</td>
<td>Ex-post</td>
<td>Japan- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA)</td>
<td>Vietnam-Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation capacity building to the Government Officials- Vietnam Australia Monitoring and Evaluation Support (VAMES)</td>
<td>TA project?</td>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning &amp; Investment (MPI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>The Child Grant Program under the Social Cash Transfer (SCT) program</td>
<td>Cash transfer programme</td>
<td>Social sector</td>
<td>UNICEF, DFID, Irish Aid</td>
<td>2010 - ongoing</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>UNICEF, DFID, Irish Aid</td>
<td>Ministry of Community Development, Mother and Child Health (MCDMCH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.2 CPDE – Process of country studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Study</th>
<th>CPDE project management</th>
<th>Country co-ordinator</th>
<th>Donor support at country level</th>
<th>Steering Committee/Reference Group</th>
<th>Launching WS</th>
<th>Validation WS</th>
<th>Country author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ord.</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Hopwood</td>
<td>Jim Rugh</td>
<td>Aristide N. Djidjoho</td>
<td>Director General of Evaluation</td>
<td>Ministry Of Evaluation of Public Policies</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David G. Houinsa, Justine A. Odjoube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Ziad Moussa/ Pablo Rodriguez Bilella</td>
<td>Pablo Rodriguez Bilella</td>
<td>Jorge Antonio Brito Pozo</td>
<td>Jefe de Unidad de Negociación del Financiamiento</td>
<td>Ministerio de Planificación del Desarrollo</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Viceministerio de Inversión Pública y Financiamiento Externo - Ministerio de Planificación del Desarrollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Ian Hopwood</td>
<td>Jim Rugh</td>
<td>Takouo Dieudonné</td>
<td>Director of North-South Co-operation and Multilateral Organisations and Co-ordinator of the National Development Effectiveness Task Force of Cameroon</td>
<td>Ministry of Economy, Planning and regional Development</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fotso Dopna Simeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Ziad Moussa/ Pablo Rodriguez Bilella</td>
<td>Pablo Rodriguez Bilella</td>
<td>Mónica Varona</td>
<td>Directora de Gestión de Demanda de Cooperación</td>
<td>APC-Colombia</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philipp Schonrock, Juana Garcia, Juan Carlos Lozano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>Ziad Moussa</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Study</td>
<td>CPDE project management</td>
<td>Country co-ordinator</td>
<td>Donor support at country level</td>
<td>Steering Committee/Reference Group</td>
<td>Lauching WS</td>
<td>Validation WS</td>
<td>Country author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Ian Hopwood</td>
<td>Nana Opare-Djan</td>
<td>National Development Planning Commission</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Stephen Ampem-Darko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Ian Hopwood</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Ziad Moussa</td>
<td>Dembéle Mamadou</td>
<td>Ministère de l’Economie et des Finances</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Raphaël Diarra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Ziad Moussa</td>
<td>Hanifa Ibrahim</td>
<td>Ministry of Economy and Finance</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Ziad Moussa</td>
<td>Madhu Marashini</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>AsDB</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Ziad Moussa</td>
<td>Pablo Rodriguez Bilella</td>
<td>National Economic and Development Authority</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Roderick M. Planta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Ziad Moussa</td>
<td>Noumea Simi</td>
<td>Aid Co-ordination-Debt Management Division Ministry Finance</td>
<td>Australia?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Karen Medica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Study</td>
<td>CPDE project management</td>
<td>Country co-ordinator</td>
<td>Donor support at country level</td>
<td>Steering Committee/Reference Group</td>
<td>Launching WS</td>
<td>Validation WS</td>
<td>Country author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Ian Hopwood</td>
<td>Jim Rugh</td>
<td>Mayacine Camara Oumar Bassirou Diop</td>
<td>Coordinator de l’Unité de Co-ordination et de Suivi de la Politique Economique et Sociale (UCSPE)</td>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri-Lanka</td>
<td>Ziad Moussa</td>
<td>Pablo Rodriguez Bilella</td>
<td>Velayuthan Sivagnanasothy</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Ministry of Plantation Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Ian Hopwood</td>
<td>Jim Rugh</td>
<td>Timothy Lubanga</td>
<td>Assistant Commissioner for Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>Office of the Prime Minister</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Ziad Moussa</td>
<td>Pablo Rodriguez Bilella</td>
<td>Cao Manh Cuong</td>
<td>Vice Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Department,</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning and Investment</td>
<td>CPDE project</td>
<td>Cao Manh Cuong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Ian Hopwood</td>
<td>Jim Rugh</td>
<td>Pamela Nakamba-Kabaso</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Zambia Institute for Policy Analysis and Research</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study on Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation
Final Study Report
### 10.3 CPDE – Analytical compilation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPDE components</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Country studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CPDE process and partner-donor profile (Capacity-friendly features) | Relevance of CPDE objectives and alignment to recipient country needs and priorities | **Benin GPRS Case Study**<br> Evaluations focused on lessons learned and mutual accountability in country priority sectors.  
**Bolivia: Evaluation of the Netherlands Co-operation**<br> The Netherlands evaluation failed to cover impact evaluation and to analyze the changes of living conditions (with-without projects) even with client satisfaction survey.  
**Mali Case Study**<br> The evaluation was part of donor country systematic review of partnership. |
| High country ownership with strong involvement of Country Government organisations |  | **Benin GPRS Case Study**<br> The actors involved in the GPRS were actively involved and took responsibility in co-ordinating and managing the evaluation. Key positions in the evaluation team were taken by nationals and the national counterpart participated on the quality assurance of the evaluation (review of the ToR, intermediary and final reports validation).  
**Bolivia: PMD Evaluation Case Study**<br> High ownership with central level of technical committee of the national council for food and nutrition, Ministry of health and ad-hoc trained team. Strong appropriation of the programme by local players.  
**Colombia: Evaluation of the Spanish Co-operation Case Study**<br> The shared assessment was through the entire evaluation process including the decision-making putting into practice high level of co-ordination and consultation. 3 committees in place: Joint Monitoring Committee, High level committee, Technical meetings (at sectorial level) which served for the preparation of the Joint Commission between Spain and Colombia for bilateral co-operation.  
**Ghana: Joint Ghana-Denmark Evaluation**<br> Approach paper developed by Eval and MOU signed by the 2 actors, laying out responsibilities of partners. Joint evaluation management group established. Staff and administrative support provided by NDPC under limited budgetary resources. 2 reference groups established in Ghana and Denmark comprising evaluation experts from both countries with interactions with several stakeholders through face to face, videoconference and mails from inception to synthesis reports. Validation workshops and dissemination of final reports. Focus group interviews and perception study were conducted with several informants and stakeholders representatives at grass root level.  
Involving the relevant country organisations on the demand side increased the usefulness of the CPDE as well as the active involvement of the NDPC representing the government.  
Dissemination of evaluation reports using country channels is important.  
**Mozambique Case Study**<br> Opportunity to build local ownership was achieved by involving high officials from the MPD in the whole evaluation process including quality assurance and dissemination as the need and purpose was defined at an early stage of the exercise. A core group of long term technicians of the MPD were involved in the process and played integral role in the management structure, quality assurance and dissemination. |
| Relevance of Timing and alignment to country recipient planning and budget cycle including |  | **Benin GPRS Evaluation**<br> Timing was mostly convenient to donors.  
**The Philippines NEDA-JICA ex post evaluation**<br> Timely conduct of the evaluation raised the need to establish an evaluation system.  
**Senegal Joint Annual Review of economic and social policies** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPDE components</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Country studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>allocation of resources</td>
<td>Joint and participatory evaluations, involving all sectors, using results oriented approach, focused on HIPC resources and budget utilisation control mechanisms. Linked to monitoring of public policies, and articulated towards reduction of extreme poverty and sustainable human development. Exercise articulated around the budget cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of relevant Country national organisations including CSOs, private sector and beneficiary communities</td>
<td>Benin GPRS Evaluation Ministries, CSO, private sector participated in the evaluation. Bolivia: Evaluation of The Netherlands Co-operation General controller of the State did not carry out a review of counterpart funding. Colombia: Evaluation of the Spanish Co-operation Case Study The shared assessment was through the entire evaluation process including the decision-making putting into practice high level of co-ordination and consultation. 3 committees in place: Joint Monitoring Committee, High level committee, Technical meetings (at sectorial level) which served for the preparation of the Joint Commission between Spain and Colombia for bilateral co-operation. Colombia: Joint Evaluation USAIF-APC (Case Study2) Project M&amp;E systems and impact assessments in place in every project and made part of project budgets. The Philippines Joint GPH JICA ex post Evaluation Protection from biases and adoption of independent features facilitated NEDA-MES involvement. NEDA co-ordinated and managed the ex post evaluation and cleared the outputs before presentation to stakeholders. Senegal Joint Annual Sector Review of the Millennium Water Supply and Sanitation Programme (PEPAM): National leadership from Ministry of Water and Sanitation initiated the evaluation with the help of involved donors. Evaluation modalities and process described in signed funding MOUs. The programme co-ordination Unit was in charge of evaluation co-ordination under the national steering committee and the technical committee in charge of the programme implementation monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of country systems and national human and financial resources (M&amp;E systems, procurement and payment systems)</td>
<td>Benin GPRS Evaluation Limited use of public finance resources or payment systems. Bolivia: Evaluation of the Netherlands Co-operation Exercises useful as it helped to improve projects and programmes supported. Use of national experts. Ghana: Joint Evaluation Ghana Denmark DAC evaluation standards used. Danish procurement system. National and international consultants used. Mali Case Study Joint process and decision making on the timing, ToR formulation, recruitment of consultant, follow up and report validation. National Financial and procurement and environmental safeguard systems used with consultation of other donors such as the WB, EU, FAO. National M&amp;E procedures applied and used and recommendations implemented notably with regard the environmental protection safeguards. Mozambique GBS Evaluation GBS Evaluation conducted through consultative process. GoM took active part in the design and management of the evaluation by commenting on the evaluation ToR, managing the group structure and in dissemination of evaluation results. The Philippines Joint NEDA JICA ex post evaluation Different management structure put in place when different ratings by external consultants. ToR jointly prepared by NEDA and JICA which used its own procurement procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPDE components</strong></td>
<td><strong>Features</strong></td>
<td><strong>Country studies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint international and local consultants were used. JICA evaluation methods used. External evaluation report prepared with input from NEDA and provision of data from implementing agencies and other stakeholders. NEDA requested to provide a separate report and presented its own rating of projects. Evaluation Feedback seminars conducted. Findings included in the Annual ODA Portfolio review submitted to Congress and used as inputs to ex ante reports by sector staffs at NEDA. <strong>Samoa Australian Collaborative Evaluation</strong> Improved mechanisms for mitigating negative media statements arising from inaccurate reporting and ineffective communication strategies during emergency phase. Development of templates and learning processes for recovery documentation at WG. Country systems development through learning-by-doing mechanisms. ECD workshops and one to one assistance at sector level to support ownership. WB facility for disaster risk reduction (GFDRR) helped GoS in having a co-ordinated approach to M&amp;E and improved consolidated reporting. <strong>Senegal UNDP Evaluation of MDGs</strong> UNDP and Ministry of planning with involvement of other TFPs agreed on the period to be covered, the scope of the evaluation (achievement of MDGs and way forward), new mechanisms for co-operation: National Steering Committee under the Ministry of Finance leadership composed by parliamentarians, CSO representatives, academia, youth and gender, private sector, donors…). Ministry of planning leveraged financial resources with logistical support (define evaluation methodology, access to information, conduct of survey, questionnaires, drafting TORs) to the evaluation team composed of 3 international experts and 5 regional consultants, and facilitated communication among actors. <strong>Senegal Joint Annual Review of economic and social policies</strong> Technical steering committee in charge of the roadmap, TOR, consultation and validation (technical, policy level) meetings with national actors, logistical support from local consultants in selected stages of the evaluation process. Financial and technical resources used from donors with counterpart funding. Full participation of national consultants. <strong>Senegal Joint Annual Review of the Water and Sanitation Programme (PEPAM)</strong> The coordination unit drafted the TOR and applied country procurement rules with steering committee’s approval. Reports validated with international experts backstopping the national committees. <strong>Uganda: Independent evaluation of Uganda’s poverty eradication plan (PEAP)</strong> The GoU developed the TOR. Evaluation led by international consulting company in conjunction with the office of the Prime Minister and under the guidance of the National Evaluation Committee (which provided support, participation and feedback). Evaluation covered PEAP implementation and results performance, institutional arrangements, partnership, economic transformation and sustainable poverty reduction. Internal quality control provided by internal peer review process and reference group composed by national and development partners. GoU financial and technical resources used. Evaluation team composed by Uganda National Evaluation Committee and international consultants with support of reference group from Uganda academia, and donor representatives. Evaluation conducted in compliance with OECD DAC standards. Series of workshops organised to share results with GoU, local governments representatives, CSOs, politicians. <strong>Uganda: Joint mid-term review of the Northern Uganda Malaria, aids and tuberculosis (Numat programme)</strong> The exercise was funded through a co-operative agreement with USAID. Collaborative evaluation work by USAID and GoU represented by local government representatives and key social partners. A MTR exercise was conducted to track changes. USAID responsible for total quality assurance and funding while GoU provided key information and feedback. USAID developed TOR,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPDE components</strong></td>
<td><strong>Features</strong></td>
<td><strong>Country studies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>methodology and applied procurement procedures. Team of international and national consultants and research assistants constituted by the National Evaluation Committee. Reports reviewed by USAID and GoU. Final report posted on USAID website. Uganda Ex post evaluation of USAID assistance to Northern Uganda: 2006-2011 - GoU represented by the National Evaluation Committee with contribution from Uganda academia. Joint team from USAID, and GoU with support from NEP. USAID developed TOR, methodology and applied procurement procedures. Vietnam Joint Evaluation with JICA 2007-2010 (transport sector in Red River Delta area with 13 ODA loan projects, 2 grants and TCA and 8 development studies)</td>
<td>The objective was to create an harmonised evaluation mechanism with use of Vietnam evaluation manual and reference to international standards. 3 national working groups and Japan working groups conducted the evaluation under Japan guidance and evaluation advisors from Ministry of transport. Vietnamese team involved in evaluation planning, design, data collection, field work, data processing and drafting reports while leading the whole process staring JPY2009 and leading/managing in 2010 with transfer of evaluation management tasks to Vietnamese team. During this period, national consultants and evaluation advisors were assigned. JICA provided the fund for the Dai Ninh hydropower joint project evaluation. Expanded MOU signed confirming Vietnamese team responsibility in conducting the evaluation with guidance from Japanese team. Use of country evaluation system and Japanese approaches to evaluation. Vietnam: Evaluation of Japan’s ODA on health sector (partner led evaluation) - JICA 2013 5 projects included in 2 area components for evaluation: improvement of health and medical services. TOR developed by JICA after consultation with MOH. Use of JICA approach of evaluation and concentration on main areas of policy and process. Vietnam Australia M&amp;E support (VAMES) initiative-Evaluation capacity building (Learning by doing). MPI selected the projects to be evaluated and established a working group Zambia: Child Grant Programme under social cash transfer. Department of social welfare in MCDMCH owned evaluation since inception and active role in management, data collection, and ensuring good timing of the evaluation and cultural appropriateness. Use of procurement and funding procedures under DFID and Irish Aid funding and UNICEF support. Use of international consultants. Evaluation aligned with government policy and strategic sector goals. Use of participatory methods to engage with communities designated by community welfare assistance committees (CWACs). Alignment of donor assistance to national development social protection policy. Social cash transfer programme manager, director of social welfare and director of planning engaged in managing the evaluation and worked with TA funded experts. Use of local consulting firms in data collection, and data processing. Quality assurance process ensured by national authorities in applying RCT. Robust communication strategy for sharing evaluation results with stakeholders including parliamentarians, civil society, media and policymakers. Preparation of policy briefs by MCDMCH and dissemination through social protection sector advisory group, workshops. As a result, the programme was scaled up and more involvement of GRZ in providing more budget resources to the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended and actual learning at the level of country individual actors,</td>
<td>Capacity strengthening of individuals, organisations through learning-by-doing approach (workshops, lessons)</td>
<td>Benin GPRS Case Study Evaluations were conducted in due respect of the national M&amp;E system however the national evaluation networks did not take part. No follow up to evaluation results was planned nor an action plan to implement the evaluation recommendations Bolivia: Evaluation of the Netherlands Co-operation The financing document framework set harmonised guidelines for accountability, reporting, financial audit and joint evaluations. Cameroon Primary School Construction Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPDE components</strong></td>
<td><strong>Features</strong></td>
<td><strong>Country studies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| organisations, and networks | sharing sessions including dissemination of evaluation results) | The involvement of local consultants and government officials in drafting the evaluation report helped in strengthening their capacities and in mastering the evaluation standards  
Cameroon Joint Evaluation of Education and Vocational Training System  
Education Inspectors and Supervisors benefitted from the evaluation.  
Ghana: Evaluation of Rural Finance Systems  
Use of learning-by-doing process with involvement of academia, CSOs, NGOs, private sector.  
Mali Country Case Study  
Learning how to conduct jointly the evaluation exercise with use of national systems and harmonisation with other donors intervening in the region.  
Mozambique Case Study  
External Aid Unit gained experience from the PDE mandate but lacked broader sector and political involvement (in particular sensitive corruption issues around the aid instrument). A strong basis for sustainability and capacity development created by involving a consortium of consultants which included national consultants based in the country.  
The GoM established the management group with interested donors and reference group with GoM officials and CSO members.  
Stakeholder feedback was organised within the OECD DAC framework. Rapid processes with GoM consultations were put in place.  
Hiring consulting services jointly managed by donors and GoM particularly in the selection process.  
The Philippines NEDA JICA ex post evaluations  
MOU formed the basis for the joint evaluation scheme with the objective to transferring the evaluation techniques and methods from JICA to NEDA with clear delineation of responsibilities.  
Annual implementation programme helped to undertake side activities such as seminars and workshops and paved the way for annual reviews. More responsibilities devoted to NEDA-MES such as designing questionnaires, site visits, focus group discussing, interviews and report write up. NEDA-MES provided lecturing through class trainings. Option to prepare separate reports by NEDA was allowed.  
Individual learning:  
Technical NEDA staff gained understanding on JICA ex post evaluation systems through M&E capacity development seminars and learning-by-doing activities such as focus group discussions, preparation of survey questionnaires and assigning ratings  
NEDA technical staff participated in field visits and gained experience in project and programme implementation.  
Organisational learning:  
Deeper understanding of evaluation concepts and processes with increased awareness for an owned country systems to evaluation,.  
NEDA reviewed the ex post evaluation Manual for more robust rating system at completion.  
NEDA formulated an Action plan for enhanced national evaluation capacity at exit of the joint evaluation exercise (2008).  
Network learning:  
JICA shared lessons learned at the 1st Philippine M&E Network with apparent need to improve the design and similar projects in the future.  
The Philippines: Joint IFAD-GPH Supervision mission  
Shared developed evaluation methodology for data collection, discussion of draft evaluation results, report drafting and finalisation, dissemination of results, and utilisation follow up. Results incorporated in annual review of ODA review report and submission to PH congress. External quality assurance reviewer. NEDA played strategic role in leading focus group discussions and conduct of the evaluation including write up of sections on evaluation report and discussion with country stakeholders. |

**The Philippines: Joint IFAD-GPH Supervision mission**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPDE components</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Country studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOU signed and defined implementation arrangements and responsibilities with clear provision of IFAD and counterpart funding for travel, field mission and logistical arrangements. MOU described also the supervision process, contractual relationships, procurement, TOR drafting and approval, and composition of evaluation team. NEDA represented by 2 M&amp;E officers with specific assigned M&amp;E tasks such as institutional development, knowledge management, gender and poverty. Individual learning: NEDA gained more knowledge and capacity through learning by doing/hands-on experience. Organisational learning: Exposure to various methodologies which enhanced the quality of the ex post evaluation manual. Network learning: Expanding the capacity through knowledge sharing with other stakeholders, control and oversight agencies and with wider audience, scope and capacity through M&amp;E network forum. <strong>Samoa Australian DFAT Collaborative Evaluation</strong> Direct assistance to develop reporting frameworks and enhance capacity for M&amp;E Evaluation method and process guided by actual TCE recovery M&amp;E. Relevant actors (recovery sectors, government ministries and co-ordinating development partners participated in the study. Every 6-month meetings to complete progress report against a related sector plan and how each sector plan meet the 9 recovery principles. 2-monthly sector co-ordination meetings led by the policy and planning section of the MoF. Ongoing dialogue for joint composition of evaluation team and joint management group with plans in line to the 3-year recovery plans and GoS mission plans. <strong>Senegal UNDP Evaluation of MDGs</strong> CSO representatives were supported by donors. Evaluation results discussed in national &amp; regional consultation meetings quality assurance mechanism. <strong>Senegal Water and Sanitation Evaluation PEPAM WSS sector M&amp;E strengthening.</strong> <strong>Uganda: Independent evaluation of Uganda’s poverty eradication plan (PEAP)</strong> Series of workshops organised to share results with GoU, local government representatives, CSOs, politicians. <strong>Vietnam Case Studies</strong> Evaluation capacity building (Learning by doing). M&amp;E Capacity built of 65 central and local government officials. Awareness sessions on importance of evaluation and knowledge from evaluation. Change the way the Department of public investment is appraising projects, sustain knowledge and skills development using learning-by-doing approach. Local technical individual and organisational evaluation capacity improved through active participation at different operational levels and in various sectors. Sector government agencies, project management units, and local evaluation consulting firms, strengthened. M&amp;E network not yet developed. <strong>Uganda: Child Grant Programme under Social Cash Transfer</strong> Capacity building of individuals in MCDMCH (social protection programme managers, director of planning and cash transfer programme). Systematic capacity building actions with skills transfer, coaching and formal training of <strong>Benin GPRS Case Study</strong> Lessons learned helped to revise the GPRS monitoring mechanism and the exchange between actors increased ownership with full participation of national actors. Only organisations and individuals found their capacities strengthened but not at the networks level. <strong>Benin GPRS Case Study2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPDE components</strong></td>
<td><strong>Features</strong></td>
<td><strong>Country studies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique: GBS Evaluation Medium-Term in-house consultancy helped building and strengthening capacity with skills transfer and coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bolivia: Evaluation of the Netherlands Co-operation: The exercise strengthened the leadership and ownership of the evaluation. Ghana Case Studies: Gradual strengthening of the evaluation culture and improvement of the national evaluation system. Senegal UNDP Evaluation of MDGs: Enriching experience in MDG evaluation and reinforcing the culture for evaluation in actively participating during the whole evaluation process. National evaluation team capitalised on the experience gained from the evaluation. Gain trust among donors and country. Senegal Annual Review of economic and social policies: MfDR and mutual accountability taking stock of progress achievement of public policies and economic and social development impacts. Qualitative gains in terms of adherence to mutual accountability and participative approach to capacity strengthening. Senegal Review of Water and Sanitation-PEPAM: Good opportunity for learning of national structures in charge of the water and sanitation sector notably the programme coordination and management committees. Lessons learned on the bottlenecks in procurement and implementation delays. However, some other structures did not take part of the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana Case Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senegal UNDP Evaluation of MDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senegal Review of Water and Sanitation-PEPAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benin GPRS Case Study Workshops were held to share the evaluation ToR which helped knowledge sharing and contributed to strengthen the national systems. Bolivia: Evaluation of The Netherlands Co-operation: The Evaluation did not include specific priority areas such as gender and environment impact analysis. Bolivia: Evaluation of Multisector programme (PMD): Improvements of programme management and monitoring. However, insufficient policy dialogue, better results oriented with requirements of results measurement in M&amp;E systems. Columbia: Evaluation of the Spanish Co-operation Case Study: The way the evaluation process was conducted should have been documented and shared by other stakeholders and made available to the public. Development of guides to strengthen the national system of international co-operation and increase the political will despite time and resources limitations. Ghana: Joint Evaluation of Ghana-Denmark Co-operation: Joint agenda for strengthening M&amp;E and Statistics (JASMES) adopted as key framework for implementation co-ordination of interventions to strengthen GoG leadership of M&amp;E and statistical systems, demand and utilisation of M&amp;E results to inform policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support of Networks The Philippines Case Studies Building CoP for M&amp;E and evaluation society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benin GPRS Case Study Workshops were held to share the evaluation ToR which helped knowledge sharing and contributed to strengthen the national systems. Bolivia: Evaluation of The Netherlands Co-operation: The Evaluation did not include specific priority areas such as gender and environment impact analysis. Bolivia: Evaluation of Multisector programme (PMD): Improvements of programme management and monitoring. However, insufficient policy dialogue, better results oriented with requirements of results measurement in M&amp;E systems. Columbia: Evaluation of the Spanish Co-operation Case Study: The way the evaluation process was conducted should have been documented and shared by other stakeholders and made available to the public. Development of guides to strengthen the national system of international co-operation and increase the political will despite time and resources limitations. Ghana: Joint Evaluation of Ghana-Denmark Co-operation: Joint agenda for strengthening M&amp;E and Statistics (JASMES) adopted as key framework for implementation co-ordination of interventions to strengthen GoG leadership of M&amp;E and statistical systems, demand and utilisation of M&amp;E results to inform policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support of Networks The Philippines Case Studies Building CoP for M&amp;E and evaluation society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benin GPRS Case Study Workshops were held to share the evaluation ToR which helped knowledge sharing and contributed to strengthen the national systems. Bolivia: Evaluation of The Netherlands Co-operation: The Evaluation did not include specific priority areas such as gender and environment impact analysis. Bolivia: Evaluation of Multisector programme (PMD): Improvements of programme management and monitoring. However, insufficient policy dialogue, better results oriented with requirements of results measurement in M&amp;E systems. Columbia: Evaluation of the Spanish Co-operation Case Study: The way the evaluation process was conducted should have been documented and shared by other stakeholders and made available to the public. Development of guides to strengthen the national system of international co-operation and increase the political will despite time and resources limitations. Ghana: Joint Evaluation of Ghana-Denmark Co-operation: Joint agenda for strengthening M&amp;E and Statistics (JASMES) adopted as key framework for implementation co-ordination of interventions to strengthen GoG leadership of M&amp;E and statistical systems, demand and utilisation of M&amp;E results to inform policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support of Networks The Philippines Case Studies Building CoP for M&amp;E and evaluation society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPDE components</td>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Country studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| production and dissemination. Use of the M&E manual by the structures involved such as sector working groups (SWG), NDPC M&E division (PPMED), District planning, M&E co-ordinating Units (DPCUs). Use of participatory approach to evaluate the medium term development policy framework.  
*Ghana: Evaluation of rural finance services:* Gradual strengthening of the evaluation culture and improvement of the national evaluation system.  
*Mozambique GBS Evaluation* Attempts to build capacity to supply evaluations. Strong links between international and local consultants. Quality assurance by management team and reference group was helpful but peer reviews were less structured and not timely. The GBS evaluation missed the opportunity to ensure a feedback and was not used for the annual review process where budget support is discussed.  
*The Philippines Case Studies* Capacities enhanced in reviewing the ex post evaluation national manual.  
*Samoa Australia DFAT Collaborative Evaluation* TA to develop consolidated Work and sector specific reporting template and on-the-shelf resource for M&E of results pertaining to future disaster events. TCE with 9 recovery principles (recovery framework) to influence sector specific recovery plans with value for money principles, and addressing vulnerability and cross cutting issues, commitment to risk management in line to GoS national strategic directions. Development and adoption of MEF and provided for risk management and reporting against recovery outcomes and principles. Paradigm shift towards high emphasis on learning dimensions. Templates and useful learning resources uploaded on MoF website for future access and M&E capacity building. DFAT documented the TCE M&E guide for results.  
*Senegal WSS Evaluation PEPAM* High involvement of national organisations and local experts promoted the knowledge transfer and learning particularly in the WSS sector. Experience acquired by the project team involved in the evaluation management and process. ECPD helped in consolidating the national ownership of parties in charge of M&E, evaluation networks (Seneval) and planning commissions.  
*Vietnam Case Studies* The ECPDE helped in developing national M&E network through knowledge transfer, and cumulative institutional/collective experience among intra and inter government organisations.
| Support of CSO, CBO, private sector evaluation systems | **Colombia: Evaluation of Spanish Co-operation Case Study** Civil society was not involved. A challenge is to align state entities and CSOs competing for the same co-operation resources (such as national planning department of the Ministry of Environment).  
**Colombia: External Evaluation of UNDAF Case Study3:** Identified success: inclusiveness and complementarity of donor and Government although it missed more territorial participation and civil society involvement and interaction with Government entities.  
**Ghana: Rural Finance Systems Evaluation** Use of learning-by-doing process with involvement of academia, CSOs, NGOs, private sector. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CPDE components</strong></th>
<th><strong>Features</strong></th>
<th><strong>Country studies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefiguration of future partner-donor evaluations (future opportunities)</td>
<td>Engaging for concrete CPDE proposals</td>
<td><strong>Ghana Case Studies</strong>&lt;br&gt;CPDE was an opportunity to strengthen significantly the evaluation culture and capacity of national structures and individuals and was a basis for the conceptualisation of a collaborative evaluation framework between donors and partners for the future. Results show conclusive signs of the collaborative approach in the realisation of other recent evaluations in Ghana: (i) Ghana Second Phase of the National Functional Literacy Project, June 2010; (ii) Ghana - Land Administration Project, June 2013; (iii) Ghana School feeding programme - the impact after 5 years of implementation (iv) Ghana Secondary Education Improvement Project; (v) Ghana Trade and Investment Gateway Project; November 2013; (vi) Ghana Second Agriculture Development Policy Operation; (viii) Building Capacity of the Urban Poor for Inclusive Development in Ghana-Phase1. Mozambique GBS Evaluation&lt;br&gt;Due to low demand for partner donor evaluations, future CPDEs need to ensure prior support from relevant stakeholders and willingness for follow up on evaluation results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building on successful experiences</td>
<td><strong>Vietnam Case Studies</strong>&lt;br&gt;MOUs to be signed with government to clarify roles and responsibilities, work plan and stakeholders, co-ordination and management. Incorporation of capacity building actions within CPDE.</td>
<td><strong>Ghana Case Studies</strong>&lt;br&gt;Generalisation of a collaborative approach with a greater attention to the strengthening of the national evaluation system; and to exploit the existence of a knowledge management centre in evaluation within the national evaluation system hosted by NDPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging with Multiyear ECD initiatives</td>
<td><strong>Ghana Case Studies</strong>&lt;br&gt;Building the necessary knowledge to boost the dynamics around the achievement of the MDGs and the universality of basic education. <strong>Cameroon Primary Education schools construction Programme</strong>&lt;br&gt;Building the necessary knowledge to support the dynamics around the achievement of the MDGs and the universality of basic education.</td>
<td><strong>Ghana Case Studies</strong>&lt;br&gt;Stakeholders other than those of government to be involved in the development of the collaborative approach in evaluation: (i) civil society organisations; (ii) private sector, notably evaluation consulting firms; and (iii) national evaluation networks. <strong>Senegal Case Study</strong>&lt;br&gt;Participatory approaches to capacity strengthening. Institutionalisation of the monitoring framework of national sector development strategies adopted with the help of the WB: Self-evaluation of donor co-ordination and consultation issued a plan of action for collaborative joint evaluations and action for development effectiveness. Consensus obtained around joint evaluation at the WSS sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and ensuring cumulative knowledge and/or applying innovative features and/or supporting new arrangements</td>
<td><strong>Benin Case Studies</strong>&lt;br&gt;Delays in implementing the evaluation procedures and M&amp;E mechanisms. Low involvement of national actors in the design of evaluations and insufficient synergies of action between the national structures and stakeholders and the lack of implementation of the evaluation results and recommendations. Overloaded national actors in charge of the M&amp;E and evaluation with numbers of simultaneous evaluations and secondary roles. Role of national actors confined to logistical support to evaluation teams and reports validations of donor evaluation initiatives. Low supply and national evaluation resources. Low utilisation and use of evaluation results by national parties. Low knowledge transfer and learning.</td>
<td><strong>Bolivia Case Studies</strong>&lt;br&gt;Delays in implementing the evaluation procedures and M&amp;E mechanisms. Low involvement of national actors in the design of evaluations and insufficient synergies of action between the national structures and stakeholders and the lack of implementation of the evaluation results and recommendations. Overloaded national actors in charge of the M&amp;E and evaluation with numbers of simultaneous evaluations and secondary roles. Role of national actors confined to logistical support to evaluation teams and reports validations of donor evaluation initiatives. Low supply and national evaluation resources. Low utilisation and use of evaluation results by national parties. Low knowledge transfer and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What internal or external factors have affected (impacted) the collaborative evaluation experiences</td>
<td>Internal factors affecting CPDE</td>
<td><strong>Benin Case Studies</strong>&lt;br&gt;Delays in implementing the evaluation procedures and M&amp;E mechanisms. Low involvement of national actors in the design of evaluations and insufficient synergies of action between the national structures and stakeholders and the lack of implementation of the evaluation results and recommendations. Overloaded national actors in charge of the M&amp;E and evaluation with numbers of simultaneous evaluations and secondary roles. Role of national actors confined to logistical support to evaluation teams and reports validations of donor evaluation initiatives. Low supply and national evaluation resources. Low utilisation and use of evaluation results by national parties. Low knowledge transfer and learning. <strong>Bolivia Case Studies</strong>&lt;br&gt;Delays in implementing the evaluation procedures and M&amp;E mechanisms. Low involvement of national actors in the design of evaluations and insufficient synergies of action between the national structures and stakeholders and the lack of implementation of the evaluation results and recommendations. Overloaded national actors in charge of the M&amp;E and evaluation with numbers of simultaneous evaluations and secondary roles. Role of national actors confined to logistical support to evaluation teams and reports validations of donor evaluation initiatives. Low supply and national evaluation resources. Low utilisation and use of evaluation results by national parties. Low knowledge transfer and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Study on Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation<br>Final Study Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPDE components</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Country studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive lessons: Counterpart leadership and ownership is essential. Technical assistance based on demand and not induced by donors. Use of national procedures. Counterparties to establish baseline and sector or subsector development indicators. <strong>Colombia Case Studies</strong></td>
<td>Importance of the Government position on its priorities to be made clear to international donor community. Building trust between the country and the donor community through fluid and frank dialogue. Encouraging the two-level dialogue both at technical and strategic. Challenges in accessing financial information and data on donor projects. Challenges of co-ordination between entities of the Colombian State which face high turnover of staff. Difficulties in using Colombian procurement rules. <strong>Ghana Country Case Studies</strong></td>
<td>Long standing TA and capacity building with high degree of flexibility are valued although some technical advisors had inappropriate experiences and skills and not integrated with GoG counterparts. Danida is now a well-valued partner in a multi-donor budget support framework but has no exit strategy for the sector of intervention (transport) but shows a long-term arrangement. However, the process used donor funding and procurement procedures. Shortage of measurable indicators and appropriate M&amp;E system can reduce a project’ ability to make timely corrections. <strong>Mozambique Case Study</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study on Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation
Final Study Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPDE components</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Country studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                | Learning by doing experiences with involvement of national actors and organisations to learn from their participation and help reshape in house country systems and processes.  
**Senegal Case Studies**  
Difficulty in complying with time schedule and deadlines with the budgetary preparation cycle (some of the recommendations became irrelevant).  
Lack of rigor in implementing the joint evaluation recommendations.  
Lack of consolidated and shared vision with the regard the outcome of the annual review of the international co-operation.  
High involvement of relevant stakeholders (representing both the demand and the supply sides of the evaluation) such as the MoF, NPC, NBS, sector M&E bureau which capacity have been strengthened.  
Evaluation findings and recommendations are not systematically shared or widely disseminated.  
The evaluation results were not used and had no influence on national policies and strategies because of the wrong timing and lack of linkage with the budget allocation process.  
The lack of national authorities and organisations in the evaluation process limits the use of the evaluation.  
**Vietnam Case Study**  
Negative factors:  
Low in-country attention to ECD,  
Low technical capacity at national (government and private sector) level,  
Lack of institutional framework to sustain the national evaluation system with sufficient budget and personnel,  
Under-developed evaluation network,  
Difficulty in harmonising country donor evaluation systems,  
Weak utilisation of in-government human resources,  
Weak institutional, collective cumulating experience in evaluation inter and intra government organisations.  
Positive factors:  
Strong government commitment and ownership,  
More priority to collaborative than donor led evaluations,  
Learning by doing approach a successful approach to local skills development,  
Early identification of key stakeholders at initial stage of collaborative evaluation,  
Government leadership and co-ordination of soften parallel evaluation initiatives,  
Adequate resources and sufficient budget to conduct, manage and co-ordinate CPDEs.  
**Zambia Case Study**  
Full ownership of the evaluation by GRZ with financial and technical support from donors: GRZ ownership guided by well-defined purpose, objectives and design of the joint/collaborative evaluation.  
Alignment to GRZ’s development policy within agreed harmonisation framework is a prerequisite.  
Right balance of interests involved between donors and GRZ.  
Consultative leadership of GRZ in involving a wide range of stakeholders in dissemination of evaluation results.  
Evaluation findings effectively used by MCDMCH to scale up and attract support for the programme.  
**Colombia Case Studies:**  
The issue if victims is not well treated as well as the rural co-ordination mechanism. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPDE components</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Country studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                 | Appreciated international co-operation mechanism despite the existence of 47 national entities in charge of public policies, prevention, protection, care and full reparation to victims (SNARIV) who took the leadership in the evaluation (APC the international co-operation co-ordination).  
*Samoa Case Study*  
Donors may have different reporting mechanisms which may be difficult to streamline but the TCE framework was a joint agreed format.  
*Senegal Case Study*  
There is an overconcentration of decision making at HQ in individual donors. This poses difficulty for harmonisation and co-ordination of government donor collaboration efforts.  
*Vietnam Case Study*  
Low priority given to collaborative evaluation by donors. |
| Lessons Learned from CPDE Experiences | At policy and strategic levels | *Bolivia Case Studies*  
Establish robust M&E systems with grant funds for impact evaluations (include ex ante impact indicators) and strengthen M&E capacity at project and programme levels and joint efforts for national evaluation system.  
Strong Government support.  
Evidence based evaluation of multi-actors programme.  
*Colombia Case Studies*  
Excessive prevention of duplication of efforts between APC and the Victims Unit (UARIV) which is the institutional co-ordination unit of 47 public entities in relation to the policy implementation of victims care and protection.  
Lack of political will from traditional donors for joint collaborative exercise.  
Few Government institutions involved in evaluation of international co-operation.  
Poor co-ordination mechanisms between intervening institutions (case of the victims care programme).  
*Ghana Case Studies*  
Early involvement of the recipient country in the joint evaluation.  
Strong political will to ensure effective national ownership, public policy effectiveness.  
Citizenry demand for evaluation with development of public and private expertise in evaluation and national evaluation policy emphasise the utilisation of evaluation results.  
The harmonisation process behind collaborative evaluations lost focus and targeting of the vulnerable and the poor.  
*Moambique Case Study*  
Need for political will and commitment.  
*Samoa Case Study*  
CPDE needs to have adequate capacity with friendly features that focus mainly on country priorities, use of country systems, institutions and organisations.  
*Senegal Case Study*  
Lack of a national vision, policy and a strategy to evaluate development projects and to take leadership in ECPD limit its effectiveness  
National ownership is mandatory to cope with the donor pressure to conduct “collaborative” evaluation. |
|         | At structures and systems levels | *Bolivia Case Studies*  
Systematisation of lessons learning.  
Official counterpart to define protocol of closure of bilateral programmes. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPDE components</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Country studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                 | Harmonisation of external co-operation with national policies.  
|                 | Technical capacities of technical councils and committees.  
|                 | Commitment and dedication of sufficient human and financial resources.  
|                 | Support of NGOs with community level strategies.  
|                 | Mobilisation of all sectors institutions at municipal levels.  
|                 | **Colombia Case Studies**  
|                 | Lack on budget allocation to APC to conduct joint evaluations.  
|                 | Lack of guidelines and procedures for joint evaluations at micro level and reference to national systems.  
|                 | Lack of specific institutional to evaluate aid effectiveness although there is an institution dedicated exclusively to monitoring, and evaluation of international co-operation projects and programmes.  
|                 | Lack of co-ordination and support for joint impact evaluation of public policies.  
|                 | **Ghana Case Studies**  
|                 | Responsibilities entrusted to NDPC clearly defined. NDPC played a key role in the evaluation process.  
|                 | **Mozambique Case Study**  
|                 | Inexistence of centralised M&E Unit holds back the development of M&E expertise in Mozambique.  
|                 | Efforts to strengthen national M&E processes and mechanisms have to go hand in hand with the simulation of a relevant domestic demand for evaluations from national policymakers.  
|                 | OECD DAC framework for the evaluation helped in understanding and conceptualising the evaluation process at the local level.  
|                 | **Samoa Case Study**  
|                 | Common agenda with shared vision for change, common understanding of issues and joint approach to solve them through agreed actions.  
|                 | Commitment to develop coherent systems that comply with national and sector priorities.  
|                 | Partnerships that foster accountability and responsibility in pursuing national development priorities and ensuring donor co-ordination.  
|                 | **Senegal Case Study**  
|                 | ECPD faced difficulties with the absence of the a national M&E system and lack of evaluative and statistical data.  
|                 | **Zambia Case Study**  
|                 | Full ownership of the evaluation by GRZ with financial and technical support from donors: GRZ ownership guided by well-defined purpose, objectives and design of the joint/collaborative evaluation.  
|                 | Alignment to GRZ’s development policy within agreed harmonisation framework is a prerequisite.  
|                 | Right balance of interests involved between donors and GRZ.  
|                 | Consultative leadership of GRZ in involving a wide range of stakeholders in dissemination of evaluation results.  
|                 | Evaluation findings effectively used by MCDMCH to scale up and attract support for the programme.  
| At process level | **Ghana Case Studies**  
| (design, | Joint development of TOR and use of new communication technologies help facilitate the joint evaluation management.  
| management, | Use of reference and management groups with MOU strengthens the collaboration and use of evaluation results in designing and programming new activities besides the substantive changes to the programme (developmental evaluation). Other examples, lessons from the Volta region water and sanitation project fed in the GoG policy in creation of the district works departments at decentralised level.  
<p>| and use)    | <strong>Samoa Case Study</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPDE components</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Country studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor timing and scheduling joint activities may clash with government initiatives and priorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate timeframe to conduct joint evaluations including building, development and management of collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient budget for greater transaction cost pertaining to joint partner donor collaborative actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Senegal Case Study</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The high frequency of joint &amp; collaborative evaluation work enhances the evaluation culture within the country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10.4 CPDE – Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country study</th>
<th>Organisations</th>
<th>Networks/ mechanisms</th>
<th>External or risk factors</th>
<th>Specific opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benin</strong></td>
<td>Future demand for CPDE will come from national organisations in charge of development planning, including local organisations and public enterprises, Government in co-operation with all international donors and all national entities, NGOs, private sector and academia.</td>
<td>Leadership in evaluation, Country evaluation system strengthening, Sufficient resources to national structures in terms of staff and technology and capacity strengthening, Knowledge centre inside the country evaluation system.</td>
<td>1) Low interest of national actors in terms of ownership, utilisation and use of evaluation results, 2) Insufficient implication and involvement of national actors in the design and conduct of the evaluations, 3) Limited capacities and insufficient synergies between national structures, 4) Limited national resources and insufficient competences in evaluation of country evaluation system.</td>
<td>MTE of UNDP programme, 2016 MDG, Communal forest management support project, Busan Partnership agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bolivia</strong></td>
<td>Measuring the real impact and efficiency of co-operation programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Patriotic agenda 2025 will constitute the reference agenda for co-operation based on clear national leadership to achieve capacity development in sector strategies, national systems strengthening, strategic vision for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cameroon</strong></td>
<td>National M&amp;E network will help assist in disseminating results of evaluation, contribute in knowledge sharing and consultation, promote a local expertise, finalise the M&amp;E guidelines of public policy evaluations, develop national evaluation norms and standards.</td>
<td>1) Weak capitalisation of evaluation results with insufficient use of statistical data and baselines for all sectors, 2) Mutual accountability often neglected by several donors, 3) Insufficient involvement of national actors in the design and conduct of evaluations, 4) Insufficient use of country systems, local consultants and national organisations, 5) Lack of national donor co-ordination framework and difficulties in operationalising sector M&amp;E frameworks and institutionalising the budget programming, 6) Inadequate M&amp;E framework with discrepancy between policies and impact/effects indicators.</td>
<td>Co-ordination of Economic Programmes with Bretton Woods Institutions, Review of co-operation frameworks and platforms with line and economic Ministries, National M&amp;E network will help assist in disseminating results of evaluation, contribute in knowledge sharing and consultation, promote a local expertise, finalise the M&amp;E guidelines of public policy evaluations, develop national evaluation norms and standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colombia</strong></td>
<td>Transfer some of the responsibility of APC to the Planning Department in charge of impact evaluation of public policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual responsibility assessments under more aid effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country study</td>
<td>Organisations</td>
<td>Networks/mechanisms</td>
<td>External or risk factors</td>
<td>Specific opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cook Islands</strong></td>
<td>GIMPA – Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration, GMEF – Ghana Monitoring and Evaluation Forum, GSS – Ghana Statistical Services, SEND Ghana, STAR- Strengthening Transparency, Accountability and Responsiveness.</td>
<td>Strong Involvement of NDPC, Strong involvement of M&amp;E networks in the design, conduct and dissemination of evaluation, CSOs and Evaluation Network will use evaluations to fight corruption in Ghana (VOPES including AfrEA, GMEF, Ghamfin and Assfin (NGOs)).</td>
<td>1) Weak demand for and utilisation of M&amp;E results, 2) Unintended negative effects arising from donor-led evaluations due to low demand in the country, political patronage and interference in commissioned evaluations, and pre-mediated and biased respondents, 3) Recognition and use of evaluation results by the citizenry, 4) Weak capacity and difficult to attract qualified evaluation staff at all levels (also in terms of IT equipment and office), 5) Lack of incentives, rewards and sanctions for compliance and non-compliance of evaluation requirements (lack of accountability for results and value for money), 6) No compliance with NDPC evaluation formats and timelines by MDAs and Metropolitan, municipal and district assemblies (MMDAs) with no adherence to reporting formats with different reporting cycles, 7) Difficulty in co-ordinating M&amp;E outputs across Government which affects the quality and timelines of the national Annual Peer Review, 8) Poor data quality, data gaps and inconsistencies, 9) Inadequate MIS and LANs across MDAS and MMDAs in transferring administrative data from district to regional levels, 10) Limited budget allocations and resources to M&amp;E (insufficient allocations to NDPC, GSS, MDAs, MMDAs for evaluation and building M&amp;E systems).</td>
<td>The first pilot CPDE to be commissioned will be based on the evaluation commissioned by Canada that was conducted by an independent assessment of CIDA programmes in Ghana delivered through various CIDA channels, and focused on the 1999-2005 Country Development programming Framework (CDPF). Canada’s CPDE will involve the ‘Evaluation of Canada’s Programs in Ghana from 2006 to 2014’. The proposed joint evaluation experience between Canada and Ghana will seek to assess Canada’s developmental efforts in Ghana from 2006 to 2014 and to compare the evaluation outcomes attained to the results of the ‘Evaluation of Canada’s Program 1999 to 2005’. The second future CPDE will be the French Support Project for Public Sector Reform based on a reform policy that was progressively worked out between France and Ghana. The objective of the French co-operation was to strengthen the central government capacities in order to put the reform in practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malawi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country study</td>
<td>Organisations</td>
<td>Networks/ mechanisms</td>
<td>External or risk factors</td>
<td>Specific opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All countries</td>
<td>Specific stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Joint programming is a factor for enhancing joint collaborative evaluation work and reducing the transaction costs, 2) Insufficient ownership by local authorities (evaluations seen as contractual obligations) where accountability is oriented towards external assistance mobilisation from donors and not to beneficiary population, 3) Lack of political interest, ownership t and accountability at highest level, 4) Weak national systems and lack of results culture, 5) Weak progress monitoring of evaluation recommendations implementation, 6) Weak M&amp;E capacities at national level (absence of national evaluation network).</td>
<td>Rural economy, Infrastructure development, Education and Vocational Training Programme, Health, Justice, Decentralisation and institutional development, Climate change and environment protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambiqu e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td>RBMEs and M&amp;E roadmaps - Participation in evaluation reference or quality groups, M&amp;E CoP to promote peer to peer collaborative networks and to participate in learning and capacity building and to advance the culture of evaluation (disseminating information, promoting studies and approaches, promoting and sustaining values and standards in community building activities), M&amp;E forums and establishment of M&amp;E websites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sector evaluations. Impact and ex post evaluations. Disaster-related evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country study</td>
<td>Organisations</td>
<td>Networks/ mechanisms</td>
<td>External or risk factors</td>
<td>Specific opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Samoa</strong></td>
<td>NGOs (national and international), ADRA, Oxfam, … Samoa CoP, and NGOs, Academic Institutions, Sectors Co-ordination Forums.</td>
<td>M&amp;E CoP in support of government initiatives such as sector co-ordination meetings currently initiated by the Policy and Planning section of the MoF.</td>
<td>1) Country organisations can be undermined by overly relying on free-lance evaluators or evaluators based in donor countries, 2) Donor led evaluations perceived as direct country performance appraisal which undermines the legitimacy of country evaluation networks and distrust country systems and mechanisms, 3) Too much focus on donor accountability and achievement of donor based standards, 4) Partner countries may overburdened by having too many evaluations at a time.</td>
<td>Multisector Disability Programme, Pacific Women Development, Roll out of the education sector supported by the Australian Government and AsDB, Joint Policy Matrix of 5 donors with the Government of Samoa, CPDE of ODA in the health sector (Impact of total support) for learning and health outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senegal</strong></td>
<td>Parliament, Public controller, private sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Areas to be covered by future evaluations are in the public investment plan: Number of project level evaluations with high development priority. Number of key reforms, agriculture sector policy evaluation, evaluation of PPP projects, donor assistance to private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sri-Lanka</strong></td>
<td>Strengthen the partner country ECD and the country evaluation systems are important to incentivize donors to use the national system rather than operate their stand-alone parallel system. Evaluation Plans should prioritise Partner – Donor Evaluations, Strengthening the Evaluation Community, Regional Community of Practice on Evaluation should be established to support peer learning and networking among partner countries and donor evaluation focal points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study on Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation
Final Study Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country study</th>
<th>Organisations</th>
<th>Networks/mechanisms</th>
<th>External or risk factors</th>
<th>Specific opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All countries</td>
<td>Specific stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Emergence of non-traditional development partners and investors (China, RSA) with uncertainty of aid-effectiveness sustainability, 2) Use of and compliance to donor procedures and reporting mechanisms limit the learning opportunities of national M&amp;E, 3) Weak government institutions mandated to enforce order and accountability in public administration, 4) Corruption that affects public service delivery, 5) Lack of citizenry empowerment to request better performance from government institutions, 6) Divergence in human rights views between GoU and donors, 7) Regular changes in government and in development partner countries.</td>
<td>Increased demand for show case evaluations of climate change interventions and decentralised evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>GoU through the OPM. Ministries and SWGs on education, water, transport and justice. Ministries Department and Agencies (MDAs) especially Water, Health, Education, Infrastructure MoF, Planning and Economic Development (MoFPED) National Planning Authority (NPA) OPM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Learning by doing approach quite effective for evaluation capacity development using effectively available human resources, sharing information and knowledge and cumulative/collective learning. Need to solve difficulties in harmonising national evaluation with donor evaluation systems, documenting experiences, networking and leveraging institutional/collective experience. Strong leading role of national organisations involved.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Lack of donor participation in national evaluation networks, 2) Donor led evaluation are less participatory and reduce ownership.</td>
<td>Learning from CPDE evaluations of multi-donor programmes and building technical and institutional evaluation capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>National consultants should be part of the whole evaluation mechanism, and not just confined to data collection but to include strategic planning for evaluation, oversight evaluation implementation, learning and using evaluation results</td>
<td>MOFNP created an M&amp;E department and a research and development programmes. M&amp;E evaluation framework of sector strategic plans could be used as an entry point for joint evaluation in addition to on-going collaboration in sectors implementing Swaps. And programme-based approaches. Cabinet office process for policy submissions provides potential entry point for increasing demand for evaluation. Use of evidence in fostering support and mobilising financial resources for public programme. Working with parliaments through national assembly research department enhances the quality of the debate by lawmakers, improves transparency and accountability and provides opportunity for evidence-based policies. Role of the Parliament supported by donors under the Parliamentary reform programme (PRP). Advocacy work benefitted from evidence generated by evaluations of public programmes. Building CSO capacities is a niche.</td>
<td>1) Low involvement of CSOs in training on M&amp;E, 2) Lack of built-in Evaluation Framework, 3) Lack of evaluation supply and recognisable evaluation mechanisms to ensure standards compliance, ethics and professionalism, 4) Neo-patrimonial political system is not always amenable to evidence from evaluations.</td>
<td>Use of country systems with GRZ to lead in defining reform programme and development priorities with support from interested donors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10.5 CPDE – Immediate follow up steps foreseen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country study</th>
<th>Immediate follow up steps foreseen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Benin**     | 1) Design a national CPDE guidelines adapted from international standards that can be used by national partners.  
2) Pilot a collaborative evaluation with interested donors in 2015 and disseminate findings and lessons from the pilot.  
3) Plan collaborative evaluation in the next national evaluation plan.  
4) Share experiences and information with other participants to the CPDE initiative. |
| **Bolivia**   | 1) Strengthen the Vice Ministry of Public Investment and External Financing of the Ministry of Development Planning, as the governing body of the National System of Public Investment, in order to establish formal monitoring mechanisms.  
2) Continue to work with the international co-operation in a co-ordinated manner through the instance of GruS Group Development Partners of Bolivia. |
| **Cameroon**  | 1) Presentation of the report on the next Multi-Donor Committee.  
2) Elaboration of a roadmap for implementing recommendations where feasible.  
3) Dissemination through workshops and meetings of sectoral platforms for development partnership. |
| **Colombia**  | APC-Colombia is under the process of transformation and redefinition of its strategic tasks due to a change of general direction and the mandate of the President to focus on the co-ordination of international co-operation in a post-conflict phase (following the peace agreements). In this sense, APC-Colombia will focus in follow-up activities of international co-operation. Probably the promotion of joint evaluations to international co-operation will be taken into consideration, considering the information provided by the study. |
| **Cook Islands** | NDPC hope to pilot three CPDEs from 2016 to 2018. The three countries earmarked for the future CPDE are: Canada, France and Germany. However, Denmark has been identified as a fourth country for quality check and technical evaluation backstopping. The purpose for this was informed by the earlier CPDE experience of Denmark and Ghana. |
| **Ghana**     | NDPC hope to pilot three CPDEs from 2016 to 2018. The three countries earmarked for the future CPDE are: Canada, France and Germany. However, Denmark has been identified as a fourth country for quality check and technical evaluation backstopping. The purpose for this was informed by the earlier CPDE experience of Denmark and Ghana. |
| **Malawi**    | Dissemination workshops, Validation of the best potential areas for collaborative assessments with an implementation action plan |
| **Mali**      | Agree and design with Donors a mechanism capable of Monitoring and Evaluating ODA flows as well as the wider follow-up on aid effectiveness commitments (all Development actors). |
| **Mozambique**| In partnership with various development partners in the Philippines:  
1) Continue to undertake joint M&E activities in the conduct of evaluations (sector, impact, ex-post and disaster-related), consistent with the GPH M&E Roadmap.  
2) Continue to undertake capacity development activities for evaluation.  
3) Further strengthening of networks/associations established for monitoring and evaluation i.e. M&E Network Philippines.  
GPH efforts to further enhance future collaborative work:  
1) Continue to work on finalizing the draft National Evaluation Policy, together with the Department of Budget and Management, in support to GPH’s thrust on performance-based decision making in planning and budgeting.  
2) Wider dissemination of evaluation findings through evaluation products and web-based sites. |
<p>| <strong>Nepal</strong>     | Carry out the CPDE of the Joint Policy Matrix with the collaboration of 5 donors and Government of Samoa – this evaluation will determine the level of commitment of all parties involved to the use of country systems. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country study</th>
<th>Immediate follow up steps foreseen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Senegal       | 1) Disseminate and share the Senegal CPDE case study to various stakeholders: public entities, Development Partners Co-ordination Committee, civil society, private sector, etc.  
2) Consider the actions and the conditions for the implementation of some proposals. |
| Sri-Lanka     | Pilot programme on CPDE in Annexure- II of the country study will be promoted for implementation. National evaluation capacity development; strengthening country evaluation system and promotion of joint and collaborative evaluation & the success stories of influential evaluations will be promoted for implementation |
| Uganda        | 1) We have already started implementation of new joint evaluations where we intend to apply the recommendations and principles of the study;  
The new joint evaluations proposed are:  
i) Evaluation of the land titling and registration reforms (Office of the Prime Minister, Ministry If Lands and Urban Development and the World Bank)  
ii) Evaluation of Youth Livelihood Program (YLP)  
iii) Evaluation of the University Primary Education Programme  
iv) Evaluation of the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund  
2) Initiated discussions with development partners for conducting joint evaluations of National Development Plan priority projects under NDP 2.  
3) Identifying specific activities to popularise joint evaluations with the action plan for the national monitoring and evaluation policy. |
| Vietnam       | The Strategy on Public Investment project/program Monitoring and Evaluation is in drafting process, in which joint evaluation will be encouraged. The MIS for PIP monitoring and evaluation is also being established. |
| Zambia        | Maintain and expand the country reference group to include Civil Society & Academia:  
1) Dissemination of the key findings of the study to government, cooperating partners & other stakeholders.  
2) Mainstreaming of CPDE work into the M&E Department at the Ministry of Finance. |
10.6 References to collaborative evaluations

*Benin – UN*
Evaluation of the Second ‘Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy’, carried out in 2012 by the Government of Benin and fourteen UN Agencies operating in the country. This was a truly collaborative exercise with some capacity intent but limited contribution to strengthening the country evaluation system.

*Benin – Denmark*
Evaluation of a multi-donor sector-wide support to education carried out in 2011. A partly collaborative exercise with no capacity intent and no contribution to strengthening the country evaluation system.

*Ghana – World Bank*
Evaluation of the Rural Financial Services Project (RFSP) jointly carried out by the Ministry of Finance and the World Bank. A fully collaborative exercise with some contribution to strengthening the country evaluation system.

*Ghana – Denmark*
Evaluation of the whole development co-operation between Ghana and Denmark from 1990 to 2006. A fully collaborative exercise with limited contribution to strengthening the country evaluation system.

*Mali – AfDB*
Final evaluation of a project supporting rural development. A fully collaborative exercise with no reported contribution to strengthening the country evaluation system.

*Mozambique – EC*
Evaluation of Budget Support Evaluation jointly managed by the Ministry of Planning and Development of Mozambique and the European Commission (EC) in co-operation with governments of Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, and the Netherlands. A collaborative exercise with no contribution to strengthening the country evaluation system.

*Philippines – Japan*
A series of ex-post evaluations of investment projects jointly undertaken by the Governments of Philippines and Japan. This six year collaboration mixed learning-by-doing and training. It made substantial contributions to strengthening the country evaluation system.

*Samoa – Australia*
Future evaluation of the Recovery Program for Education and Health Sectors after the Tropical Cyclone Evan to be carried out by the governments of Samoa and Australia. This evaluation is embedded in a wider ECD approach.

*Vietnam – Australia*
A series of pilot country-led evaluations embedded in an evaluation capacity development project.

*Vietnam – Japan*
A series of ex-post evaluations of investment projects jointly undertaken by the Governments of Vietnam and Japan. This five year collaboration mixed learning-by-doing and training. It made a substantial contribution to strengthening the country evaluation system.

*Zambia – UNICEF*
Evaluation of the Child Grant Program involving a randomized controlled trial. The evaluation was led by UNICEF, with funding from UK and Ireland, and participation of the Government of Zambia. It made some contributions to strengthening the country evaluation system.
10.7 Questionnaire - Survey to donors and partner countries

Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation Initiative

10.7.1 Introduction

The following questions are asked to members of the Evaluation Network of the OECD-DAC (EvalNet) and partner country coordinators so they can state and/or confirm their intentions about future collaborative evaluation work.

Objectives: Answers to the questions will be synthesized and included in the final CPDE Study Report. The questionnaire responses will help inform discussions on the future directions of the initiative and collaborative partner-donor evaluation work.

Background: The Study on Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation (CPDE) work was mandated and commissioned by EvalNet in November 2012 as a follow-up to the 2011 Evaluation of the Paris Declaration (PDE) on aid effectiveness. Since then, 18 partner countries and 16 national and multilateral donor institutions have confirmed their interest to be involved in the present Study. The Study was launched at a workshop held in Kampala (Uganda) on 24-25 March 2014. It was hosted by the Office of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Uganda. A Synthesis Workshop was held on 02-04 December in Manila, co-hosted by the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) of the Republic of the Philippines and the Asian Development Bank (ADB).

Fourteen partner countries participated in the Study- Benin, Bolivia, Cameroon, Colombia, Ghana, Mali, Mozambique, Samoa, Senegal, Sri Lanka, The Philippines, Uganda, Vietnam and Zambia- produced a Country Study. Four Thematic Papers were produced on the basis of the Synthesis Workshop and Country Studies. All documents were reviewed by external quality assessors.

A four volume CPDE Study report has been submitted for review to the Reference Group in a draft version. It identifies emerging conclusions, makes proposals on how to take the CPDE Initiative forward, and raises questions to donor institutions and partner countries in this regard. For more details about implementation status see June 2015 EvalNet Update Note at: http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/collaborativepartnerdonorevaluation.htm

We would highly appreciate if you could fill in the survey before October 27, 2015.

If you have any further questions or comments regarding this Study in general, or this online survey, your contact persons are:

Julia Schwarz (Survey Manager) Julia.Schwarz@particip.de
Claude Leroy Themeze (Advisor to the Management Group of the CPDE Study) cleroy@worldbank.org

We would like to thank you in advance for your co-operation.

10.7.2 Preliminary information on the respondent

1) Please indicate the type of organisation for which you have been involved in the CPDE Study:* (PDE = Paris Declaration Evaluation | CPDE = Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation)

() CPDE financers
() CPDE contributors (non-financial)
() Other EvalNet members
() CPDE Country coordinators
() PDE Country coordinators
() PDE & CPDE Country coordinators

2) Please provide your contact details
First Name: _________________________________________________
Last Name: ________________________________________________
10.7.3 Donor institutions

3) Would your institution be ready to use country systems through collaborative partner donor evaluations?
   ( ) On a frequent basis
   ( ) For a few pilot collaborations
   ( ) Not at all

4) In the case of a weak country evaluation systems, would your institution be ready to
   [ ] Engage in programs combining pilot CPDE projects and targeted Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD) activities?
   [ ] Engage in multi-year capacity oriented collaboration?
   [ ] Make prudent use of the country systems with an aim of learning by doing?
   [ ] Avoid any use of country systems?

5) Would your institution be ready to
   Identify few partner countries with an enabling context (donor readiness at country level & opportunities for successful collaboration) and engage in dialogue on possible collaborative evaluation work?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) Maybe
   ( ) Don’t know

Include few CPDEs in the agency’s work plan with the objective of maximizing the learning-by-doing in partner country?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) Maybe
   ( ) Don’t know

Conduct collaborative evaluations in order to use the partner country systems for e.g. planning, designing, purchasing, steering, using evaluations?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) Maybe
   ( ) Don’t know

Monitor collaborative evaluations efforts and the learning-by-doing benefits stemming from them in the partner countries?
   Note: At this stage, this question is about your interest and intentions. Implementation modalities would be defined collectively during the post-study phase.
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) Maybe
   ( ) Don’t know

Include collaborative evaluations in its ECD strategy?
Entrust central evaluation function with a responsibility to promote learning-by-doing in partner countries?
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Maybe
( ) Don’t know

If your institution is not ready to use country systems through collaborative partner donor evaluations, could that position change in the future?
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Maybe
( ) Don’t know

Under which conditions?:
______________________________

10.7.4 Partner countries

6) Would your institution be ready to:
   Take responsibility for promoting CPDEs where possible with a learning-by-doing objective?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) Maybe
   ( ) Don’t know

   Liaise with country aid management for identifying collaboration opportunities?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) Maybe
   ( ) Don’t know

   Identify one or more donor agencies with whom collaborative evaluation would be possible?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) Maybe
   ( ) Don’t know

   Engage in a few evaluation collaborations designed for maximizing the learning-by-doing?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) Maybe
   ( ) Don’t know

   Include collaborative work in the country evaluation policy if such a policy exists?
Monitor the progress of country evaluation systems including aspects related to evaluation demand and use?
Note: At this stage, this question is about your interest and intentions. Implementation modalities would be defined collectively during the post-study phase.
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Maybe
( ) Don't know

Optimise the learning-by-doing benefits of collaborative evaluations for the various country players (line ministries, regional authorities, evaluation professionals-VOPE, civil society, parliamentarians, etc.)?
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Maybe
( ) Don't know

10.7.5 Donors and partner countries
7) In the post-study phase of the CPDE initiative, would your institution be ready to participate in a light structured Management Group (three meetings a year, mostly online plus email interaction)?
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Maybe
( ) Don't know

8) In the medium-term, would your institution be ready to participate in a working group of development assistance evaluation functions from donor agencies and partner countries?
( ) In an informal working group (e.g. through IDEAS or another relevant development evaluation network)?
( ) In a formal working group hosted by an existing international institution (e.g. EvalNet, UNEG, CLEAR, etc.)?
( ) Not at all

9) Should the above quoted working group:
Multiple answers allowed
[ ] Coordinate CPDEs through a multi-year program and a common learning framework?
[ ] Leave partners and donors collaborate on an opportunistic manner?
[ ] Establish a learning framework and capitalize knowledge on collaborative evaluation?
[ ] Exchange news and lessons on an opportunistic manner?
[ ] Engage the group in promoting capacity oriented collaborations?
[ ] Accumulate knowledge on the benefits of learning-by-doing through collaborative evaluations for both partner countries and donor agencies?
[ ] Explore the transition from donor-led and collaborative evaluations to country-led evaluations?
[ ] Maintain the on-line repository used by the CPDE Study?
[ ] Publish news from collaborative partner donor evaluations on a regular basis through relevant channel(s)?
[ ] Convene physical gatherings of network members at least every two years?

10) Would your institution be ready to provide the working group with some institutional, human and financial resources?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) Maybe
   ( ) Don’t know

11) In the longer term, should the above quoted working group become a permanent arena where all evaluation functions from donors and partner countries can exchange views and collaborate?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) Maybe
   ( ) Don’t know

12) Please provide any other comments or suggestions.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank You!

Thank you for taking our survey. Your response is very important to us.
10.8 Survey results
Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation Initiative

Survey to members of the Evaluation Network of the OECD-DAC (EvalNet) and partner country coordinators

10.8.1 Introduction
The survey to members of the Evaluation Network of the OECD-DAC (EvalNet) and partner country coordinators was carried out in October/November 2015. It was implemented by means of a web-based questionnaire.

The following questions were asked to members of the Evaluation Network of the OECD-DAC (EvalNet) and partner country coordinators so they can state and/or confirm their intentions about future collaborative evaluation work.

Objectives: Answers to the questions have been synthesized and included in the final CPDE Study Report. The questionnaire responses will help inform discussions on the future directions of the initiative and collaborative partner-donor evaluation work.

Background: The Study on Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation (CPDE) work was mandated and commissioned by EvalNet in November 2012 as a follow-up to the 2011 Evaluation of the Paris Declaration (PDE) on aid effectiveness. Since then, 18 partner countries and 16 national and multilateral donor institutions have confirmed their interest to be involved in the present Study. The Study was launched at a workshop held in Kampala (Uganda) on 24-25 March 2014. It was hosted by the Office of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Uganda. A Synthesis Workshop was held on 02-04 December in Manila, co-hosted by the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) of the Republic of the Philippines and the Asian Development Bank (ADB).


The questionnaire consisted of an introductory section and three sections with questions, the first for EvalNet members, the second for partner countries and a third section with questions for both, EvalNet members and partner countries.

The questions posed were largely of quantitative nature (radio button or multiple choice), complemented with two open space questions to provide a possibility of further comments or explanations on the choices selected. The answers to none of the questions in the sections were posed as obligatory, therefore in some question results there is less than the maximum potential answers. For most questions, there was also the option “I don’t know” that could be ticked by the respondents.

10.8.2 Participating donor institutions and partner countries
In total 72 institutions were contacted to participate in the survey. 26 donor institutions and 12 partner countries completed the survey, accumulating to a response rate of 53% (50% for donor institutions and 60% for partner countries). Their answers are integrated in the subsequent analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8</th>
<th>Participating donor institutions and partner countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donor institutions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Partner Countries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country/Bank</strong></td>
<td><strong>Institution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austrian Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Danida - Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spanish Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donor institutions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Partner Countries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/Bank</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>U.S. Department of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Ministry for Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Ministère des Finances et des Comptes Publics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Department Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Minister’s Secretariat – Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea International Co-operation Agency (KOICA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Economic Development Cooperation Fund (EDCF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Camões, Instituto da Cooperação e da Língua (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Federal Department of Economic Affairs, Education and Research – EAER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>Independent Evaluation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AsDB</td>
<td>Independent Evaluation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Independent Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subsequent graph depicts the number and percentage of participating institutions disaggregated by CPDE financiers, CPDE contributors (non-financial), other EvalNet members, PDE & CPDE country coordinators, CPDE country coordinators and PDE country coordinators.
10.8.3 Donor institutions
The following questions were addressed to donor institutions (CPDE financiers, CPDE contributors (non-financial), other EvalNet members).

10.8.3.1 Would your institution be ready to use country systems through collaborative partner donor evaluations?
According to the survey, around 2/3 of the respondents would be ready to use country systems for a few pilot collaborations. Three donor institutions would consider using it on a frequent basis, while five institutions would not use it at all.
Following up on the previous question, the institutions which are not ready to use country systems through collaborative partner donor evaluations were asked whether their position could change in the future. Out of the five respondents, three believe that this position could maybe change in the future, one respondent didn’t know. As conditions under which this position could change, respondents replied that:

- The institution needs to undertake its first evaluation,
- The position depends on the authorizing environment, and
- Due to the type of work, the concept of CPDE is not particularly relevant.

**10.8.3.2 In the case of a weak country evaluation system, would your institution be ready to**

For this question, multiple responses were possible. More than half of the donor institutions would be ready to make prudent use of the country systems in the case of a weak country evaluation system. Only one donor institution believes that country systems should be avoided in such a case.
10.8.3.3 Would your institution be ready to

This question asked for the institutions’ readiness with regard to a number of activities. For each activity the institutions could reply with yes, no, maybe or don’t know. Following the answers provided, nearly half of the institutions would be ready to identify few partner countries with an enabling context and engage in dialogue on possible collaboration work. The least favored activity relates to entrusting central evaluation function with a responsibility to promote learning by doing, for which six institutions confirmed readiness and four declined to be ready for it.

Figure 7   Would your institution be ready to

Source: CPDE Survey
10.8.4 Partner countries
The following question was addressed to partner countries (PDE & CPDE Country coordinators, CPDE Country coordinators, and PDE Country coordinators). The question followed the same format as for the previous question.

Figure 8  Would your institution be ready to

- Identify one or more donor agencies with whom collaborative evaluation would be possible?
- Include collaborative work in the country evaluation policy if such a policy exists?
- Optimize the learning-by-doing benefits of collaborative evaluations for the various country players?
- Liaise with country aid management for identifying collaboration opportunities?
- Engage in a few evaluation collaborations designed for maximizing the learning-by-doing?
- Take responsibility for promoting CPDEs where possible with a learning-by-doing objective?
- Monitor the progress of country evaluation systems including aspects related to evaluation demand and use?

Source: CPDE Survey
This question asked for the *partner countries*’ readiness with regard to a number of activities. Around 2/3 of the partner countries would be ready to:

- Identify one or more donor agencies with whom collaborative evaluation would be possible,
- Include collaborative work in the country evaluation policy if such a policy exists, and
- Optimise the learning-by-doing benefits of collaborative evaluations for the various country players.

For the remaining activities the readiness only slightly decreases with eight and seven partner countries ready to take them up.

### 10.8.5 Donor institutions and partner countries

The following section presents the questions which were asked to both, donor institutions and partner countries.

#### 10.8.5.1 In the post-study phase of the CPDE initiative, would your institution be ready to participate in a light structured Management Group (three meetings a year, mostly online plus email interaction)?

**Figure 9**  
*In the post-study phase of the CPDE initiative, would your institution be ready to participate in a light structured Management Group? (aggregated and disaggregated response)*

As depicted in the graphs above, the survey confirms a high willingness to participate in a post-study phase through a light structured Management Group. 14 institutions expressed their readiness to be involved. In general partner countries’ interest seems to be considerably higher, as nine out of 12 countries would be interested to participate.
10.8.5.2 In the medium-term, would your institution be ready to participate in a working group of development assistance evaluation functions from donor agencies and partner countries?

Again, the survey responses illustrate a high readiness to continue the initiative in a formal working group hosted by an existing international institution. Nearly all partner countries taking the survey confirmed their interest in being involved.

Figure 10 In the medium-term, would your institution be ready to participate in a working group of development assistance evaluation functions from donor agencies and partner countries? (aggregated and disaggregated response)

Source: CPDE Survey
10.8.6 Should the above quoted working group:
This question allowed for multiple responses.

Figure 11 Should the above quoted working group:

Source: CPDE Survey
Most of the respondents would be interested in exchanging news and lessons in an opportunistic manner. However, it is noteworthy that partner countries expressed a higher interest in engaging the group in promoting capacity oriented collaborations and explore the transition from donor-led and collaborative evaluation to country-led evaluations.

10.8.7 Would your institution be ready to provide the working group with some institutional, human and financial resources?

Nearly half of the respondents of this question is maybe ready to providing the working group with some institutional, human and financial resources is indecisive. Three institutions, all from partner countries, are ready to do so. Two respondents clarified in the comment section that although his/her institution might seem somehow reluctant to support this effort, it is not because it is not considered as important, but rather due to limited human and financial resources within the institution.

Figure 12 Would your institution be ready to provide the working group with some institutional, human and financial resources? (aggregated and disaggregated response)

10.8.8 In the longer term, should the above quoted working group become a permanent arena where all evaluation functions from donors and partner countries can exchange views and collaborate?

More than half of the survey respondents believe that the working group should maybe become a permanent arena. Again, higher interest can be noted from partner countries, where five confirmed that a permanent body would add value so that all evaluation functions from donors and partner countries can exchange views and collaborate.
In the longer term, should the above quoted working group become a permanent arena where all evaluation functions from donors and partner countries can exchange views and collaborate? (aggregated and disaggregated response)

Source: CPDE Survey

Additionally, the following comments and suggestions were provided by the survey participants:

- If the CPDE approach is properly structured it will serve as a catalytic tool for championing evaluations at the impact level. Learning-by-doing and capacity building in evaluations must be the target in a well-resourced evaluations focused manner.
- Hope that in future concrete cases are explained in more depth in order to draw lessons from the practices and difficulties encountered.
- Take it step by step, opportunistic starting with a few pilots, preferably under EvalNet and UNEG.
- Collaborative partner donor evaluation helps to improve professionalization in evaluation, strengthening learning and helps capacity development and strengthening country evaluation systems.
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