



## **ROOM DOCUMENT 3**

# **DAC Network on Development Evaluation**

### **FOLLOW UP TO THE JOINT EVALUATION OF GENERAL BUDGET SUPPORT**

This note has been submitted by the UK for consideration at the fifth meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation.



**5th meeting  
16 – 17 November 2006**

## **Follow up to the Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support**

Note submitted by the UK for consideration at the fifth meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation.

### **Background**

1. The Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support (1994—2004) was published in May 2006. The evaluation, the most comprehensive evaluation of General Budget Support undertaken, was the first independent evidence-based evaluation of budget support across several countries. It was undertaken on behalf of 24 donors and 7 partner countries (Burkina Faso, Malawi, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Rwanda, Uganda and Vietnam). The Report provides recommendations on a range of policy and operational issues.

### **Preliminary Follow-up to the Evaluation**

#### **Dissemination Conference (9/10 May 2006)**

2. The GBS report was initially presented at a Policy-makers Dissemination Conference (9-10 May 2006, Paris) hosted by the OECD and with participation from a wide range of donor and partner countries and representatives of civil society. The meeting was held to disseminate and discuss the findings of the evaluation; to mark the handover of the work to the policy-making community; and to discuss recommendations from the work which would improve the effectiveness of budget support. The Forum recognised that follow-up action would be necessary within donor agencies and partner countries, and through the work of a number of DAC committees (including the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness, the Working Party on Statistics, the Governance Network, and the Joint Ventures on Results and on PFM).

3. Participants at the dissemination conference recommended that it would be useful to undertake a **stock-take of follow-up to the evaluation** within two to three years. Collation of both joint and individual agency management responses could be used as the basis for future analytical work and review, and to assist Members with effective implementation of the evaluation's recommendations.

#### **The DAC and the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness**

4. The GBS evaluation was subsequently considered at a meeting of the DAC on 19 May, and at the DAC Working Party on Aid Effectiveness on 5-7 July 2006. At both meetings, participants expressed strong appreciation of the evaluation. A number of DAC members noted that their budget support policy would be updated.

#### **Survey of DAC members' management responses to the Evaluation**

5. The May 2006 Dissemination Conference, the DAC meeting and the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness supported the proposal that the Evaluation Network should undertake a follow-up exercise to collate members' management responses to the evaluation, and to monitor delivery against the commitments set out in the

management responses. This proposed work has been included in the DAC Network on Development Evaluation draft programme of work for 2007-08.

6. As the country which led the GBS evaluation, the UK is willing to take an active or lead role in this process, and would welcome suggestions for a joint monitoring process. Member countries might be asked to submit their management responses to the evaluation by the end of December 2006. It is suggested that a first review of progress against the management responses be undertaken by the end of 2007. This could be followed by a further review in 2008, as appropriate, in view of preliminary findings.

### **Review of GBS Evaluation Methodology**

7. The GBS evaluation is acknowledged as a leading example of a complex theory-based evaluation. A Note on the Approach and Methods used for the evaluation is currently being prepared by the consultants (led by Stephen Lister of Mokoro consultants, in association with the University of Birmingham), and this will shortly be available to Network members for comment.

8. A number of practical issues were also identified in the process and these have helped to inform the Network 'Working Paper on Joint Evaluations: Recent Experiences, Lessons Learned and Options for the Future', and the 2006 'DAC Guidance for Managing Joint Evaluations'. Some particular issues to be highlighted in the final 'Note on Approaches and Methods' include: the need for early clarity on the relative remits and responsibilities of the management group, steering group and the consultants; the need for a single long-term chair for the evaluation; clarity in advance about the range of products required; acknowledgement of the value of undertaking pilot studies; and the need for agreed grievance procedures at the outset of a major evaluation.