



# STUDY ON COLLABORATIVE PARTNER-DONOR EVALUATION

**REPORT ON THE LAUNCHING WORKSHOP  
KAMPALA (UGANDA) ON 24-25 MARCH 2014**

April 2014

**STUDY ON COLLABORATIVE PARTNER-DONOR EVALUATION**

**Report on the Launching Workshop  
Kampala (Uganda) on 24-25 March 2014**

**List of contents**

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Main outcomes of the workshop .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Next steps .....</b>	<b>2</b>

**Appendices**

**Appendix 1 – List of participants**

**Appendix 2 – Workshop agenda**

**Appendix 3 – Workshop proceedings**

## 1 Introduction

The **Study on Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation**, which was mandated and commissioned by the Evaluation Network of the OECD – DAC (EvalNet) in November 2012, 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 **11 partner countries** (Benin, Cameroon, Colombia, Ghana, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Philippines, Senegal, Uganda and Zambia) as well as by representatives of **11 EvalNet members** (African Development Bank, Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, UK, USA and the World Bank) The detailed list of participants is included in Appendix 1.

Not all partner countries and EvalNet members having confirmed their interest in involvement in the Study could attend the workshop. At present, some **18 partner countries** and some **15 national and multilateral donor agencies** are expected to take part in the Project. The present workshop report is meant to inform all parties involved.

The workshop was to attain the following **objectives**: 1. Achieve a consensus on objectives and working modalities of the Project; 2. Review draft Terms of Reference (including templates and tools) for country coordinators and adopt the documents for operational use.

The **agenda** of the workshop is included in Appendix 2. The workshop was opened on 24 March 2014 by H.E. Hon. Prof. Tarsis Kabwegyere, Minister for General Duties, Office of the Prime Minister. It was closed on 25 March by Ms. Christine Guwatudde Kintu, Permanent Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister. Opening and closing remarks were also made by Ms. Claude Leroy-Themeze, French Ministry of Economy and Finance, Chair of the Management Group of the Project, and Ms. Riitta Oksanen, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Member of the Management Group. A detailed account of the **proceedings** of the workshop is included in Appendix 3.

## 2 Main outcomes of the workshop

The workshop fully achieved its two objectives, as participants achieved a consensus on **objectives and working modalities of the Project** as well as on a revision of the **Terms of Reference** of the country coordinators (including templates and tools). The **Concept Note** of 26 June 2013 and the **Update Note** of 28 January 2014 were found to be informative and useful documents that could guide the Project.

Participants nevertheless raised the following **issues** and **challenges**:

1. There is a need to somewhat reword the objectives of the Project to more strongly emphasize the **capacity building potential** of collaborative partner-donor evaluations and also the fact that this Project should prepare the ground for the elaboration of a best practice document.
2. Partner countries need to formally **confirm their participation** in the Project and also formally **designate the country coordinators**. In some countries, there have been institutional and personnel changes since the Paris Declaration Evaluation. The Management Group should write a formal invitation letter to partner countries having expressed interest in the Project, which partner countries can then respond to.
3. The implementation of the Study will require the **mobilisation of in-country resources**, for which there is no budgetary provision in the overall Project. Resources may be required, for example, for professional services to conduct the study and for the organisation of a launching workshop at country-level.
4. Participants observed that in partner countries **national work-plans and budgets for 2014** have already been adopted and that it will be difficult to insert new activities stemming from this Project. Similar constraints also exist for local donors.
5. The Management Group acknowledged these constraints, but nevertheless expressed the expectation that partner countries could implement the Project on **resources mobilized locally**, e.g. by involving in-service human resources, academic institutions and / or national evaluation associations and possibly also by inserting this Study into on-going projects. The Study is also not to be particularly lengthy or costly.
6. Under exceptional circumstances, the Management Group may be able, in certain cases, to **top up local resources** from savings made on certain budget lines of the overall Project. This will, however, require a convincing funding request from the respective partner country.
7. Participants estimated that the need for formal confirmations, local resource mobilisation, setting up a reference group composed of members of the evaluation system and possibly procurement of professional services to conduct the Study would require an **adjustment to the proposed timelines**.

8. It was agreed that a **three-month preparatory phase** was needed (1 April – 30 June 2014), during which the in-country reference group would have to be established, country-specific Terms of Reference be finalized, resources be mobilized and a launching workshop be organised.
9. The **actual in-country study phase** could be relatively short with a draft report to be submitted for quality assurance and possibly peer reviews to the Project Coordinators by 31 July and a final report incorporating comments received by 30 September 2014.
10. The country studies could then be presented at the **synthesis workshop** in October 2014. A Partner-Donor Collaborative Agreement could then be finalised in November / December 2014.
11. Throughout the process, country coordinators could rely on **technical support** provided by the Project Coordinators.
12. A **web-based platform** (ShareFile) will be established, which will allow country coordinators to upload important documents for information-sharing with other member of the global Reference Group.

The comments and suggestions made by workshop participants led to some amendments to the draft **Terms of Reference** of the country coordinators proposed by the Project Coordinators. The revised Terms of Reference are included as Appendix 6, the template for the country studies as Appendix 7 and the toolbox for the country coordinators as Appendix 8.

### 3 Next steps

Workshop participants agreed that the following next steps need to be taken as soon as possible:

1. Representatives from partner countries will inform the Chair of the Management Group, Ms. Claude Leroy-Themeze, French Ministry of Economy and Finance, to whom the **official invitation letter** should be addressed.
2. Partner countries will formally **confirm their interest** in participating in the Project and **designate / confirm the appointment of their country coordinators**.
3. Partner countries will also propose a **roadmap for their studies**, including information on membership in the local reference group, implementation modalities and timelines, mobilisation of national and local donor resources and procurement of professional services, if required.
4. Project Coordinators remain at the disposal of country coordinators for **technical advice and support**.

The web-based platform for information-sharing will be established at the beginning of the month of April 2014. All members of the global Reference Group will have access to this website. Country-coordinators will have administrative rights to up-load and delete documents for their respective countries.

Appendix 1  
Study on Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation Work  
Launching Workshop, Uganda  
24-25 March 2014

Country	First Name:	Last Name:	Email	Institution Name	Title/Function
<b>Partner countries</b>					
Benin	Aristide	Djidjoho	<a href="mailto:adjidjoho@gmail.com">adjidjoho@gmail.com</a>	Ministère de l'Evaluation des Politiques Publiques	Directeur Général de l'Evaluation
Cameroon	Ferdinand, Severin	Fokou	<a href="mailto:foksop@yahoo.fr">foksop@yahoo.fr</a>	Ministère du Plan et Développement	Groupe de travail chargé du suivi de la mise en oeuvre de l
Cameroon	Guy	Guemaleu	<a href="mailto:guemaleuguy@yahoo.fr">guemaleuguy@yahoo.fr</a>	Ministère de l'économie de la planification et de l'aménagement du terr	Groupe de travail chargé du suivi de la mise en oeuvre de l
Colombia	James	James Leaver	<a href="mailto:jamesleaver@apccolombia.gov.co">jamesleaver@apccolombia.gov.co</a>	Agence Présidentielle de Coopération (APC)	South-South Cooperation coordinator
Ghana	Nana	Opere-Djan	<a href="mailto:nana.oparedjan@gmail.com">nana.oparedjan@gmail.com</a>	National Development Planning Commission	Director
Malawi	Richard	Zimba	<a href="mailto:rzimba@finance.gov.mw">rzimba@finance.gov.mw</a>	Ministry of Finance	Officer Debt and Aid Management Division
Mali	Mamadou	Dembele Mamadou	<a href="mailto:dembelemamadou@gmail.com">dembelemamadou@gmail.com</a>	Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances	Président à l'Harmonisation de l'Aide
Mozambique	Hanifa	Ibrahim	<a href="mailto:hibrahimo@mpd.gov.mz">hibrahimo@mpd.gov.mz</a>	Ministry of Planning and Development	Head of Department
Mozambique	Orlando	Penicela	<a href="mailto:openicela@mpd.gov.mz">openicela@mpd.gov.mz</a>	Ministry of Planning and Development	Technician
Nepal	Hari	Prasad Pandey	<a href="mailto:hpandey@mof.gov.np">hpandey@mof.gov.np</a>	Ministry of Finance	Under-secretary
Philippines	Rosalina	Almendral	<a href="mailto:RGAlmendral@neda.gov.ph">RGAlmendral@neda.gov.ph</a>	National Economic and Dev. Authority	Chief economist & development specialist
Senegal	Mayacine	Camara	<a href="mailto:camaramayacine@gmail.com">camaramayacine@gmail.com</a>	Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances/UCSPE	Coordonnateur
Uganda	Timothy	Lubanga	<a href="mailto:tklubanga@yahoo.co.uk">tklubanga@yahoo.co.uk</a>	Office of the Prime Minister/ NIMES	Assistant commissioner
Zambia	Shebo	Nalishebo	<a href="mailto:snalishebo@yahoo.com">snalishebo@yahoo.com</a>	Zambia Institute for Policy Analysis & research	Research Fellow
<b>Uganda Delegation</b>					
1	John	Muheirwoha		Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development	
2	Maris	Wanyera		Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development	
3	Richard	Ssewakiryanga		NGO FORUM	
4	Abdul	Muwanika		Evaluation Association	
5	Winnie	Nabiddo Mukisa		Academia/ACODE	Evaluations
<b>EvalNet members</b>					
<b>Agency</b>					
AfDB	Jessica	Kitakule Mukungu	<a href="mailto:J.KITAKULE-MUKUNGU@AFDB.ORG">J.KITAKULE-MUKUNGU@AFDB.ORG</a>	African Development Bank Group (AFDB)	Lead Evaluation Officer
Austria	Simone	Knapp	<a href="mailto:Simone.Knapp@ada.gv.at">Simone.Knapp@ada.gv.at</a>	Department of Development Cooperation	
Denmark	Martin	Bo Brander	<a href="mailto:mabbra@um.dk">mabbra@um.dk</a>	Danish Embassy in Kampala	Deputy Head
Finland	Riitta	Oksanen	<a href="mailto:riitta.oksanen@formin.fi">riitta.oksanen@formin.fi</a>	Ministry for Foreign Affairs	Senior Advisor
France	Claude	Leroy-Themeze	<a href="mailto:Claude.Leroy-themeze@dgtresor.gouv.fr">Claude.Leroy-themeze@dgtresor.gouv.fr</a>	Ministry of Economy and Finance	Head of evaluation unit
Germany-GIZ	Johanna	Pennarz	<a href="mailto:johanna.pennarz@giz.de">johanna.pennarz@giz.de</a>	GIZ	
Ireland	Aine	Hearns	<a href="mailto:aine.hearns@dfa.ie">aine.hearns@dfa.ie</a>	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Deputy director
Ireland	Eric	Thomas	<a href="mailto:erin.thomas@dfa.ie">erin.thomas@dfa.ie</a>	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Intern
UK	David	Rider-Smith	<a href="mailto:d-ridersmith@dfid.gov.uk">d-ridersmith@dfid.gov.uk</a>	Department for International Development	Evaluation Adviser, head of capacity
USA	Rand	Robinson	<a href="mailto:rrobinson@usaid.gov">rrobinson@usaid.gov</a>	USAID	Program Development and Evaluation Officer
World Bank	Ximena	Fernandez-Ordone	<a href="mailto:xfernandezordone@worldbank.org">xfernandezordone@worldbank.org</a>	Independent Evaluation Group	
<b>Assistance team</b>					
Adviser	Niels	Dabelstein	<a href="mailto:dabelstein@telia.com">dabelstein@telia.com</a>		Adviser
Project coordinator 1	Lucien	Bäck	<a href="mailto:lucien.back@particip.com">lucien.back@particip.com</a>		Project coordinator
Project coordinator 2	Ziad	Moussa	<a href="mailto:ziad.moussa@particip.com">ziad.moussa@particip.com</a>		Project coordinator
ADETEF	Paul-Alexis	Berthezene	<a href="mailto:paul-alexis.berthezene@adef.finance.gouv.fr">paul-alexis.berthezene@adef.finance.gouv.fr</a>		Public procurement & PPP department Deputy director
Office of Premier Uganda	Benjamin	Kachero	<a href="mailto:bkachero@gmail.com">bkachero@gmail.com</a>		Economist
	Florence	Mbabazi	<a href="mailto:mba_flo@yahoo.com">mba_flo@yahoo.com</a>		Information systems

## STUDY ON COLLABORATIVE PARTNER-DONOR EVALUATION

### LAUNCHING WORKSHOP AGENDA

**Objectives:**

- Achieve a consensus on objectives and working modalities of the project
- Review draft Terms of Reference (including templates and tools) for country coordinators and adopt the documents for operational use.

**Monday 24 March 2014**

<i>Time</i>	<i>Session</i>	<i>Facilitation</i>
09.00-10.00	Opening, welcome and introductions	Government of Uganda: H.E. Hon. Prof. Tarsis Kabwegyere, Minister for General Duties Management Group (France and Finland)
	Coffee / tea	
10.30-11.30	Introduction to the Study on Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation Presentation (15 minutes) Discussion (45 minutes)	Chair of the Management Group (France)
11.30-12.30	Objectives of the workshop Remarks by the Adviser on Paris Declaration Evaluation process Presentation (30 minutes) of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Analytical Framework of the Project</li> <li>b) ToR country coordinators (with template and tools)</li> </ul> Presentations of evaluation systems in Benin and Uganda Discussion (30 minutes)	Project Coordinators
	Lunch	
14.00-14.30	Introduction to group work on how to study country evaluation systems (with examples from specific partner countries)	Project Coordinators
14.30-16.00	Group work: How to study country evaluation systems (with examples from specific partner countries)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who are important individual actors / which are organizations, networks and mechanisms? Please provide examples.</li> <li>• Where does demand for evaluation come from? Examples?</li> <li>• Please provide examples of competent evaluation services.</li> <li>• Enabling factors (e.g. public interest, utilization etc.)</li> <li>• How to study role / contribution of PDE and other partner-donor evaluations</li> </ul>	3-4 groups (2 English, 1 French) – mix of partner country and donor representatives
16.00-17.30	Presentation of group work	
	Summary with conclusions and recommendations	Project Coordinators

Appendix 2

**Tuesday 25 March 2014**

<i>Time</i>	<i>Session</i>	<i>Facilitation</i>
09.00-09.30	Introduction to group work on how to operationalize country studies	Project Coordinators
09.30-11.00	Group work: How to operationalize country studies? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who is going to do the research and write the report?</li> <li>• Who will be consulted during the research and for comments on the draft report?</li> <li>• What support is required (e.g. locally, from the Project Coordinators etc.)?</li> <li>• Timelines</li> <li>• Examples of challenges?</li> </ul>	3-4 groups (2 English, 1 French)
11.00-12.30	Presentation of group work Summary with conclusions and recommendations	Project coordinators
	Lunch	
14.00-15.30	Amendments to draft ToR (including template and tools) Finalization of the ToR for the country coordinators Operationalization at country level Support expected from Project Coordinators	Project Coordinators
	Coffee/ tea	
16.00-17.00	Summary of conclusions and recommendations and next steps Adoption of ToR country coordinators (including templates and tools) Timelines and communication Management of web-based platform for document sharing (ShareFile)	Project Coordinators
17.00-17.30	Closing Remarks	Management Group (Finland)
17.30	Closing	Government of Uganda: Ms. Christine Guwatudde,

**STUDY ON COLLABORATIVE PARTNER-DONOR EVALUATION**  
**Proceedings of the Launching Workshop**  
**Kampala (Uganda) on 24-25 March 2014**

**List of contents**

<b>1</b>	<b>Opening ceremony .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Session 1: Introduction to the Study on Collaborative Donor-Partner Evaluation .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Session 2: Group work on how to study evaluation systems .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Session 3: Group work on how to operationalize the country studies .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Session 4: Finalization of the TORs of the country coordinators .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Closing ceremony.....</b>	<b>4</b>

**List of abbreviations and acronyms**

ECD	Evaluation Capacity Development
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
PDE	Paris Declaration Evaluation
ToR	Terms of Reference
VOPEs	Voluntary Organizations of Professional Evaluators



## 1 Opening ceremony

The Minister of General Duties at the Prime Minister's Office of the Republic of Uganda, H.E. Hon. Tarsis KABWEGYERE, welcomed the participants in the name of the Government of Uganda and officially opened the workshop. He highlighted that Uganda is at a "take-off" stage, with an average economic growth of 6% over the past 15 years, a solid political commitment to administrative and social reforms and one of the leading countries of Africa in the field of decentralization. A key milestone in the administrative reform was the development of a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system which aims at improving government performance and promoting the use of evaluation information. Hon. KABWEGYERE highlighted the importance of using evaluation findings in order to make informed decisions and as an empowering tool to citizens, because citizens also have a role to play in holding their government accountable.

The chairperson of the Project Management Group, Ms Claude LEROY-THEMEZE (France), provided some opening remarks, explaining that the present initiative builds primarily on the positive dynamics that were observed during the process of the evaluation of the Paris Declaration (PDE) as well as during the subsequent follow-up by EvalNet through the Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD) task team. This follow-up work indicated significant interest in addressing the issue of collaborative partner donor evaluation. The concept note for the present project was approved in June 2013 during the EvalNet meeting. At present some 18 partner countries and 15 donor institutions have committed to the process, in what could constitute a "walk the talk" dynamic learning process post-PDE in order to reinforce the collaboration between donors and partner countries in evaluation, Ms LEROY-THEMEZE concluded.

Project Management Group member Ms Riitta OKSANEN (Finland) reiterated the added value of collaborative donor-partner work around evaluation, noting the emergence of several converging initiatives in that direction, most notably the African Parliamentarians Forum on Development Evaluation which was recently launched during the African Evaluation Association bi-annual meeting in Cameroon in March 2013. Ms OKSANEN expressed her appreciation to the Government of Uganda for hosting the workshop, highlighting the important efforts exerted by Uganda in developing and institutionalizing a national evaluation system, and hoped that the workshop would be a privileged occasion for networking and learning.

## 2 Session 1: Introduction to the Study on Collaborative Donor-Partner Evaluation

The session started with opening remarks from the PDE Coordinator and advisor to the project, Mr. Niels DABELSTEIN (Denmark), who echoed the concern expressed by the Minister that accountability to citizens and the local population has emerged as a key paradigm in the transition from Aid Effectiveness to Development Effectiveness. Mr. DABELSTEIN also pointed out that the current project is by no means a replication of the PDE, but rather a collective capacity building exercise based on the voluntary participation of both donor institutions and partner countries to deepen the learnings from PDE through a learning-by-doing approach. He stressed that apart from a joint framework for mapping the current donor-partner evaluation landscape in participating countries and which is proposed by the project, much of the rest depends on the individual country context and the joint decision of partner countries and donor institutions to engage in joint evaluation work. "Let's Evaluate together", Mr. DABELSTEIN concluded.

Ms Claude LEROY-THEMEZE then provided a comprehensive overview of the genesis of the project, how it was conceptualized and the major milestones for its operationalization. She explained that the main driver behind the project was to set up a light and interactive mechanism that would continue the engagement with the 22 partner countries involved in the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration. EvalNet will serve as a hub for maintaining the partner country network coming out of the PDE, while identifying possible opportunities to further develop joint evaluation work and capacity development. The broader goals of the project are:

1. To create an informal platform for exchange that can encourage and respond to proposals for country-led evaluations and promote joint evaluations
2. To keep donors and partner countries up-to-date on opportunities and practices
3. To find opportunities for learning by doing

4. To link with capacity building and learning initiatives

Ms LEROY-THEMEZE indicated that out of the 22 partner countries who were engaged in the PDE, 18 responded favorably to engage in the present study. Some 15 EvalNet members (bilateral and multilateral agencies and organisations) also expressed their willingness to support the process technically and/or financially as well as globally and/or at the country level.

The second part of the session was dedicated to two case study presentations. Mr. Aristide DJIDJOHO, Director General of Evaluation at the Ministry of Public Policy Evaluation and Denationalization of Benin, presented Benin's impressive institutionalization of evaluation of public policies since 2000. The process involved a) the establishment of an institutional framework for evaluation; b) the adoption of a national evaluation policy; and c) the creation of a national Advisory Body on Evaluation comprising members of government, civil society and the communities of evaluators and academics. Subsequently, Mr. Timothy LUBANGA, Assistant Commissioner for M&E in the Office of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Uganda, gave an introduction to the National Evaluation System and the Government Evaluation Facility. Major achievements since 2004 include the creation of a database profiling all important evaluations, development of evaluation standards in collaboration with the National Evaluation Association, the formulation of a national evaluation policy and networking with partners in other countries.

### 3 Session 2: Group work on how to study evaluation systems

This first working session involving all workshop participants served a dual purpose:

- A “refresher” of the PDE process and stakeholders, especially those of relevance to the present project (actors, organisations, networks, mechanisms, demand, supply etc.) and;
- Information-sharing on current evaluation system dynamics in partner countries, following the case studies on Benin and Uganda which were presented during the first session.

Participants were divided into three working groups (one Francophone and two Anglophone groups) who had to reflect on a set of common questions/challenges.

To the question on **organizations and networks in charge of evaluation at the country level**, participants reflected extensively on the roles of Governmental Institutions, parliamentarians, civil society organizations, citizens, academia and research institutions, national consulting firms specializing in evaluation, as well as the Voluntary Organizations of Professional Evaluators (VOPEs) who play distinct yet complementary roles, although the importance of these roles vary per category of stakeholder depending on the country context. Participants also highlighted the importance of the private sector and which should go beyond its current role as a simple sub-contractor providing services.

To the question on **demand for evaluation** at the national level, participants pointed that demand has been dependent on the emergence of a proper political and economic enabling environment. The structural reforms have also led to a fundamental but also technical demand to learn from experience and improve performance. This is sometimes donor led, sometimes country led and in some cases jointly led. It could constitute very appropriate entry points for the present project. Also to note, the increased demand by the constituencies of donor organizations (and the governments behind them) to show results and impact which is also a favorable driver for demand. It appears also that demand is organically linked to the type of instrument being evaluated. Budget and sector support evaluations are mostly driven by governmental demand, while in donor-led initiatives, demand is mostly generated by donors. Last but not least, it appears that demand has been mostly restricted to monitoring rather than evaluation, although the trend has been changing recently.

To the question on **enabling factors**, in addition to public interest and legal/institutional requirements, participants pointed that the presence of a culture of accountability to results as well as an educational system that favors critical thinking and learning-by-doing could be two important enabling factors. The presence of joint platforms for aid management could also be an enabling factor, if evaluation is mainstreamed into the working agenda of these platforms.

To the question on the **use of evaluation results**, participants highlighted the need for a paradigm shift that stresses the learning dimension of evaluation instead of evaluation being perceived as an audit exercise. Greater efforts are hence needed to communicate about the importance and the added value of evaluation. Use also depends on the presence of mechanisms (and willingness) to make evaluation

results public. There has been an increasing trend in partner countries of NGOs and civil society organizations playing a watchdog role and being one of the main drivers for utilization.

And to the last question on **promising entry points** for the present study, participants recommended making strategic decisions with regards to the choice of countries, sectors and topics that could potentially give the best “return on investment”. They also noted the presence of joint management mechanisms in some sectors (such as the health sector in Uganda), or the annual rolling plans for the evaluation directorates in Francophone Africa to which joint evaluation could be an added value.

#### 4 Session 3: Group work on how to operationalize the country studies

The third session of the workshop was dedicated to the operationalization of country studies, mainly through the review of the ToRs of Country Coordinators from a practical perspective, identifying resources available to conduct the studies, stakeholders to be consulted, the type of support required as well as the challenges that might come along the way.

A set of guiding questions was discussed in the same format of the previous session (one Francophone and two Anglophone groups) which came up with the following conclusions and recommendations.

To the question on **who is going to do the research and write the reports**, participants indicated that in some countries, national evaluation plans and budgets have been developed and approved at the beginning of the year leaving very little flexibility to incorporate new tasks or mobilize resources that have not been previously accounted for. In some other countries, such plans are currently under preparation and discussion and will start only in July, which risks to delay the study. In that regard almost all country coordinators advocated for entrusting the drafting process to a local consultant and/or firm who will be working under the supervision of the country coordinators

With respect to **who will be consulted in the process**, there was a consensus that primary stakeholders are the units in charge of evaluation and/or aid coordination within various governmental structures and priority should be given to involving existing joint coordination structures working with these units, with – if needed – some lobbying to put evaluation on the agenda of these joint coordination structures. Primary stakeholders should be assisted by an informal working group and/or advisory or steering committee who should be nominated during the early stages of the preparation. The stakeholders mentioned in the previous session (governments, donors, academia, think tanks, civil society organizations, private firms and national evaluation associations) should be involved in the process. These stakeholders could be mobilized at two key moments in the life of the project, namely during a public kick-off workshop to initiate the process and a closing workshop to validate and disseminate the findings, as well as timely contributions in between. If there are no financial incentives to these stakeholders (and there will be probably none) it is very important that country coordinators highlight the added value of the learning from the process as well as the professional recognition that the contribution of these stakeholders will entail.

With respect to the **type of support is required**, there was again a consensus that it will be very difficult to mobilize financial resources for the consultants/firms undertaking the study. Three possible sources of support were identified:

1. Country coordinators should try and seek if it is possible still (with some acrobatics) to mobilize resources from national budgets
2. If the first option is not feasible, they should try and approach possible donors interested in supporting evaluation in general and joint evaluation work in particular within their own countries. The Management Group can back-up their quest with the needed support letters and contact. For example, the Spanish Cooperation Agency has agreed to support Colombia and Bolivia technically and financially in undertaking the study.
3. Should the second option fail, then the Management Group might have some limited resources available that are derived from the savings realized on the launching workshop in Kampala, the mobilization of the contingency funds and some re-engineering of the funds earmarked for the synthesis workshop.

There were also suggestions to engage in a peer review during the process by countries with comparable setting, as well as a suggestion for a regional consolidation and review once the country studies are completed (Francophone Africa, Anglophone Africa, Asia, Latin America & the Pacific, ...)

With respect to **timelines**, and after thorough discussions, it was agreed to devote the months of April, May and June 2014 to preparatory work and have all draft studies ready for quality assurance and possibly peer reviews by the end of July 2014. Reports can then be finalized during August-September with the synthesis workshop planned in October 2014. During the months of November / December 2014, a Collaborative Partner Donor Agreement could be finalized.

With respect to the **challenges that might be encountered** along the process, participants mentioned some administrative challenges (nomination of the right country coordinator from the right administrative service, securing the approval of the hierarchy, mobilizing resources timely and successfully, etc...), technical challenges (mobilization of the right expertise, meeting the tight calendar for the study, finding enough evidence and producing the right material, ...) to more fundamental challenges such as stakeholder motivation, generating demand at the national level and the use of results. Last but not least, some operational challenges were also mentioned such as the national elections (in Zambia) and Ramadan (which falls in July this year).

### 5 Session 4: Finalization of the TORs of the country coordinators

The Session was devoted to the finalization of the Terms of Reference of the country coordinators based on a draft presented by Project Coordinators. The main workshop report contains a summary of issues raised, to which the final version responds.

### 6 Closing ceremony

On the behalf of the Management Group, Ms Riitta OKSANEN reiterated the Group's full commitment to support the country coordinators and to help them overcoming any difficulties they might face. She also mentioned that the Government of Finland has a keen interest in collaborative evaluations with partner countries and the benefits they may bring in changing donor attitudes.

The Permanent Secretary of the Office of the Prime Minister, Ms. Christine GUWATUDDE KINTU, then addressed the participants, highlighting the big changes that are currently underway in the global aid architecture, for this aid to become more relevant and effective. In that regard, the Government of Uganda is deeply committed to evaluation and very emphatic on the use of evaluation to consolidate the reforms that the country is undertaking. After this statement, she declared the workshop closed.