PARTENAIRES EN EVALUATION DU DEVELOPPEMENT
- APPRENDRE ET RENDRE COMPTE -

Actes de l'atelier

Atelier organisé par la France et le Réseau de l'évaluation du développement auprès du CAD

Paris, 25-26 mars 2003

Ministère de l'économie, des finances et de l'industrie
Centre de conférences « Pierre Mendès-France »
139, rue de Bercy
PARIS (12ème arrondissement)

PARTNERS IN DEVELOPPEMENT EVALUATION

- LEARNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Workshop proceedings

A workshop organised
by France and the DAC Network on Development Evaluation

Paris, 25-26 March 2003

Ministère de l'économie, des finances et de l'industrie
Centre de conférences « Pierre Mendès-France »
139, rue de Bercy
PARIS (12ème arrondissement)

Sommaire

Summary

PROLOGUE

Les présents actes ont été établis par l'unité "Evaluation des actions de développement" du Ministère de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie avec l'appui du Secrétariat du CAD et de Sylvie Robert, consultante, sur la base du verbatim réalisé par le Cabinet Scribe-net.

Reflétant aussi fidèlement que possible ces deux journées, ils utilisent le français et l'anglais en fonction de la langue utilisée par les différents orateurs.

Ils trouvent leur complément dans les contributions écrites des intervenants qui figurent sur le site de l'atelier : http://www.minefi.gouv.fr/TRESOR/cicid/atelier/accueil.htm .

PROLOGUE

These proceedings have been established by the Development Activities Evaluation Unit, Ministry of the Economy, Finances and Industry with the help of the DAC Secretariat and of Sylvie Robert, consultant, on the basis of the verbatim made by the Cabinet Scribe-net.

Trying to reflect these two days as faithfully as possible, they use French and English according to the language used by each speaker.

They are complemented by the written contributions which can be found on the Workshop website http://www.minefi.gouv.fr/TRESOR/cicid/atelier/home.htm.

SYNTHÈSE & ENSEIGNEMENTS

M. Daniel Kamelgarn

Responsable de l'unité évaluation des activités de développement, Ministère français de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie

L'atelier, qui s'est tenu les 25 et 26 mars 2003 au Ministère de l'Economie, de l'Industrie et des Finances français à Paris, a été co-organisé avec le Groupe de travail sur l'évaluation de l'aide auprès du CAD (qui s'appelle désormais Réseau de l'évaluation du développement). Il tient son origine dans des demandes émanant d'organisations non-membres du CAD et désireuses de partager les réflexions de ce Réseau.

Près de 300 évaluateurs ou gestionnaires de l'évaluation de l'aide se sont ainsi retrouvés à Paris pendant deux jours. Ils venaient de quarante-trois pays différents dont dix-huit de l'hémisphère Sud. Les cent quatre-vingt organisations ainsi représentées constituent les trois constellations de l'évaluation :

- La communauté des bailleurs de fonds : administrations d'aides bilatérales, institutions financières de développement, organisations des Nations-Unies,
- Les organisations de la société civile : ONG (organisations non gouvernementales), fondations privées, organisations syndicales et professionnelles,
- Les pays bénéficiaires de l'aide dans leur différentes composantes : administration, société civile, …

Cet atelier a permis à différents professionnels de l'évaluation de se rencontrer, de se connaître, et d'échanger sur des sujets et des préoccupations d'intérêt commun. C'est la première fois qu'un tel échange s'effectuait à cette échelle. Pour cette seule raison, cet atelier constitue déjà un succès. L'importance de cette participation et le grand nombre de pays représentés témoignent de l'intérêt croissant qui est porté à l'évaluation de l'aide. En particulier, la participation d'une cinquantaine de personnes venant des pays de l'hémisphère Sud montre que l'évaluation commence à véritablement s'implanter dans ces pays et que les efforts en matière de renforcement des capacités en évaluation portent leur fruit. La participation massive des organisations de la société civile et la qualité de leurs interventions démontrent plus encore que l'évaluation est devenue une pratique courante dans ces organisations : l'évaluation de leurs activités n'a pas (ou plus) seulement pour objectif de répondre aux attentes de leurs bailleurs de fonds, les travaux qu'elles réalisent participent aussi et surtout de leur volonté de se rendre plus efficaces, plus efficientes et enfin plus transparentes vis-à-vis du public.

Ainsi que l'a rappelé, dans son discours d'ouverture, M. Francis Mer, le Ministre de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie de la France, l'évaluation de l'aide doit contribuer non seulement à améliorer l'efficacité de l'aide en rendant compte de ce qui est fait et en aidant à en tirer les enseignements, mais aussi à créer les conditions favorables à son augmentation car "*plus nous serons tous convaincus que nous savons de manière efficace mettre en oeuvre et mesurer les impacts de notre aide, plus nous aurons le courage et l'audace d'augmenter cette aide*". Accroître l'audience de l'évaluation en élargissant la base de ceux qui y participent concourt également à ce double objectif. C'est aussi répondre à un souci et à une demande légitime des parties prenantes de l'aide, tant il est vrai que, comme l'a dit Rob D. van den Berg, Président du Réseau de l'évaluation du CAD, accroître le partenariat dans l'aide suppose de l'accroître dans l'évaluation de cet aide.

Au cours des deux journées, un grand nombre de sujets a été abordé au cours de quatre sessions.

1. Les pratiques évaluatives par type de communauté

La première session a permis aux bailleurs de fonds et aux organisations de la société civile de présenter leurs activités et pratiques. Chacune des trois communautés de bailleurs de fonds possède déjà son réseau au sein duquel leurs membres échangent sur leurs pratiques, ce qui favorise une certaine harmonisation. Les présidents de ces trois réseaux (Réseau de l'évaluation du développement du CAD, Evaluation Cooperation Group et United Nations Inter Agency Working Group on Evaluation) ont pu dresser le tableau des activités de leurs membres, des principaux sujets de préoccupation actuels et des orientations futures. S'agissant des organisations de la société civile, qui ne disposent pas de tels réseaux au niveau international mais qui ont dans certains pays des instances de concertation, trois présentations ont été faites qui ont permis d'exposer les pratiques de ces organisations en Grande Bretagne, en Norvège et en France. Au cours des discussions qui ont suivi, certaines ONG internationales et des représentants des pays bénéficiaires ont pu compléter ce tableau en présentant leurs propres pratiques. Des réseaux de professionnels de l'évaluation se mettent en place dans les pays bénéficiaires, y compris à une échelle internationale (notamment l'International Development Evaluation Association, IDEAS) et peuvent être amenés à améliorer l'échange et l'amélioration des pratiques.

Il apparaît ainsi que les pratiques évaluatives sont devenues courantes dans chaque communauté, avec des similitudes et des questionnements communs mais aussi des différences dues aux objectifs particuliers poursuivis par chaque catégorie d'organisation. Ainsi les ONG sont plus participatives dans leurs pratiques et sans doute plus intéressées par la fonction d'apprentissage de l'évaluation alors que les bailleurs de fonds s'interrogent davantage sur l'amélioration des performances et l'efficacité de l'aide et insistent plus sur la fonction de redevabilité.

Cette matinée a aussi mis en évidence le besoin de mieux connaître les pratiques des uns et des autres sans toutefois que cela doive conduire à des standards uniformes en matière de pratiques d'évaluation.

2. Quelques problématiques et défis actuels

La deuxième session a permis d'échanger en sous-groupes sur quelques problématiques et défis actuels du développement et de l'évaluation : l'évaluation participative, l'évaluation de l'impact (notamment social), les modalités d'internalisation (ou d'appropriation) des résultats de l'évaluation, et l'évaluation de l'aide humanitaire et de l'assistance en situation de conflit.

- **S'agissant d'évaluation participative**, l'atelier a d'abord mis en évidence la richesse et le foisonnement au sein des ONG de ces pratiques qui visent à impliquer les bénéficiaires au processus d'évaluation. Ce type d'évaluation présente des avantages au regard de quatre critères qui influent sur leur qualité : l'accessibilité au public, la crédibilité, l'utilisation des résultats et enfin l'efficience. Les discussions et exposés ont également montré que les évaluations participatives nécessitaient une approche très structurée et beaucoup d'expertise pour être menées à bien. Autre idée émise et que j'aimerais retenir : la participation des parties prenantes (*stakeholders*) n'est pas obligatoire à toutes les étapes du processus évaluatif et le caractère participatif d'une évaluation peut se focaliser sur l'une ou l'autre étape ; ce pourra être la conception dans certain cas ou l'exécution dans d'autres ; il est clair cependant que la participation à la définition des termes de référence d'une évaluation est essentielle.

- **L'évaluation de l'impact, en particulier social,** a été abordée à travers trois études de cas qui ont mis en évidence la difficulté méthodologique d'appréhension de cet aspect essentiel de l'évaluation. L'impact concerne toutes les parties prenantes du développement, et pas seulement les pays bénéficiaires de l'aide. Il en résulte une difficulté à concevoir des indicateurs, tâche à laquelle de nombreux travaux sont actuellement consacrés, et la nécessaire précaution qui doit être apportée à leur utilisation. Le travail effectué par le Réseau du CAD sur la gestion axée sur les résultats et les critères de sélection des indicateurs a suscité l'intérêt des participants, même s'il s'agit d'une réflexion qui n'est pas encore achevée.

- **L'appropriation (ou internalisation) des résultats de l'évaluation** est au cœur de la fonction d'apprentissage, tant au niveau de la formulation des politiques que de la structure des organisations. L'appropriation des résultats sera d'autant plus aisée que le processus de l'évaluation aura intégré cet objectif dès l'origine. Trois expériences ont été exposées par une organisation syndicale philippine, qui avec l'appui d'une ONG danoise s'est développée en intégrant les acquis de l'évaluation, un ONG internationale, qui a modifié sa structure de gestion en y introduisant l'apprentissage, et un fonds britannique destiné à réduire la marginalisation des pauvres. Chacune a montré que l'évaluation peut constituer un puissant levier de changement et d'amélioration des pratiques lorsque l'appropriation et la dissémination des résultats sont correctement pensées.

  D'autres idées force ont aussi été émises : a) l'évaluation interne et l'auto-évaluation comme moyen pour se préparer à l'évaluation externe et la rendre constructive ; b) l'évaluation ne doit pas occulter que le développement est un processus qui ne s'apprécie pas uniquement à travers les résultats des projets ; c) capitaliser l'apprentissage d'une façon systématique et homogène pour qu'il ne soit pas seulement individuel mais collectif ; d) choisir des évaluateurs ayant une capacité de médiation et de négociation.

- **L'évaluation de l'aide humanitaire** s'est développée au début des années quatre-vingt dix. La meta-évaluation réalisée et exposée par ANALP et les débats qui ont suivi ont montré que ce type d'aide requiert des modalités d'évaluation différentes de celles des projets de développement. En l'occurrence, la question de savoir ce qui s'est effectivement passé apparaît souvent première par rapport à la recherche des causes de succès ou d'échec.

3. La redevabilité ou le "rendre compte"

La troisième session était consacrée à l'une des fonctions majeures de l'évaluation, à savoir sa fonction de redevabilité ou du "rendre compte". Toutes les formes d'organisation sont confrontées à cette exigence de redevabilité, que ce soient les bailleurs de fonds bi ou multilatéraux ou les ONG, même si elle ne s'exprime pas toujours de la même façon et si les réponses apportées sont par conséquent différentes. En outre, l'évaluation n'est pas le seul moyen de répondre à cette exigence : ainsi les organisations caritatives qui doivent rendre des comptes à leurs donateurs ont développé des chartes et des critères de comportement et de transparence (dans les domaines financier et commercial en particulier) ; dans le cas d'une administration publique comme la France, le contrôle parlementaire s'exerce également sur les activités d'aide.

Le cadre de suivi-évaluation mis au point par l'ONUSIDA est impressionnant : 189 pays ont signé un engagement commun de suivi des actions entreprises au niveau national. Ce cadre repose sur un nombre limité d'indicateurs, aisément disponibles, qui s'appliquent aux différentes étapes du processus et qui répondent aux besoins de suivi aux niveaux à la fois global et national.

Enfin, Robert Picciotto, directeur du Global Policy Project, a justement rappelé que l'exigence de redevabilité questionnait l'ensemble des politiques publiques et leur impact sur les pays pauvres. Ainsi l'aide au développement (mais aussi d'autres politiques des pays développés telles que la politique commerciale, etc.) ne devrait pas rendre des comptes uniquement à ses commanditaires du Nord mais porterait aussi une responsabilité plus large vis-à-vis des bénéficiaires de cet aide. Les modalités d'exercice de ce contrôle restent toutefois à inventer.

La redevabilité des ONG vis-à-vis de leurs bailleurs de fonds pose des questions spécifiques. L'expérience australienne est particulièrement stimulante parce qu'elle repose sur la mise au point d'indicateurs qui ont fait l'objet d'un choix et d'une discussion entre les ONG et l'agence gouvernementale. Mais si les ONG ont à rendre compte de la façon dont elles ont conduit leurs actions, il faut qu'elles puissent le faire de leur propre manière et en préservant leur autonomie.

4. Améliorer la collaboration et renforcer les capacités d'évaluation

La quatrième et dernière session a conclu sur les moyens d'améliorer la collaboration entre les différentes communautés de l'évaluation et de renforcer les capacités d'évaluation.

Les capacités d'évaluation se sont incontestablement renforcées dans les pays bénéficiaires au cours des dernières années, notamment grâce et à travers la mise en place de réseaux, comme ceux soutenus par l'UNICEF. Elles se sont aussi développées au sein des ONG, petites et grandes dans les pays développés grâce à des fonds de soutien et d'appui tels que le F3E en France.

Ce qui est frappant s'agissant de collaboration, c'est à la fois le foisonnement d'expériences entre les différentes parties prenantes du développement et la demande insistante de la part des bénéficiaires de l'aide et des organisations de la société civile d'être considérés davantage comme des partenaires à part entière par les bailleurs de fonds. Il y a une demande de réciprocité et de partenariat. Dès lors, les évaluations conjointes devraient tenir compte des préoccupations des uns et des autres et n'être pas seulement des exercices auxquels sont invités les partenaires. Comme l'a montré le Professeur Chen Zhaoying, la perspective actuelle reste encore celle des donateurs et il reste du chemin à parcourir pour que les évaluations soient véritablement conçues du double point de vue du bailleur de fonds et du récipiendaire.

Ainsi que l'a rappelé le directeur général de l'Agence française de développement, Jean-Michel Severino, l'évaluation n'est pas un processus technocratique mais un processus social et l'ingénierie sociale de ce processus reste à parfaire. En particulier, les évaluations, dites conjointes, doivent être sérieusement repensées dans leur méthodologie pour devenir de véritables exercices partenariaux. On pourrait également dire qu'il convient de passer de l'évaluation de l'aide à celle du développement, selon la formule de Rob D. van den Berg.

*

*   *

*

Certains de ces sujets n'ont parfois été qu'effleurés, ce qui a suscité le désir d'approfondir les discussions. Cette première rencontre a créé des attentes et fait émerger des idées ; en cela, elle apparaît davantage comme le début de ce qui pourrait être une nouvelle étape dans l'évaluation de l'aide et du développement.

Ce qui est d'abord apparu au cours de ces journées c'est le désir mutuel d'échanger ; c'est aussi la quantité d'expériences méconnues des uns et des autres, par exemple le développement récent mais important des pratiques d'évaluation au sein des ONG ou encore les progrès faits dans ce domaine par les pays bénéficiaires de l'aide.

En second lieu, une attente s'est faite jour de collaboration sur un pied d'égalité entre les différentes communautés. Certains représentants des ONG ont été sensibles au fait d'être considérés comme des partenaires à part entière au cours de cet atelier, ce qui a assuré son bon déroulement. Cela tient aussi au fait que ces institutions ont atteint un niveau de maturité qui rend possible et désormais incontournable cette parité. Il semble que le principal enseignement de ces journées, du point de vue des bailleurs de fonds, est la nécessité de renouveler la manière de procéder à l'évaluation en favorisant et développant la collaboration avec les autres institutions impliquées dans l'aide au développement et avec les bénéficiaires de l'aide eux-mêmes. Deux mots pourraient conduire ce renouvellement : partenariat et réciprocité. Il y a une attente, il y a une nécessité, il y a une exigence.

Enfin, il me paraît important de rappeler que, si l'évaluation a deux objectifs principaux, rendre compte et apprendre, elle ne doit pas perdre de vue qu'elle participe également à la promotion du développement au sein de nos sociétés.

SUMMARY & LEARNING

Daniel Kamelgarn

Head of the Development Evaluation Unit
Ministry of the Economy, Finance, and Industry

The workshop held in Paris on 25 and 26 March 2003 at the French Ministry of the Economy, Finance, and Industry has been arranged in collaboration with the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation (renamed since the Network on Development Evaluation). This workshop was organised following requests from non-DAC members to be included in the Network's thought processes.

Approximately 300 evaluation managers and specialists from 43 different countries, including 18 from the developing world, gathered in Paris for two days. The 180 organisations thus represented encompassed the three types of partners that conduct such evaluations:

- The donor community: bilateral aid agencies, development banks, and United Nations organisations;
- Civil-society organisations: NGOs (non-governmental organisations), private foundations, trade unions and trade organisations;
- Various components of aid beneficiary countries: authorities, civil society, etc.

The workshop allowed various evaluation professionals to meet, get to know each other, and discuss topics and concerns of common interest. Never before has this type of exchange taken place on such a broad scale: for that reason alone, the workshop was already a success. The high participation rate and the large number of countries in attendance are proof of the growing interest in aid evaluation. Specifically, the participation of approximately 50 representatives from emerging countries shows that evaluation has started to become an established practice in these countries and that efforts to enhance evaluation capacity are producing results. The massive participation of organisations from civil society and the quality of their presentations clearly demonstrates that the evaluation of aid has become common practice amongst such organisations. The sole objective in evaluating their activities is not – or is no longer – limited to meeting donor expectations; the studies undertaken by these organisations underscore their willingness to become more effective, efficient, and transparent in the eyes of the public.

As Francis Mer, French Minister of the Economy, Finance, and Industry, reiterated in his opening speech, the evaluation of aid must help improve the effectiveness of aid through accountability for the actions undertaken and through the lessons drawn, but must also foster conditions for increasing aid, given that, *"The more we are all convinced that we have effective ways of implementing and measuring the impact of the aid we give, the more we shall have the* *courage and boldness to increase the amount we give."* This double objective can also be met by increasing an evaluation's audience via the expansion of its participant base. The latter also provides a response both to the concerns expressed by aid stakeholders and their legitimate requests. As stated by Rob D. van den Berg, Chair of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, increasing aid partnership presupposes increasing the partnership of those involved in aid evaluation.

Many topics were discussed during the four sessions of the two-day workshop.

1. Evaluation practices according to community

During the first session, donors and civil-society organisations presented their activities and practices. Each of the three donor communities already has a network through which its members discuss their various practices, fostering a certain degree of harmonisation. The chairs of the three networks (the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, the Evaluation Cooperation Group, and the United Nations Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation) drew up an account of their members' activities, their current preoccupations, and their future directions. While civil-society organisations do not have such networks at their disposal on an international level, they have established consultative bodies in certain countries; accordingly, three presentations were given outlining the practices of these organisations in the United Kingdom, Norway, and France. During ensuing discussions, various international NGOs and representatives of beneficiary countries complemented the foregoing reports by giving accounts of their own practices. Networks of evaluation professionals are being established in beneficiary countries as well as internationally (in particular, via IDEAS – the International Development Evaluation Association); these can help improve the exchange and development of best practices.

It therefore appears that evaluation practices have become widespread within each community, with similarities and common questions as well as differences due to the specific objectives pursued in each category. For example, NGOs have more participatory practices and a greater interest, presumably, in the learning aspect of evaluation, whereas donors tend to focus more on the question of improving aid performance and effectiveness while emphasising the notion of accountability.

The morning session also highlighted the need for everyone to become more familiar with each other's practices while avoiding the creation of uniform standards in terms of evaluation.

2. Current issues and challenges

During the second session, subgroups discussed various issues and current challenges in the areas of development and evaluation: participatory evaluation, evaluation of aid impact (especially at the social level), ways and means of internalising (or owning) evaluation results, and the evaluation of humanitarian or conflict-related assistance.

- **In terms of participatory evaluation**, the workshop underscored the richness and profusion of NGO practices aimed at involving aid beneficiaries in the evaluation process. This type of evaluation presents advantages in terms of the four criteria that influence the quality of evaluation: access to the public, credibility, use of results, and efficiency. The discussions and presentations also revealed that participatory evaluations require a very structured approach and a high level of expertise in order to be successfully carried out. Another idea raised, and one worth retaining, is the notion that stakeholder participation is not compulsory at each step of the evaluation process. The participatory approach of the evaluation can focus on either step: on the design phase in some cases and on implementation in other situations. However, participation in the definition of the evaluation's terms of reference is clearly essential.

- **The evaluation of aid impact, particularly on the social level,** was approached via three case studies highlighting the methodological difficulties involved in defining this essential aspect of the evaluation process. Aid has an impact on all stakeholders in development and not just on the countries benefiting from the aid. As a result, it is difficult to establish indicators (a task that is currently the focus of many studies), and it is also essential to exercise caution when using such indicators. The work carried out by the DAC Network on performance-based management and indicator-selection criteria was of great interest to participants, although the thought processes regarding these aspects have not yet been concluded.

- **The ways and means of internalising evaluation results** lie at the heart of the learning process, in terms of both the formulation of policies and the structure of organisations. The internalisation is facilitated when the evaluation process integrates this objective from the start. Three organisations presented their experiences, including a Filipino trade union organisation (supported by a Danish NGO) that experienced growth through integration of the lessons of the evaluation; an international NGO that modified its management structure by adding the notion of learning; and a British fund fighting to decrease the exclusion of the poor. Each organisation demonstrated how evaluation could become a powerful lever for changing and improving practices provided that the internalisation and circulation of results is undertaken properly.

  Other pertinent ideas were voiced: a) internal evaluation and self-evaluation can be a preparation for external evaluation and a means of making it constructive; b) evaluation must not obscure the notion that development is a process and cannot be assessed exclusively on project results; c) learning should be capitalised in a systematic and uniform manner so as to ensure that it is an individual as well as a collective endeavour; and d) evaluators should be selected with an eye to their skills in mediation and negotiation.

- **Evaluation of humanitarian assistance** was developed in the early 1990s. Assessments of evaluations carried out and presented by ALNAP, as well as the debates that ensued, demonstrate that this type of assistance requires evaluation policies that differ from those required by development projects. The question of what took place often seems to take precedence over an examination of the reasons for success or failure.

3. <u>Accountability</u>

The third session concentrated on one of the main functions of evaluation: accountability. From bilateral and multilateral donors to NGOs, all organisations must contend with the demand for accountability, although this requirement does not always appear in the same form and the responses to it are various. Moreover, evaluation is not the only way to satisfy this requirement: charitable organisations, which are accountable to their donors, have created charters and criteria that focus on performance and transparency (particularly in the financial and commercial areas), whereas in public administrations like that of France, parliamentary control can be exercised over aid activities.

UNAIDS has established an impressive framework for monitoring evaluations: 189 countries have signed a joint agreement for the monitoring of actions launched at the international level. This framework is based on a limited number of readily accessible indicators that can be applied to the different steps of the process and which meet monitoring requirements in both global and national terms.

In addition, Robert Picciotto, Director of the Global Policy Project, reminded us that providing accountability entails an examination of all public policies and their impact on poor countries. Accordingly, development assistance (as well as other policies in developed countries, such as trade policies) should not simply be accountable to sponsors from the developed world, but should bear an even greater responsibility toward aid beneficiaries. The terms for exercising this level of monitoring have yet to be established.

The accountability of NGOs to their donors raises specific questions. The Australian experience is particularly thought provoking, as it relies on the establishment of indicators selected and discussed jointly by the NGOs and the government agency concerned. However, if NGOs are to account for the manner in which they conduct their actions, they must be allowed to exercise this accountability in their own manner, without losing their autonomy.

4. <u>Enhancing collaboration and evaluation capacity</u>

The fourth and final session concluded the workshop with an examination of ways in which to enhance collaboration between the various evaluation communities and to enhance evaluation capacity.

Evaluation capacity has undeniably improved in beneficiary countries during the last few years through the establishment of networks such as those supported by UNICEF. It has also developed within both large and small NGOs in developed countries through assistance and support funds, such as the F3E in France.

The most striking aspects of collaboration involve the range of experiences represented by the various development stakeholders and the pressing insistence of aid beneficiaries and civil-society organisations to be considered full partners by donors – in short, their demand for reciprocity and partnership. As such, joint evaluations should take into account the preoccupations of all those involved rather than remaining exercises to which partner countries are merely invited. As Professor Chen Zhaoying has pointed out, the current perspective remains that of the donor, and much work remains to be done before evaluations are genuinely perceived as representing the viewpoint of both donor and recipient.

As Jean-Michel Severino, Director-General of the French Development Agency, has stressed, evaluation is not a technocratic process but rather a social one, though the social engineering of this process remains to be perfected. In particular, so-called joint evaluations must be carefully rethought in terms of their methodology if they are to become true exercises in partnership. It might also be said – to echo the words of Rob D. van den Berg – that the time has come for moving from the evaluation of aid to the evaluation of development.

*

*   *

*

Certain workshop topics were only lightly touched upon, giving rise to the need for further discussion. This first meeting has created expectations and generated new ideas, however, and in that respect may represent a new step in the evaluation of aid and development.

What was most striking during these sessions was the shared desire for dialogue and an awareness of the broad range of experience yet to be fully drawn upon – the recent yet significant development of evaluation practices in NGOs and the progress achieved in this domain by aid beneficiary countries, for instance.

Secondly, an expectation has arisen regarding the implementation of collaborative, equal-terms relationships amongst the various communities. There were several NGO representatives who expressed their appreciation at being treated as full-fledged partners during the workshop, a degree of respect that in turn guaranteed the event's success. This development can also be attributed to the level of maturity that these organisations have attained, progress that renders such parity both possible and essential. From the donor viewpoint, the main lesson to be drawn from the meeting is that it is necessary for donors to overhaul their approach to the evaluation process by promoting and developing cooperation with the other institutions involved in development assistance as well as with the beneficiaries themselves. Two terms come to mind that might guide such overhaul: partnership and reciprocity. Such changes are expected, fundamental and necessary.

Finally, although the two main objectives of evaluation are accountability and learning, it is important to recall that evaluation of aid practices also helps promote development within our own societies.

INTRODUCTION

Discours de bienvenue

M. Francis Mer

Ministre français de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie

Bonjour,

J'ai tenu à ouvrir votre atelier de travail pour montrer l'importance que le gouvernement français, et plus particulièrement ce Ministère, attache à vos travaux.

Je crois avoir compris que c'est la première fois qu'il y a autant de monde dans une salle pour essayer de travailler sur ce sujet majeur qu'est celui de l'évaluation de l'aide. Il est clair que dans ce domaine, comme dans tout autre domaine, la notion d'évaluation, la notion de quantification, de qualification, sont des notions importantes pour qu'ensemble nous rendions compte de l'intérêt de ce que nous faisons et de l'efficacité de la manière dont nous travaillons.

Il y a dans cette salle beaucoup de monde :

- 40 Etats et agences d'aide des pays de l'OCDE ;
- Des représentants des pays accédant à l'Union Européenne ;
- 15 agences des Nations Unies ;
- Les banques de développement multilatérales ;
- Le Fonds Monétaire International ;
- Et de nombreux représentants de la société civile, que ce soient des ONG internationales ou plus ciblées sur un pays, des fondations privées, des organisations syndicales dont je tiens à saluer l'implication même si elle est plus récente car je crois que le sujet que vous allez traiter, le sujet de l'aide et de l'efficacité de cette aide, est un sujet majeur qui doit impliquer la totalité des parties prenantes de notre monde économique ;
- Il y a bien sûr des professionnels de l'évaluation de l'hémisphère Sud avec des représentants venant de l'Afrique et de l'Amérique latine ; je remercie les coopérations qui les ont soutenus.

Je ne terminerai pas cette présentation sans remercier tous ceux qui directement ou indirectement nous ont aidé à bâtir cette réunion à travers des coopérations directes ou indirectes.

De quoi parlons-nous ? Nous parlons d'aide, et je voudrais rappeler la manière dont, en tant que président français du G8 nous souhaitons orienter nos réflexions dans ce domaine. Nous avons quatre thèmes majeurs, dont trois seront repris dans votre atelier.

Les quatre thèmes sont :

- La solidarité, et notamment le partenariat pour le développement du Sud (particulièrement de l'Afrique) et pour l'accès de tous à l'eau ;
- La responsabilité des Etats du Nord et du Sud, la responsabilité des acteurs économiques et notamment celle des entreprises ;
- La sécurité qui n'est pas directement à l'ordre du jour mais qui fait l'objet de beaucoup de réflexion dans les travaux du G8 de fin février et qui continuera à faire l'objet de réflexions dans les travaux ultérieurs. Sécurité, ça veut dire terrorisme, ça veut dire armes de destruction massive, c'est un sujet qui est particulièrement à l'ordre du jour actuellement ;
- Et finalement le dialogue démocratique, car tout ceci doit se faire dans un contexte de dialogue soutenu entre la société civile et les Etats.

Votre atelier est sensé au cours des deux jours travailler sur trois de ces thèmes, notamment l'esprit de responsabilité pour montrer qu'au niveau des gouvernements comme des entreprises, des améliorations sont nécessaires. La gouvernance des entreprises est à améliorer, mais cet objectif concerne aussi les Etats et les représentants de la société civile. Chacun doit œuvrer pour améliorer la transparence et l'efficacité dans lesquelles cet esprit de responsabilité doit être développé.

En ce qui concerne le renforcement de la démocratie, il passera partout par un renforcement du dialogue entre la société civile et les Etats.

En ce qui concerne la solidarité, c'est bien sûr le premier thème, le thème prioritaire de notre G8, et il est évidemment au cœur de vos préoccupations.

Qu'avons nous dit le 22 février quand nous nous sommes réunis dans cette salle au niveau du G7 finances ? Nous avons affirmé tous ensemble notre engagement à relever le défi de la pauvreté, et à consolider les résultats qui ont été déjà obtenus à Monterrey et à Johannesburg, en insistant sur la nécessité de mobiliser plus d'argent, pour parler simplement, mais aussi, et c'est le thème de votre atelier, d'améliorer l'efficacité de l'aide. Il s'agit donc peut-être de dépenser plus, mais aussi de dépenser mieux, en fixant des objectifs quantifiés d'une manière ou d'une autre et, bien sûr, en s'orientant essentiellement vers des politiques axées sur la croissance.

Tous ces éléments nous ont permis de réaffirmer notre soutien aux objectifs du millénium pour le développement, notamment en matière de santé, d'éducation et d'eau. Nous avons aussi réaffirmé notre détermination à nous occuper plus particulièrement des Pays Pauvres Très Endettés, ainsi que du Fonds Mondial pour la Santé, et nous avons particulièrement insisté sur la nécessité de penser aux pays africains à travers l'initiative du Nouveau Partenariat pour le Développement de l'Afrique (le NEPAD). Nous avons bien entendu également rappelé la nécessité pour tous ces pays d'améliorer leur gouvernance et de nous démontrer l'efficacité de leur politique si nous voulons qu'ils nous encouragent à abonder dans le sens de cette politique.

Nous avons deux messages spécifiques simples au niveau français dans ce domaine : Premièrement, même si nous sommes aujourd'hui l'un des principaux contributeurs de l'aide aux pays en développement, nous avons pris l'engagement et nous le tiendrons, quelles que soient les difficultés pour le tenir, de porter notre effort d'aide à 0,7 % du PNB préconisé par l'ONU, sachant que nous visons un pourcentage de 0,5 % dans cinq ans, et dès 2003 nous avons commencé à le faire.

Deuxièmement, nous partageons avec vous la nécessité d'améliorer l'efficacité de notre aide, l'efficacité de l'aide en générale, qui n'incombe pas seulement à ceux qui en bénéficient, mais aussi à ceux qui la délivrent.

Il faut donc, et ceci concerne la France mais aussi toute la communauté des pays développés, que nous concentrions notre aide de manière à avoir la conviction que cette aide n'est pas gaspillée, n'est pas dispersée, et qu'elle se traduit pas des résultats tangibles et mesurables, même s'il faut éviter la tentation qui consiste à oublier que dans les pays les plus pauvres, l'aide est une absolue nécessité.

Nous sommes aussi convaincus qu'une harmonisation des procédures est une condition non suffisante, mais en tout cas nécessaire, pour améliorer l'efficacité de l'aide. Il y a eu à Rome une réunion le 25 février qui a permis d'avancer dans le sens d’une harmonisation de l'aide des pays développés. Ceci doit permettre d'améliorer le rendement de notre aide en diminuant les charges administratives de gestion des aides multiformes qui sont aujourd'hui émises vers les pays bénéficiaires.

J'insiste sur ce point car il s'agit pour nous de créer les conditions pour que les frais généraux de mise en oeuvre de l'aide soient les plus faibles possible, de manière à ce que le maximum arrive à destination. Au sein du Comité d'Aide au Développement, nous avons proposé une recommandation sur cette coordination et cette harmonisation des pratiques des donateurs, comme ce fut déjà le cas pour les pays les moins avancés, une recommandation qui devrait être intégrée dans les pratiques et les politiques de tous les pays.

Nous avons aussi considéré qu'il serait souhaitable que le Comité d'Aide au Développement crée un groupe de travail pour mesurer l'efficacité de l'aide en relation avec tous ceux qui sont concernés, notamment les organes de l'ONU ainsi que les banques multilatérales. Il faut que ce comité ait un mandat clair et il faut surtout qu'il ait un calendrier car on ne sait travailler bien que sous la pression du temps. Il faut aussi, bien sûr, qu'il travaille en étroite collaboration avec le Groupe de travail sur l'évaluation de l'aide et, plus généralement, qu'il travaille avec l'ensemble de la communauté en matière d'évaluation.

Le troisième point et le quatrième point sur lesquels nous cherchons à avancer consistent à maximiser l'impact de cette aide, et pour la maximiser, il faut la mesurer, d'où la nécessité de mettre en place des moyens pour mesurer l'impact, procéder à ces mesures et enfin en tirer les conséquences. Tout ceci est simple dans le monde de l'entreprise au sens général du terme, c'est un peu plus compliqué dans les domaines qui nous intéressent, mais ce n'est pas une raison pour ne pas trouver ensemble des moyens adaptés car, je le répète, la mesure permet l'efficacité. Il est clair que dans ce domaine la Banque mondiale continuera à jouer un rôle important de précurseur.

Enfin, nous considérons que le développement doit tenir compte des impératifs de solidarité avec les générations futures, d'où l'idée de développement durable et de préservation de l'environnement avec le cas particulier de l'eau qui est très probablement l’un des sujets sur lequel, avec le sida, nous devrions essayer de créer les conditions pour que l'efficacité de notre aide se traduise le plus rapidement possible par des progrès significatifs.

Monsieur Camdessus a animé un groupe de travail international montrant l'ampleur des efforts que nous devrions réaliser pour obtenir et atteindre les objectifs du millenium, et c'est dans ce contexte là que nous avons encore, en tant que président du G8, l'intention de proposer à nos partenaires à Evian, au mois de mai, un plan d'action sur l'eau.

Vos objectifs, je les partage, ils se traduisent par la notion de redevabilité, c'est à dire rendre compte. C'est un mot latin « redimere » et il se traduit par « accountability » en anglais. Je trouve que rendre compte, rendre des comptes à ceux qui ont accepté de faire un effort en pensant aux autres, me paraît une bonne traduction. C'est celle que vous n'avez pas retenue puisque vous avez parlé de « redevabilité », mais je pense qu'en français « rendre compte » fait mieux ressentir la puissance des mots derrière ce concept.

Autour des idées que vous avez développées, il est clair que cette nécessité de rendre compte est un complément indispensable à tous les systèmes d'audit qui existent, non seulement pour les acteurs économiques non soumis aux lois du marché, mais également pour tous les autres. Cette capacité de rendre compte doit être de qualité, elle doit être exercée de manière indépendante, et elle doit bien sûr répondre à quelques normes dont vous commencerez peut-être à préciser les contours lors de vos travaux.

C'est aussi, comme nous l'avons compris, un moyen d'améliorer la capacité de l'aide publique et nous attendons donc avec beaucoup d'intérêt votre capacité à imaginer ou à tenir compte de toutes les pratiques qui existent déjà dans ce domaine, pour qu' ensemble nous sortions de cet atelier avec des idées plus précises sur ce qu'il est nécessaire de faire pour améliorer notre aide, si nous voulons continuer à avoir un peu de générosité, un peu de courage, un peu d'audace. Tout ceci pour dire que si nous voulons pourvoir continuer à penser aux autres, il faut que nous ayons le sentiment de le faire d'une manière efficace.

Cette efficacité, cette idée de penser aider les autres, je crois que cela doit s'inscrire dorénavant dans un dialogue plus soutenu avec la société civile et bien sûr entre tous les Etats, d'où mon intérêt de voir que la société civile au sens large du terme est très bien représentée ici. J'exprime le souhait que, ensemble, vous puissiez avoir des travaux fructueux vous permettant à vous d'avoir le sentiment d'avoir appris et nous permettant à nous de bénéficier des résultats de ce que vous aurez appris ensemble.

Voilà les quelques mots que je voulais évoquer avec vous sur un sujet que vous connaissez de manière professionnelle mieux que moi, pour vous dire simplement que, et ceci est important, il y a derrière les thèmes sur lesquels vous travaillez beaucoup d'enjeux, et que plus nous seront tous convaincus que nous savons de manière efficace mettre en oeuvre et mesurer les impacts de notre aide, plus nous aurons le courage et l'audace d'augmenter cette aide. Cette aide ne remplace pas, bien sûr, la capacité et la nécessité pour ces différents pays de se prendre eux-même en main, mais cette aide est et sera indispensable dans l'avenir si nous voulons bâtir non seulement un monde durable mais un monde vivable. Par conséquent, je serai très heureux d'avoir l'occasion ultérieurement d'écouter de la part de mes collaborateurs le résultat de vos travaux car ils sont tous utiles au moment d'une histoire du monde particulièrement important avec tous les défis que nous avons relevés et avons à relever ensemble.

Je vous remercie de votre attention et vous souhaite une bonne journée.

Welcoming speech

Mr. Francis Mer

Minister of the Economy, Finance and Industry

Good morning,

I was eager to open this seminar, your workshop, in order to signal the importance that the French government, especially my own Ministry, attaches to your work.

I believe I am correct in saying that this is the first time such a great number of people have been brought together in the same room as part of an effort to work collectively on the major topic of aid evaluation. It is clear that, in this domain as in any other, the notions of evaluation, quantification and qualification are significant enough to warrant our being accountable to the benefits of what we are doing and to the effectiveness of the way in which we work.

As you are no doubt aware, the many people in this room represent a wide range of organisations:

- Forty States and aid agencies from OECD countries,
- Representatives of countries acceding to the European Union,
- Fifteen United Nations agencies,
- The multilateral development banks,
- The International Monetary Fund,
- Various representatives of civil society, including NGOs – some international and some more focused on a single country – and private foundations, plus trade union organisations, whose involvement, however recent, I commend, since I believe that the topic you will be discussing, that of aid and its effectiveness, is one of major importance that must involve all players in our economic sphere,
- And, of course, professionals in the evaluation field from the southern hemisphere's developing countries, i.e. representatives from Africa and Latin America, who are here today thanks to the assistance of overseas co-operation departments.

I cannot end this introduction without thanking all those who have helped us, to one extent or another, in organising today's meeting through direct or indirect co-operation initiatives.

So, what is our subject here today? Our subject is aid, and I would like to remind you of the ways in which France, under its current G-8 Presidency, wishes to focus its thoughts on this area. We have defined four main themes, of which three are to be taken up in your workshop.

The four themes are:

- Solidarity, especially in terms of partnership in the development of the southern hemisphere (particularly Africa) and of access to water for all;

- Responsibility, namely that of the States of the northern and southern hemispheres and that of economic players, especially private enterprises;

- Security, which is not formally on the agenda today but which was the subject of a great deal of thought during the G-8 Finance ministers' meeting at the end of February and which will continue to be a focus for study in the G-8's later work. Security means protection against terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, a highly topical subject at the present time;

- The need to do all the above as part of a sustained dialogue between civil society and national governments – what we mean by democratic dialogue.

Over its two days, your workshop is meant to work on three of these themes – particularly on the spirit of responsibility – in order to show that improvement is needed for both governments and enterprises. Corporate governance needs to be improved, but this is an objective that also applies to national governments and representatives of civil society. All concerned must endeavour to increase transparency and effectiveness so that this spirit of responsibility can thrive.

In terms of the strengthening of democracy, in all cases a strengthening of the dialogue between civil society and national governments will be necessary.

Regarding solidarity, the latter is of course the first theme, the one with the highest priority for the G-8, and clearly the one to which you will be devoting the greater part of your attention.

What was said on 22 February, when the G-7 Finance ministers met in this room? Together, we affirmed our commitment to addressing the challenge of poverty and to building on the positive outcomes of Monterrey and Johannesburg, not only underlining the need to mobilise greater financial resources, not to put too fine a point on it, but also – and this is the theme of your workshop – the need to improve the effectiveness of aid. The latter means more spending, perhaps, but also better spending, the definition of quantified targets of one kind or another, and, naturally, a crucial focus on growth-oriented policies.

All of these elements enabled us to reaffirm our support for the Millennium Development Goals, particularly in the areas of health, education, and water supply. We also reaffirmed our determination to deal in priority with the Highly-Indebted Poor Countries and the Global Health Fund, and we underscored, with special emphasis, the necessity of giving thought to the countries of Africa through the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) initiative. And, of course, we reiterated the need for all of these countries to improve their governance and to demonstrate solid policy performance if they wish to encourage us to back their policies.

Two specific French messages in these domains are quite straightforward. First of all, despite the fact that we are already one of the principal contributors of aid to developing countries, we have made a pledge – one that we will abide by regardless of the difficulties involved – to ultimately increase our aid efforts to 0.7% of GDP as recommended by the UN. We are aiming at a percentage of 0.5% over five years and we have begun to increase our aid efforts as of 2003.

Secondly, it is clear that we share with you the view that it is necessary to improve the effectiveness of our aid, and the effectiveness of aid in general, this being the responsibility of both those who are its beneficiaries and those who provide it.

Therefore, we must – and this concerns not only France but also the whole community of developed nations – focus our aid if we are to be certain that it is not being wasted or dissipated, and that it is leading to tangible, measurable results. We must, however, avoid falling into the trap of forgetting that, for the poorest countries, aid is an absolute necessity.

We are also convinced that the harmonisation of procedures is a condition that, while not sufficient in and of itself, is nevertheless a necessity if aid effectiveness is to be improved. On 25 February last, there was a meeting in Rome that I believe facilitated progress regarding the harmonisation of aid from the developed countries, since it should now become possible to improve aid efficiency by reducing the administrative burden involved in managing the multiple aid formats currently being provided to beneficiary countries.

I emphasise this point since it is our view that conditions must be established to keep the overheads involved in implementing aid as low as possible in order to ensure that the maximum amount of aid arrives at its destination. We have put forward a recommendation to the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) relating to such co-ordination and harmonisation of the practices of donor nations, as was already the case for the least advanced countries, a recommendation that should be incorporated into the practices and policies of all countries. We also considered it desirable for the Development Assistance Committee to create a working group to measure the effectiveness of aid with respect to all those involved, in particular UN agencies and multilateral banks. This Committee should have a clear remit and, above all, it must work according to a timetable – we all do our best work when there are time constraints.

Where evaluation is concerned, of course, the Committee must also work in close conjunction with the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation and, more generally, with all those involved in aid evaluation.

The third and fourth points on which we are endeavouring to make progress involve the maximisation of the impact of the aid provided; and, if it is to be maximised, we need to measure it, hence the need to put in place a means of measuring the impact, to proceed with the actual measurements, and then, finally, to learn the lessons that need to be learned. All this is straightforward in the world of enterprise – in the broadest sense of this term – but it is a little more complicated in the areas of concern to us here. That fact should not prevent us, however, from working together to arrive at appropriate ways of doing this because, as I have said, measurement makes effectiveness possible. In this domain, it is clear that the World Bank can, in my estimation, continue to play a major role as forerunner.

Lastly, we feel that development must take into account the need to show solidarity with future generations – hence the notion of sustainable development and the preservation of the environment. Water supply is a specific case of this, and very probably one of the issues, along with AIDS, regarding which we must try our best to create conditions where the effectiveness of our aid leads as swiftly as possible to significant progress.

As you may be aware, Mr. Camdessus has led an international working group, testifying to the scale of the efforts we must make if we are to attain and maintain the Millennium Development

Goals, and in this context we have the further intention, in our role as President of the G-8, of proposing an action plan focussing on water to our partners in Evian in May.

Your objectives, which I share, are reflected to a certain extent in the notion of "*redevabilité*", a French term of Latin origin that means to render accounts or to be answerable for something. I feel that to render accounts, to be accountable to those who have agreed to make efforts for the sake of others, is a good way of translating this concept, though the word "*redevabilité*" in French doesn't really cover the whole idea; I myself think that "*rendre compte*" in French – "accountability" in English – better expresses the power of the underlying concept.

Based on the ideas that you have developed, it is clear that this need for accountability is an indispensable complement to all the auditing systems that exist not only for those economic players not subject to market forces but for all other players as well. Such accountability must not only be rigorous, it must also be applied independently, and it must of course meet a certain number of standards, which you will perhaps begin to draw the broad outlines of in the course of your work.

However, accountability is also, as we have already seen, a means of improving the capacity of public aid, and it is for this reason that we are looking forward, with great interest, to seeing how far you are able to go in designing procedures, or in giving consideration to practices already in place in this field, that will allow us all to leave this workshop with a clearer idea of what we must do to improve our aid practices if we wish to continue to show a bit of generosity, a bit of courage, and a bit of boldness. All of this boils down to the idea that, if we wish to be able to continue taking the well-being of others into account, we need to feel that we are doing so effectively.

Such effectiveness in pursuit of helping others must henceforth, I believe, be part and parcel of a more sustained dialogue with civil society and, of course, with all the States involved, hence the interest with which I note that civil society, in the broad sense of the term, is very well represented here. I should like to express the wish that, together, you will be able to perform useful work that will both let you yourselves feel that you have learned something and allow us to benefit from the results of the lessons you have learned together.

And so I come to the end of what I wanted to say to you regarding a subject that you, as professionals, are more familiar with than I. I wished quite simply to say to you something of great importance, and this is that underlying the topics you are addressing a great deal is at stake and that the more we are all convinced that we have effective ways of implementing and measuring the impact of the aid we give, the more we shall have the courage and boldness to increase the amount we give. Aid cannot, however, make up for a lack of capacity on the part of the countries concerned to take themselves in hand, nor can it eliminate the necessity of doing so. Aid is indispensable, and will continue to be so in the future if we wish to build a world that is not only sustainable but also worth living in. Consequently, I look forward to the opportunity of hearing what my staff has to say regarding the results of your work, which is of use not only to you but to all and which comes at a particularly important moment in world history, when we find ourselves facing up to a world full of challenges.

I appreciate your kind attention, and wish you a good day. Thank you.

Mr. Rob D. van den Berg

Working Party on Aid Evaluation (WP-EV), Chair

Monsieur le Président, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a great honour and pleasure for me to address the workshop partners in evaluation.

More than two years ago, the DAC working party on aid evaluation, the WP-EV, at its regular meeting here in Paris, organised a brainstorming session on its future work, role and mandate, and that session yielded a wealth of ideas. Today, thanks to the very positive response of the French Ministry of the Economy, Finance and Trade and thanks to the active involvement of many of the members of the DAC working party, we are gathered to discuss the options for partnership and evaluation on an unprecedented scale.

The idea was born of a growing sense of unease within the working party that at our meetings we were talking about pressing evaluation issues which should really be discussed before a wider audience. The DAC working party consists of representatives of the evaluation departments of bilateral donors. It focuses mainly on bilateral concerns ; other concerns are more difficult to address and there are at least two other constituencies that are organised. First of all, the United Nations Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation, the IAWG, which brings together all the evaluation units and officers of the UN agencies and the evaluation co-operation group of the international financial institutions. These groups address the evaluation concerns of their respective constituencies.

The most important group of actors in development, our partner countries, are not represented in these groups. Of course, wherever possible the WP-EV, the IAWG and the ECG involve partner countries and other partnership activities, and most importantly in their evaluations. Furthermore, the three groups exchange observers and collaborate on many issues. However, none of the three groups has a mechanism for consulting beyond its own members, and our question was how do we meet, exchange information and collaborate with the following communities : our partner countries, the evaluation community and NGOs and civil society - not only in partner countries but also in the development community and OECD countries - and any other evaluation communities like the private sector, human rights organisations, humanitarian assistance institutions, networks, associations, professionals, and so on.

This concern about the possible lack of communication channels between different evaluation communities was sparked by the challenges that we were facing in evaluating bilateral aid.

First of all, many donors have initiated a shift in funding from projects to programmes, from programmes to sector-wide approaches, to sector-wide support and from separate and clearly identifiable funding to co-funding, joint funding or even budget support, though we know that many donors do not put all their money where their mouth is, this shift still poses a huge evaluation challenge.

For many of the bilateral evaluation units it entails a shift from project or activity-level evaluations to higher-level evaluations and the trend towards joint funding poses the challenge of attribution. It is no longer possible to follow the contribution of one donor into one basket.

A principle that we could adopt as a community in this regard, both to prevent evaluation bombardments and to recognise the problems of attribution is the following : **when donors finance together, they should evaluate together.**

Second, in the past decade, we have seen efforts in the donor community to improve its credentials as a partner in development. Partnership is one of the four principles of the comprehensive development framework. As the call for a truly global partnership, it is the last and perhaps the most difficult of the millennium development goals.

In all our bilateral programmes we observe efforts to improve partnership. Again, the reality may not always match the rhetoric. For evaluators, however, increased partnership should have implications for joint learning and for mutual accountability. This brings us to a second principle that the evaluation community could adopt : **increasing partnership should include partnership in evaluation.**

The first challenge is the drive towards ownership. This is also one of the four principles of the comprehensive development framework and it has been carried over into the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP).

It is a common refrain in development, a lack of sustainability of projects, programmes and policies all because of a lack of ownership. Apart from being backed up by the evidence, the emphasis on ownership is based on a recognition that people are not developed by others, but they develop themselves. Similarly, countries are not developed by other countries, but they develop themselves. The role of aid is nothing more and nothing less than to support or to act as a catalyst for indigenous development. Again, the reality in international relations may not always match these lofty principles.

However, the changing role of the donor with greater emphasis being placed on the part played by the recipient has implications for the evaluator and this leads us to a third principle that the evaluation community could adopt : **increasing ownership should also lead to ownership of the evaluations.**

Big principles are up for discussion, the challenges to not affect the ultimate purpose of evaluation, to learn from the past and to account for what has happened.

The changes we need to discuss are in the composition of the teams, in the shift in emphasis and questions, in scope and focus and in reporting. The purpose of this workshop is not to adopt new principles for aid evaluation - we do not have the mandate to do that - but perhaps we can formulate a « Paris declaration » on the way forward in development evaluation.

As a fourth, and perhaps final, principle of such a declaration, we need to challenge the central role that aid plays in our work. The principle of ownership states quite clearly that development is an indigenous phenomenon in which aid can only play a catalytic supportive role. The millennium development goals pose the challenge of evaluating what has been done to reach these goals, locally, nationally and internationally. Should we focus on evaluating development rather than just the small contribution made by aid to development ? Surely our partners are more interested in the evaluation of the overall development of a sector rather than just the contribution of the donors to that sector.

Furthermore, the last millennium development goal recognises that indigenous development is only possible in an enabling international environment. This presents us with another challenge : ensuring that other areas of international policy like trade, migration or issues of peace and security actually enable rather than obstruct development. Many donors in partner countries are already working on improving international enabling environments.

How will the evaluation community react to the challenge of the eight millennium development goals ? **Should we as an evaluation community go from evaluating aid to evaluating development ?** I predict that this issue will be a topical discussion in the days ahead.

The purpose of this workshop is not only to learn from each others and to discuss common concerns and issues of interest. It also aims at exploring how we can meet the challenges of evaluation. Will we do so as separate communities or will we be able to identify ways for future collaboration and co-operation ? Fortunately, we can build on existing forms of collaboration. Let me just mention a few.

The Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP) includes non-governmental participants. It has built up a significant track record in supporting, strengthening and learning from evaluations of humanitarian assistance. Is this a model that can be adopted elsewhere ?

During the international evaluations, both the evaluation of the comprehensive development framework led by the operations evaluations department of the World Bank and the joint evaluation of external support of basic education led by the policy and evaluation department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands have concluded new and innovative partnerships with partner countries and an interesting mix of donor organisations. We can learn from this.

The working party works on best practices, guidelines and lessons to be learnt from a series of evaluations on related issues. Increasingly, partner countries, NGOs and the research community have become involved in this type of work, often through involvement in seminars in which draft reports were discussed. Will it be possible to broaden the scope of best practices and synthesis work to other evaluation communities ? The three well-established formal evaluation communities tend to work for so-called task forces to tackle specific jobs. These task forces tend to include external partners depending on the subject. This is an existing vehicle for collaboration across communities which has not yet been used explicitly for that purpose. Over the next few days, we may come up with proposals for co-operation for which joint task forces could be established which would report to different constituencies.

There are currently some mechanisms for information exchange on the Internet, such as the development gateway and evaluation inventories, which could enable and promote an on-going debate within the evaluation communities on issues of common interest. Should we look for additional opportunities, is there a willingness to facilitate discussions ? The greatest challenge is undoubtedly the mobilisation of our colleagues and partners in the South. The number, scope, level and quality of joint evaluations are increasing, yet there is room for improvement. Training, creating an enabling environment, supporting institutions and individuals… things have got better in recent years, but yet there is room for improvement. This workshop is being attended by some representatives from the South, yet there is room for improvement. Funding may be an important obstacle - many of us have funds available to undertake evaluations but not to mobilise capacity in the South. Other channels of support needs to be explored. Ideas need to be discussed and IDEAS, the International Development Evaluation Association, may play a role in this.

There are many ideas floating around in our community. Nevertheless, we need to recognise that collaboration amongst evaluators is a potential minefield of misunderstandings about definitions, methodologies, concepts, logic and rationalities.

It reminds me of the question, why did the chicken cross to the road ? The simple answer is that it wanted to get to the other side. But the evaluation wants to know first whether the chicken took the shortest path across the road and whether it crossed the road in the quickest possible way. And second, if it can be established whether the chicken indeed in actual fact reached the other side and remained there and is expected to remain there in the future. And three, whether the needs of the chicken have been met by crossing the road.

To answer these questions, the evaluator will, in a participatory process with the chicken, establish an intervention logic, a log frame or even a theory of how chickens cross roads, which will lead to the gathering and analysis of relevant data.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the next few days will see a full discussion of chickens and roads and all the ramifications or possible benefits of future co-operation.

Thank you very much.

CHAPITRE 1 : LES PRATIQUES DE L'ÉVALUATION

Au cours de cette première session, les bailleurs de fonds et les organisations de la société civile présentent leurs approches et leurs pratiques en matière d'évaluation. Les principales questions abordées sont « Les objectifs et les méthodes sont-ils semblables ? Quelles sont les contraintes auxquelles est confrontée chaque communauté ? Que pouvons nous apprendre les uns des autres ? »

Président : M. Henri Rouillé d'Orfeuil, Président, Coordination Sud.

Rapporteur : M. Hans Lundgren, Conseiller, Direction de la Coopération au développement, OCDE.

Contributions :

Bailleurs de fonds

- « Groupe de travail du Comité d'Aide au Développement (CAD) sur l'évaluation de l'aide », Rob D. van den Berg.
- « United Nations Inter Agency Working Group on Evaluation (IAWG) : Partenaires en évaluation », Khalid Malik, Président de l'IAWG et Directeur, Bureau de l'évaluation, Programme des Nations Unies pour le Développement (PNUD).
- « Note sur l'Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) des banques multilatérales de développement », Gregory K. Ingram, Président entrant d'ECG et Directeur Général, Operations Evaluation, Banque Mondiale.

Organisations de la société civile

- « Vers l'évaluation des performances organisationnelles : expériences en matière de renforcement de l'apprentissage, de la redevabilité et d'une meilleure compréhension du changement social », Margaret Niewens, British Overseas Aid Group (BOAG).
- « Les défis de l'évaluation vues par les organisations non gouvernementales norvégiennes et leurs partenaires », Pia Reierson, Directeur de l'appui aux programmes, Aasa Sildnes, spécialiste en développement et Susie Tapia, Directeur régional, Fondation Stromme.
- « Les ambitions du partenariat entre ONG françaises et pouvoirs publics : évaluer pour contribuer à refonder les politiques publiques », François Doligez, F3E (IRAM).

CHAPTER 1: EVALUATION PRACTICES

Donors and civil society organisations present their evaluation approaches and practices. Key issues are "Are objectives and methods similar? What are the constraints faced by each evaluation community ? What can we learn from each other ?".

Chair: Mr Henri Rouillé d'Orfeuil, Chair, Coordination Sud

Rapporteur: Mr Hans Lundgren, Advisor, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD.

Donors

- "Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Working Party on Aid Evaluation", Mr Rob D. van den Berg, WP-EV Chair.
- "United Nations Inter Agency Working Group on Evaluation (IAWG) : Partners in evaluation", Khalid Malik, IAWG Chair and Director, Evaluation Office, United Nations Development Program (UNDP).
- "Note on the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) of the Multilateral Development Banks Evaluation Co-operation Group", Gregory K. Ingram, ECG incoming Chair, Director-General Operations Evaluation Department World Bank.

Civil Society Organisations

- "Towards organisational performance assessment: experiences of strengthening learning, accountability and understanding social change", Margaret Niewens, British Overseas Aid Group (BOAG).
- "Evaluation challenges as seen by Norwegian non-governmental organisations and partners", Pia Reierson, Director Programme Support, Aasa Sildnes, Development Specialist and Susie Tapia, Regional Director, Stromme Foundation.
- "Evaluation and French NGOs, a tool for two major ambitions: accountability and learning for the improvement of practices", François Doligez, IRAM.

Introduction

M. Henri Rouillé d'Orfeuil, Président de Coordination Sud

En tant que Président de Coordination Sud, qui est la Fédération des ONG en France, je souhaiterais souligner le fait que choisir un acteur non-gouvernemental pour animer cette première session marque déjà en soi l'esprit de cet atelier.

Pour reprendre la parabole du « chicken » : la première chose sera d'éviter que le « chicken » soit écrasé avant d'avoir atteint l'autre côté de la route et l'on va essayer de l'aider à traverser dans les meilleures conditions.

Monsieur le Ministre a fait un discours qui place délibérément cette réunion sous le signe du dialogue et du partenariat entre les acteurs publics, notamment les bailleurs de fonds, et les acteurs non-gouvernementaux, qui, en général, se positionnent comme des opérateurs.

Bien entendu, ces deux familles d'acteurs ne sont pas toujours égales devant les évaluations, les uns jugeant parfois les autres ; c'est la règle du jeu. Nous pourrions sans doute manifester une plus grande complémentarité opérationnelle en intégrant les procédures de financement dans les évaluations de projets. Ces procédures de financement sont en effet parfois harassantes pour les associations et nécessitent un investissement très importants.

Les contributions à notre disposition sont déjà une bonne base. Notre dialogue se décline à plusieurs niveaux : au niveau de nos méthodes bien sûr, de nos instruments, de nos outils. Il s'agit là d'une discussion classique importante en particulier parce que nos deux familles n'ont pas l'habitude de discuter entre elles. Notre dialogue a également un caractère politique, et l'évaluation doit nous aider à situer nos actions, peut-être encore plus que nos projets, à la fois dans le temps et dans l'espace.

Dans le temps, car nos actions doivent se situer dans une dynamique. Nous intervenons aujourd'hui, mais nous intervenons par rapport à des acteurs qui prennent des initiatives qui ont leur propre dynamique, leurs propres modes de fonctionnement, et l'aide ne peut pas se substituer à ces acteurs. La véritable réussite viendra évidemment après l'opération, peut-être même des années après. L'évaluation doit être large et doit montrer que notre projet a conforté les dynamiques ou déjà à l'œuvre ou qui ne demandent qu'à naître.

Notre action doit aussi se situer dans l'espace. Nous avons l'habitude d'intervenir dans des lieux précis à des moments donnés, souvent localement, mais cette intervention, compte tenu de l'immensité des besoins, n'a de sens que si elle prend une valeur nationale ou internationale. Il faut que nos interventions aient une exemplarité et qu'elles puissent servir de référence pour les politiques publiques nationales, voire pour les politiques des organisations internationales.

C'est également cela l'évaluation. Et s'il existe une communauté des évaluateurs, cette communauté doit se situer par rapport aux acteurs, ceux qui prennent des initiatives, ceux qui vivent la réalité et ceux qui feront le développement.

Contributions - Bailleurs de fonds

« Development Assistance Committee (DAC) »

Mr. Rob D. van den Berg

Working party on Aid Evaluation (WP-EV), Chair

The DAC (Development Assistance Committee) working party

The working party was established in the early 1980s. Its role and mandate was to improve evaluation practice and to encourage standardisation to undertake census studies and to promote collaboration and joint work as well as promote evaluation capacity development and mobilisation. The current membership of the group are the independent evaluation units of the DAC members or the units which take care of the independent evaluation, which is a slight difference. Observers are the evaluation units of UNDP, operations evaluation department of the World Bank, evaluation department of the IMF and regional development banks.

The DAC principles on aid evaluation

A very important achievement of the DAC working party has been the adoption in 1991 of the DAC principles for learning as a basis for accountability. It proposes organisational requirements, evaluation policy and an independence of evaluation which has to be guaranteed. It proposes criteria and it proposes working in partnership.

A definition of the criteria and aim of evaluations are given in the DAC principles. First of all, evaluation is termed as an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. Secondly, the aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, developmental efficiency and effectiveness, in fact sustainability. These are the criteria on which we are supposed to judge development aid, and then an evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors.

Nowadays we have the new result-based management schemes of input, output, outcome and impact. How do they actually relate to the criteria that we use in the DAC principles on aid evaluation ? Input, output, outcome and impact framework delivers a linear perspective from input to impact. When we discuss issues of efficiency, effectiveness and relevance, these are relationships between, first of all, efficiency, input and output and then effectiveness is a relation between output and outcome (some of us in the international community prefer the term efficacy instead of effectiveness). Relevance can been seen as a relation between outcome and impact.

There is another way in which we use the term relevance and that is going back to the original idea in the first place to see whether the input that we proposed, or the whole framework that was proposed, mentions the policy that is supposed to finance this.

These issues can be translated into day-to-day questions.

The first one is of course, if you look at the relationship between input and output. « Did I pay or did I do too much to get the output we wanted to have ? »

Secondly, from output to outcome, « Did I get value for money or for my efforts, if it is not a financial effort ? » And lastly, « Is it any good or useful ? » ; « If it is not any good or useful, why did we do it in the first place ? ».

In the second half of the 1990s, the DAC working party reviewed its principles. « Where do we stand ? Do we apply them as we should ? » The result of that review was that, overall, there was no need for a change in the DAC principles. These questions remain, so to say, universal and important. However, new challenges.

New challenges and concepts : partnership, ownership, good governance and policy coherence

New concepts in development poses special challenges that we discussed in the past few years in the DAC working party and at various meetings of bilateral and international agencies.

For instance, on partnership, « how can we evaluate partnership ? » It is after all a relationship and it has a focus on process rather than product and the upcoming CDF evaluation will be presented as a process-oriented evaluation. This may be an area where we, as bilateral agencies, can learn from NGOs, because partnership has been an objective in NGOs relationships, between NGOs in the North and South and NGOs internationally, for a longer time perhaps than the attention it has received in government circles.

Ownership is also a new concept, or a fairly new concept that it difficult to evaluate. It may concern mostly a feeling or an emotion. We know that we are often able to point to a lack of ownership, and indeed that is related to the sustainability question. But when do we have positive proof of existence of ownership ? What are objective criteria ?

Good governance is also a new concept which is a container concept. It includes, for example, the rule of law, but also good policies and a well-functioning public sector. How to benchmark good in all these various instances and can we draw general conclusions ? How do they add up ?

Policy coherence is then the last new concept to which I would like to draw attention. Here, the main difficulty is « which viewpoint would we have to adopt ? ». Of course, we, in the development community, want to adopt our own viewpoint. We want to look at other policies and say « they are detrimental to development policies and therefore they are wrong. » But can we judge other policies from the perspective of development co-operation ? In doing so, will we invite other policies to judge development co-operation from their perspectives. At the core, these are political issues and perhaps our role is not to judge but to provide information to the political debate. So often on policy coherence, the trouble is really caused by the lack of information and the lack of debate.

Independence and participation

Independence and participation is an issue that we have discussed quite often in various meetings. First I would like to make a distinction between external evaluation and self-evaluation. The last is a management tool, especially in what we term as the learning organisation and it can be an instrument for quality assurance. But here we are concerned in external evaluation with the need to look at the execution and facilitation of the programme or policy from the outside. Here the issues of independence and participation come up.

Independence is often seen as necessary to prevent conflicts of interest and outside interference in evaluations. In bilateral development co-operation, independence will allow the minister, for instance, to say that evaluations do not speak with the minister's voice. They are not politically influenced. They come from an outside source. That can be seen as a benefit.

On the other hand, participation is seen as necessary to ensure that all viewpoints, knowledge and experience are taken into account. Sometimes, these two are put into opposition with each other. I would like to make an appeal to go beyond the naive views in these areas, and to say that naive independence does not take all viewpoints into account. Naive participation sometimes disregards possible conflicts of interest, lobbying and closed minds, and sometimes offers no solution. So these challenges oppose one another but they may help one another to find a balance and optimum mix.

To go further into independence, there is a way to look at this through the phases of the evaluation process and there, we can recognise planning and programming, scope and progress of an evaluation, terms of reference, data gathering and analysis and reporting. In the bilateral aid community the last two, data gathering and reporting, are considered as crucial. There we really need independence and it is guaranteed in almost all cases in the bilateral aid community. This shows that independence is a function of making a judgement as objective as possible on what is happening and it is not really something which we do for the sake of independence.

A recent OECD paper looked at other aspects of the independence criteria. The questions of organisational independence, avoidance of conflicts of interest and protection from external influence, are important issues that we need to look at when we want to improve independence. The main point in organisational independence is that the responsibility for independence and evaluation should be separated from the responsibility for aid management. This means that, organisationally, evaluation should be high in the organisation. We may need a code of ethics to avoid conflict of interest and not all users have one. Protection from external influence is guaranteed in almost all cases, but the problem may be internal influence. Indeed, if we look at behavioural independence, we see that there is a suspicion that, in some cases, this is not guaranteed.

Learning and accountability

On learning and accountability, again we have an issue which is often opposed. I would like to point out that evaluation in the DAC principles is a basis for accountability. In accountability in general, evaluation plays a very limited role. Just think about some statements we could make in this respect. If the minister said, « I am accountable because I am being evaluated », that would sound rather stupid. But the reverse would sound even more incomprehensible, if the minister said « I am not accountable because I am not being evaluated ». We know that that breaks down and that a minister is accountable anyway, whether or not he is being evaluated.

Learning without account for what has happened does not make much sense. In fact, I would suggest that the specialist should be on other levels. We have different evaluation methodologies, informative evaluation methodology or authoritative evaluation methodology. The informative one is accountability but authoritative is the learning one but takes accountability on board as well. Most evaluations undertaken by bilateral agencies are informative.

Attribution

The last point I want to make is the question of moving up an attribution which is just a highlight of the problem I raised in my introduction. If we currently look at the number of evaluations we have at the project activity level, these are in the hundreds of thousands of evaluations and attribution is no problem. On the programme level, we have less evaluations and going down to policy country level, joint international level, we have less and less evaluations and they are more difficult to do as the attribution problem increases. This points to a summit of global evaluations that have not yet been undertaken and there the problem of attribution would perhaps be insurmountable. But it is a challenge we face.

The products of the DAC working party

We recently published a glossary of evaluation and result-based management terminology. We came up with synthesis reports, we support evaluation capacity mobilisation and we organise workshops and joint work. These are the products we have to offer the evaluation community.

« United Nations Inter Agency Working Group on Evaluation (IAWG) : Partners in Evaluation. »

M. Khalid Malik

IAWG Chair and Director, Evaluation office, United Nations

Development Program (UNDP)

I would like to highlight two parts of my presentation, one part is to talk about what we are doing in the evaluation group, the demands for evaluation in the UN and, secondly, to talk about challenges certainly based on our work and maybe also in a broader sense and some of the challenges of course dovetail very well with what Rob Van Den Berg said earlier.

Clearly the MDGs (Millennium Development Goals), the millennium declaration, the conference in Monterrey are pivotal to the way in which we look at current and future evaluation in the UN. One cannot overplay or over score the importance of the millennium declaration as this is really a « first » where there is a shared vision globally in terms of what our approach to our targets are, and where the entire world, as it were, is behind us. Monterrey was important and this really forms a basis for a lot of the work in which the UN agencies and the UN system are currently involved.

The evaluation function in the UN system

In recent years there has clearly been a much greater demand for evaluation which comes from our governing bodies, their individual funds and programmes and executive boards. There is a much greater interest in application and some of the universities have taken a leadership role. Thirdly, there is an increasing interest, and last year was a very positive year for us in that sense, in simplifying and harmonising our procedures and again a lot of work is underway to do precisely that. These three together form a very important basis for us to move forward in the future.

The UN evaluation group

It is a group of about 33 UN agencies and entities. The size and structure of the evaluation functions and agencies vary from a large department to, in some cases, half a person. There is a wide variety of membership of this group. This started as an informal network in 1984 but, over the last few years, there has been a big effort to make it a work-driven exercise. Web sites have been set up, and joint activities which are currently underway.

At this point we have four groups which are trying to take a number of issues forward. One of them is what we call the norms and standards group, led by UNICEF. It is preparing a framework that sets norms and standards for the evaluation function within the UN system. This is a very important undertaking as we have set minimum standards which would allow the thinking on evaluation and those looking at evaluation to be consistent among agencies.

The second group is the knowledge and learning group led by UNDP and, as we increasingly realise, this really is the biggest added value in the evaluation groups, to see what works and what doesn't and to make sure that people are learning from it. This group is focussing on encouraging learning, in joining in the evaluations and by participating in each other's evaluations, and hosting and exchanging information on the web site.

The third group is the MDG group led by UNIDO. As I said in the beginning, MDG is really the basis from which we are trying to redefine all our work and this is an opportunity for the UN system to see what MDGs really represent in terms of the evaluation framework for the UN system as a whole. Again, it is trying to harmonise and standardise our evaluation methods, to identify good practices and, in some ways, to regulate the basis for systemised performance reporting.

The fourth group is the evaluation capacity group, led by the banks, that gathers all the information related to the agencies', and hopefully increasingly, are setting up some joint activities. We see this as a modest contribution to strengthening the whole capacity of the UN system clearly as the Monterrey and millennium challenges are very significant to the way of doing business in the future.

Challenges

Firstly, this really requires that we do not think of business as usual, as there is a need for a much larger shift than perhaps we had been working on in the past. In some ways, the shift that has to take place has to be from aid-effectiveness types of issues, trying to see whether aid is useful or good, in fact what we call « development effectiveness ». Simply stated, this means that all our representatives and our boards, and the tax-bases that finance them, are asking very simple questions as « are we making a difference in the lives of people or not ? », and evaluation has to rise up to that occasion. Unless we are able to answer this very simple but very powerful question, I am not sure that we are really providing very much added value.

In some ways it is forcing us to move away from technocratic issues and technical matters. Maybe I should add a provocative point here, this may be of interest to the various communities represented at this meeting, that maybe it is time to rewrite the DAC OECD criteria on efficacy and effectiveness, because, fundamentally, this is very much project and programme specific. What we are trying to do is to look at development effectiveness first and then see whether aid flows are really progressing it or detracting from it. This does rather require taking a much broader approach to aid, not just aid but trade, and looking at the enabling conditions that Rob Van Den Berg mentioned.

There is actually a forthcoming development effectiveness report by UNDP which will go into some of the macro-economic details but we have highlighted three aspects of development effectiveness which need to be looked at very systematically and then, as it were, to see whether aid programmes earn our support or not.

First, clearly **ownership**, but it is much more than ownership of programmes, it is ownership of qualities of development strategies and, if you are thinking of development as a transformation of society, you really have to think in a broader sense.

The second aspect which we want to emphasise is **development capacity**. There is a kind of thesis being advanced here that getting capacities right often means getting prices right and this is a capacity not only of institutions but also at society level. This is where civil society participation is important but, fundamentally, accountability and transferability work less as a societal issue, than as an organisational issue as such.

Thirdly, to look at **quality environments**. Here we are not trying to take any position as to what is good or bad policy but rather to take the position that policies are fundamentally country and geography specific. Why is it that the same policy in different countries have different outcomes ? There must be some other reason and this is why this shift from development to development effectiveness has a very large implication for the way that evaluators do their work.

Secondly, the broader perspectives required are clearly focussing on partnerships, on coalition building with a strong interest in outcomes and development changes. I would submit here that this issue of attribution is really a red herring. Attribution which may be of some interest at organisation level has to be replaced by issues of contribution and a much greater interest in seeing whether the outcome is moving or not. Why has there been such an interest in getting MDGs up front ? The reason is simply that people are tired of seeing statements by UNDP, the Banks or others who keep saying that 80 % of projects are doing well, and that each year they are doing better, but when you compare that with the country or the sector, that factor may not be doing so well. So how do we balance micro-successes with macro-failures ? We have to link what we do with the final development issue. This is why I submit that the question is not really that important and that all the technical effort we are making on it may be redirected elsewhere.

Thirdly, I feel that we have to think much more consciously and coherently about the links between organisational effectiveness and development effectiveness. As mentioned earlier on, development is not our development ; we are organisations, we are meant to catalyse and support others' development. In some ways, the challenge for us is to ask how does our agency, the UN system, make the best contribution to the achievement of the MDGs, and what are the strategies that underpin that. This has interesting implications for the debate which I am sure you will have on accountability versus learning, with ultimately added value which is the real bottom line.

Fourth, I think that evaluation has a large role to play. This has been recognised by inter-governmental bodies in many different forms, but in order to do so, it has to change and adapt. It has to provide empirical evidence for organisational improvement and it has to provide a platform to learn more systematically what works and what does not work in development terms, not necessarily on organisation terms. Unfortunately, the traditional approach to development is to look at something when it has ended, but that is precisely when the demand for that information is the lowest as the people have left or are not interested. We have to find ways of providing real-time information for decision-making.

Finally, if we are really serious about helping MDGs to become a driving beacon for all of us, we have no choice but to invest heavily in strengthening national capacities on evaluation. It is precisely civil society and precise national capabilities which will provide the capacity of learning to look at development progress. The MDGs will not work if they simply remain at the organisation of government level, they have to become a societal issue and it is the people themselves who have to exercise their voices and accountability on this process. Therefore, in a very modest way, the MDGs and the Banks, with some modest efforts on our side, must try to find ways of making national capacity because this is ultimately where the action is and our support for that purpose.

« Note on the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) of the multilateral development Banks »

M. Gregory K. Ingram

ECG incoming Chair, Director General, Operation Evaluation Department

World Bank

I am pleased to be here at the request of Stephen Quick, the chairman of the Evaluation Co-operation Group (ECG) of the International Financial Institutions, to address issues dealing with development effectiveness.

The Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) : history and products

The ECG was founded in 1995 by the heads of the evaluation units of the multilateral development banks (MDBs). The charter members include the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the EBRD, the Inter-American Development Bank Group, and the World Bank Group. The European Investment Bank joined in 1998. The IMF established an independent evaluation office in July 2001 and became a member in November, 2001. In order to facilitate links with evaluation units of other international organisations, the ECG includes as observers the UNDP, the chairman of the UN Inter Agency Working Group on evaluation, and the chairman of the DAC working party on evaluation.

The ECG's aim is to strengthen co-operation among evaluators and to harmonise their evaluation methodology. The chairman commented that everything cannot be standardised, but our shareholders would like to have similar methods applied across institutions so that comparisons of results can be made. At the same time, the comparability of evaluation results has to take into account the different circumstances of the institutions, which is really quite a challenge.

At the first meeting, held in 1996, the mandate of the institution was set forth. Given the complexities of international development, the differing institutional practices of each MDB, and the benefits to be gained by sharing and learning, the ECG's mandate includes these objectives:

- Strengthen the use of evaluation for greater MDB effectiveness and accountability
- Share and disseminate lessons learned;
- Harmonize evaluation principles, standards and practices;
- Enhance evaluation professionalism within MDBs;
- Facilitate borrowing member countries' participation in evaluations and promote in-country evaluation capacity development; and
- Collaborate with evaluation units in bilateral and other multilateral institutions.

In 1996, when the first meeting of the ECG was held, it decided to identify best practices in evaluation and to disseminate them. It also sought to harmonise performance indicators and evaluation criteria while taking into account the different circumstances of each institution.

The ECG has progressed towards its objectives. In order to harmonise criteria at individual project level and to facilitate corporate reporting, the ECG produced two good practice papers, one for public sector operations (completed in 2002), and another for private sector operations (completed in 2001). These good practice papers encompass topics such as criteria, rating scales, standards to be used, the governance of evaluation, the role of independent evaluation, and dissemination.

The good practice standards for evaluation of private sector operations is now being followed up with a benchmarking exercise by an independent consultant who is assessing the degree to which the good practice standards are presently being used across the MDBs. This exercise is highlighting both areas of convergence and divergence; the latter calls for additional efforts at harmonisation.

In addition to the good practice papers, the ECG has also produced inventories and surveys, comparison papers, and a glossary of evaluation terms. It also publishes a newsletter, « Evaluation Insights », available on its website (www.ecgnet.org).

The current agenda of the ECG

In terms of work for the future, we continue to address many of the same challenges already identified. For example, work is underway on the evaluation methodology used for country programmes. The World Bank has done about 60 country evaluations and is working with the Inter-Development Bank (IDB) to harmonise evaluation methodologies for country programmes. The ECG is also doing work on what is termed evaluability—the design of operations with well-specified objectives and measurable indicators that will make it easier to evaluate their outcomes.

The Asian Development Bank in particular is taking the lead on developing methodology for policy-based operations, an area in which most of the MDGs have a growing involvement. The ECG is also addressing issues relating to the governance of evaluation, and especially issues of independence. Rob Van Den Berg made reference to criteria for independence that the World Bank's Operations Evaluation Department has been working on. Members of the ECG have recently been asked to do a self-evaluation of their own independence using these criteria. ECG members are also co-operating on evaluation capacity development and moving forward to evaluate regional and global public goods. This is an area where the World Bank has begun to develop evaluation methods and apply them to evaluate global programs.

Contributions - Organisations de la société civile

« Towards organisational performance assessment : experiences of strengthening learning, accountability and understanding social change »

Ms. Margaret Newens

British Overseas Aid Group (BOAG)

The British Overseas Aid Group (BOAG)

I am speaking on behalf of the British Overseas Aid Group, which comprises five agencies in Britain: Action Aid, Save the Children UK, Christian Aid, CAFOD and Oxfam GB. We are going to look at the work that we have been doing together, and as separate agencies, about moving from programme and project evaluation to looking at assessing programme performance and impact at an organisational level.

We face many challenges in these assessments. One of the big challenges of course is that we are working in partnership with others, both North and South. Secondly, we strive - first and foremost - to be accountable to poor people. Thirdly, we are more and more engaged in policy change processes, advocacy and campaigning, up to international level. We are also aware of the dangers in introducing performance assessment systems in organisations, as identified in various reviews: bureaucratic solutions that overburden staff and partners, lead to perverse incentives and poorly serve learning and improvements in practice.

What we know is that we are going to need to use a range of methodologies in combination if we are to try to draw together assessments across programmes. In this presentation, we will look briefly at four areas of study within the BOAG group:

- Making participatory assessments and downward accountability central to our approach.
- Developing assessment tools for better understanding policy change processes and our part with them.
- Engaging our stakeholders in commenting on our performance and building in external expertise and scrutiny to our assessments.
- Having integrating tools and frameworks to help draw together analysis at organisational level.

Listening to and learning with communities and partners

The BOAG agencies all consider listening to and learning with communities and partners to be a core process and one which is fundamental for bringing about learning and change in our practice. One example of the work going on within the BOAG group is from Action Aid in their participatory review processes, which seek to confront issues of power in relationships between northern agencies, southern partners and communities. The reviews are introducing greater openness with information, including sharing financial information with partners and communities, when assessing the impact of programmes.

CAFOD and Christian Aid have also been looking at their partnership relationships and trying to be more explicit about the values of partnership.

From this work, we see that these participatory approaches, working with those closest to the development process, produce assessments that have a richness and relevance that is crucial. We know that trust is important for learning, but there are barriers and blockages to openness and trust developing and we need to be sensitive to this. We also see learning with partners and communities as critical to the legitimacy of all our actions and for acknowledging mutual responsibilities in partnerships - as one CAFOD partner put it “going together through those bumps”.

Assessing contribution to policy and practice change – local to international

Developing tools and approaches for assessing contributions towards policy and practice change, from local to international level, is a new area for many of us. Within the BOAG group, we are experimenting with different methodologies:

- Action research to understand better the value of participatory policy work, where we support marginalised groups engage in policy-making processes and monitoring.
- Methods that help us understand our contribution to bringing about policy change, when the people we hope will benefit from the change are far distant.
- And Christian Aid’s use of the “significant change” methodology, to identify examples of successful advocacy from across the agency against different criteria – with learning at different levels of the organisation integral to the methodology.

As civil society organisations, North and South, become more engaged in influencing policy processes, and with all the activity that there is about exploring the engagement of poor people in Poverty Reduction Strategy Processes, important evaluation questions emerge. For instance:

- The quality of these processes.
- The monitoring of policy delivery.
- And the legitimacy and accountability of different actors in these processes.

Standing back – stakeholder perspectives and external scrutiny

Standing back, we seek to include a wide range of stakeholder perspectives in our assessments and make sure there is external scrutiny. Oxfam, for example, undertakes stakeholder surveys, inviting both internal and external stakeholders to comment on agency performance across a number of areas. BOAG agencies are also looking at the engagement of stakeholders in strategic review meetings and special meetings of stakeholders, including at a policy level. And, importantly, we are looking at how we can make best use of external expertise, for instance by moving the focus to engagement at a more strategic level of review and evaluation and the commissioning of thematic evaluations across programmes.

In these ways, we are trying to encourage honest feed-back away from contractual and funding considerations and seeing how we can best bring in new insights and expertise from outsiders to make sure we add rigour to the overall process that we are trying to develop.

Integrating frameworks and tools

And then, we are looking at having some integrating tools and frameworks. Over recent years, all of us in the BOAG group have moved towards having a number of strategic objectives at organisational level. Obviously that forms a basic framework for drawing together assessments, but some of us have also looked at introducing a small number of "dimensions of change and principles", against which we seek to assess all our work. For instance, Save the Children has defined five dimensions of change related to the core principles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child: looking at changes in the lives of boys and girls and young people, in equity and non-discrimination, and in terms of greater participation and active citizenship, etc. We are finding that these integrating frameworks help us focus our learning at different levels of the organisation, and across levels, within our annual review cycles. They support synthesis, while respecting local diversity in terms of the change that is important in a given local situation and how it is achieved. But we also recognise that time is required to embed frameworks and tools like these within large, complex organisations, to build up the evidence base on which we make judgements and for consistency to grow in how tools are used.

The need for a range of methodologies

In conclusion, we believe that we are going to need a range of methodologies, and we need to use them in combination, to make organisation-wide assessments. We feel that we have a lot more joining-up to do of the different methodologies in order to make our assessments more rigorous. We also need to be careful that we keep the approach open, simple and light. The quality of relationships also affects assessments and we all face challenges in building trust in relationships, not overburdening partners and ensuring that our core values do drive assessment processes. The role of International NGOs is changing, particularly as we engage more at a strategic level through advocacy and campaigning and in supporting others in policy making processes. These developing areas of work raise new issues: the need to look at legitimacy and to demonstrate accountability, not only of ourselves but of others engaging in these social change processes.

We would like to end with a quote from Onora O'Neill's Reith lectures on the BBC last year, where she argues that we need to move towards a more intelligent accountability, one which recognises "that, since much that has to be accounted for it not easily measured, it cannot be boiled down to a set of stock performance indicators…….. Those who are called to account should give an account of what they have done, and their successes and failures, to others who have sufficient time and experience to assess the evidence and report on it." We would like to achieve that sort of balance.

« Evaluation challenges as seen by Norwegian Non-Governmental Organisations and Partners »

Ms. Pia Reierson

Director program support, Stromme Foundation

What are the evaluation challenges seen by Norwegian NGOs or partners ? The answer is based on assessment of evaluation reports, input from 34 member organisations of the Norwegian Development Network, discussions between the members of the same network and experiences by Norwegian NGOs in participatory evaluation in the South.

It is found that 25 % of the Norwegian development NGOs uses the OECD DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance. Another 25 % uses them occasionally, but not systematically. Among the OECD DAC criteria, effectiveness and impact are addressed more often than relevance, efficiency and sustainability. The assessment of the evaluation reports show that neither evaluation method nor purpose is clearly stated; furthermore, the concepts of impartial, independent, objective, systematic and participatory evaluation are not widely adopted nor well understood by the Norwegian NGOs. However, in this brief presentation, it is less interesting to point out why it is so, but rather to look at what can be done.

We have two proposals. Our Norwegian development authorities need to envision what they need and what they want and set up a strategy for this. The NGOs need to have a stand on what evaluation principles to use and why. Unfortunately, evaluation has become a loaded word, often with a negative undertone that threatens and brings insecurity and even fear, especially to those who are to be evaluated. Evaluations are often used for performance rating and control. However, there are trends of change among the Norwegian development organisations. These trends were discussed among a group of participants in a recent workshop in Oslo on participatory monitoring and evaluation.

Learning leading to action as the main purpose of the evaluation process

Most Norwegian NGOs now see learning as the main purpose of evaluation. It is not about proving but rather improving, and contrary to the bookshelves reports: it is about learning leading to action. The notion of impartiality, independence and objectivity is questioned. Neutrality has generally been abandoned as a realistic guiding principles in social science and the media, and it is due time to do the same in development co-operation.

The crucial factors are rather, firstly, reliability and trustworthiness, which we believe can be assured by honesty, integrity and commitment, and a number of various approaches can be made. Secondly, participation by relevant stakeholders at the relevant stages in order to ensure ownership of the analysis and the conclusions, and accountability and motivation for further action.

In view of this, we may suggest the following definition of the evaluation process: *The evaluation process should be an integral part of policy-making, planning and management of development initiatives, initiated and carried out by, or together with relevant stakeholders, with learning leading to action as the main purpose. Its aim should be to assess the relevance of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and/or sustainability.*

Ms. Aasa Sildnes

Development specialist, Stromme Foundation

I would like to introduce you to a case study of an evaluation process that took place last year with, the Adolescent Mothers` Centre situated in the outskirts of Lima in Peru

The project background

A training programme for young mothers was implemented by CEDETEP (Centro de Desarollo Technico Productivo), an indigenous Peruvian organisation, in 1998. As a result of this, a lot of concerns came out about the very difficult life situation many of these young mothers faced. Some of them were victims of rape and violence. CEDETEP approached Stromme Foundation which had been working with children at risk for a number of years also in other parts of the world and asked if together we could plan and implement a programme for these particular group. It resulted in a programme with the objective to reduce the number of adolescent mothers through information work and to help the young mothers to reintegrate into family, society, education and work life.

This particular project involved a lot of infrastructural work and, it was well documented and according to plan. As the project approached its mid-term evaluation phase, the team decided that it would be rather more important to focus on the softer part of the evaluation. We wanted to focus on the participants, on the impact the project had on them, and also looking at the way forward for the centre. **« Who's reality counts ? »**

Some of you might recognise a quote from Robert Chambers here, and really that is what we had to ask ourselves when we started the evaluation. Of course, when we ask who are the main stakeholders, you get only one answer: the mothers and their children. Based on this, it became very important to find ways and means on how to integrate the young mothers into the process of evaluation. It was also suggested that the evaluation included testing of various participatory tools, to assess its usefulness with this particular group of participants. We used tools and methods from traditional PRA/PLA thinking and also methods from organisational psychology and applied psychology. An interesting experience was that the team came with different toolboxes. Some from the traditional way PRA/PLA thinking and others from applied psychology. These tools combined managed to create an environment of trust and opening up for a good process, and was a unique and interesting experience that created active and positive involvement from the stakeholders.

Looking for relevant tools that could be used by the stakeholders

How can a process like this be documented ? It can be documented in various ways. The team decided to describe the process in the report and to assess the various tools used, mentioning the objective for using it, the result and also give a conclusion on whether this was a good tool to use with this particular group of people. As the field work was interrupted by a weekend, the team learnt that all the staff members met for a seminar over the weekend where new techniques were applied to identify strategic choices for the centre. This was of course very encouraging to the evaluation team and the approach that was chosen, as it indicated a high degree of involvement and interest by the staff group to contribute to future improvements.

I mentioned the weakness with report writing because the report is written when the team leaves a project and it is of course impossible to say something about what happens afterwards or to document lasting change. Another challenge is that it is difficult to document learning. My proposal is therefore that in participatory evaluations, we look for a « step 2 » report where all the stakeholders are involved in documenting lasting change and learning.

Ms. Susie Tapia

Regional director in Lima, Peru, Foundation Stromme

After two and a half years' work, an evaluation was made of this project.

What did the evaluation leave with us ?

In the first place, it left a wonderful report full of interesting participatory dynamics with which all stakeholders can identify, and that can be used as a guide, with a good number of interesting findings.

It also left motivation for improvement, given that all stakeholders took part in the process. The document has some good recommendations to follow. We can here mention the need to build up the competence of the project, the need to redefine the project's attention strategy, as a mean to reach greater numbers of young mothers, the need to involve the mothers both in the planning and implementation of the project's activities, the need to establish contact with similar institutions in order to improve collaboration and advocacy; finally involvement of the community and the parents in the project's activities as a means of achieving sustainability of the project in the future and the need to redesign the prevention work strategy.

Six months later, looking at the results of the year, I can share with you some of the outcomes. With regard to the staff competence, it has been encouraging to see how the staff participated in a number of seminars in order to reinforce their competence. We were able to redefine the project's strategy to assist young mothers. In that respect, it is important to outline the four lines that have been given priority: the support to the mothers that include a nursery and a kindergarden for their children, psychological attention, legal counselling and temporary shelter; the need to provide them with vocational training as a means of giving them skills to earn their living after they leave the programme; the need to work with the family to involve the mothers' partners and their parents and to do a lot conciliation work among them; and the need to develop the young mothers' leadership skills forming the young mothers Support Committee.

Changes that occurred after the evaluation

The mothers' involvement, both in the project's implementation and planning: it is important here to note the tremendous change that has been given to the young mothers' role, from being passive and purely receptive they have become active subjects within the project.

Redefining the prevention work strategy: we now see the mothers taking part in the preventive radio programmes. Preventive talks on sexuality and reproductive health are now offered in the centre.

Involvement by the parents and the community: this aspect has been given greater attention and, in response to that, the community takes the centre into account in its activities. We see the mothers taking part in the community parades. The centre is also able to provide vital support to the community, the mothers baby-sit for the community children.

At the end of the year 2002, what did we find? 64 % of the evaluation recommendations had already been put into practice. The project had reached 45 % more adolescent mothers than in the previous year and increased of 145 % the scope of its preventive work among students. There are still some challenges to be addressed in the future, but I would like to finish by mentioning that all stakeholders felt empowered after the process and it will surely help them improve the project performance.

« Les ambitions du partenariat entre ONG françaises et pouvoirs publics : évaluer pour contribuer à refonder les politiques publiques »

M. François Doligez,

vice-président du F3E (IRAM)

Je parle au nom du F3E, et cette présentation va prolonger le propos de l'exposé précédent, notamment en essayant de positionner le partenariat entre organisations de solidarité internationale et pouvoirs publics autour de l'évaluation sur une contribution pour la refondation des politiques publiques.

Une dizaine d'années d'expérience des ONG françaises en matière d'évaluation : perspectives globales en matière de dialogue entre OSI et pouvoirs publics

Un travail collectif a été animé par le F3E qui est un acteur du milieu associatif français dont la mission est de promouvoir l'évaluation et les études au niveau des organisations de solidarité internationale, notamment grâce à l'appui du Ministère des affaires étrangères et de l'Agence Française de Développement.

Il y a une dizaine d'années, quand le F3E est né, les enjeux pour les Organisations de Solidarité Internationale (OSI) étaient essentiellement, pour le F3E, de diffuser la culture d'évaluation dans le milieu associatif français. Comme nous l'avons vu dans d'autres pays, les réticences étaient fortes, l'évaluation étant vécue d'abord comme une contrainte ou un contrôle, il était difficile de la mettre en œuvre et de favoriser l’appropriation par les différents acteurs. Avec l'expérience, l'évaluation est devenue un outil de dialogue pour les OSI et peut-être un outil de changement dans une certaine mesure. « Evaluer pour évoluer » était un peu le mot d'ordre de l'époque en matière d'évaluation.

L'expérience a montré très justement que la pratique de l'évaluation pouvait permettre aux OSI de communiquer sur leurs résultats, sur leurs pratiques, et de réfléchir également sur leurs actions et leurs projets en lien avec les différentes parties prenantes de ces actions : milieu associatif, partenaires du Sud et du Nord, donateurs ou bailleurs et bénéficiaires de ces actions.

En termes de bilan

Avec les bailleurs de fonds en particulier, l'évaluation est devenue pratiquement un passage obligatoire qui s'inscrit maintenant dans une procédure de cofinancement des pouvoirs publics permettant de renouveler le financement. L'accès aux résultats des travaux d'évaluation se développe également par le biais de procédures qui garantissent notamment la transparence des informations qui sont transmises aux donateurs, sans qu'il y ait cependant réellement des débats autour de l'évaluation et de ses applications.

Si l’on peut dire que les partenaires du Sud et du Nord sont associés depuis un certain nombre d'années, ils le sont en particulier parce qu'ils sont absolument indispensables à la bonne fin de ce processus d'évaluation. Ils sont en général très peu impliqués dans la conception des évaluations et les questions qu'elles posent ou dans une certaine réciprocité. C’est le cas, par exemple, pour l'analyse des partenariats qui soutiennent des actions et des projets et qui, le plus souvent, se limite aux critères d'efficacité concernant les partenaires du Sud et leur fonctionnement, mais prend rarement en compte l'ensemble du processus et des dispositifs impliquant les partenaires du Nord et les bailleurs du fonds, ainsi que les autres acteurs des actions et des projets de développement.

Au niveau des OSI, l'exercice d'évaluation est souvent perçu comme étant le domaine des professionnels, des salariés ou des cadres des associations, et cela engendre parfois des relations assez tendues avec les bénévoles ou les militants. Il est difficile d'impliquer ces militants dans les processus d'évaluation, même si l'on trouve quelques exemples de réussite, comme par exemple Artisans du Monde en France, qui a mené une évaluation très intéressante de ce point de vue débouchent sur une réflexion commune entre bénévoles-militants et cadres de l'association ainsi que d'autres parties prenantes des projets qu'elle supporte.

Les bénéficiaires impliqués dans les actions peuvent quant à eux avoir accès, dans le meilleur des cas, à la parole, en particulier dans le cadre d'évaluations participatives. Ils sont très rarement, ou trop rarement, destinataires des résultats des évaluations. Il s'agit d'un paradoxe puisqu'ils devraient être *a priori* les premiers intéressés par le résultat des évaluations et de ce que cela implique pour les actions de développement.

Il y a donc une certaine inégalité au niveau des différentes parties prenantes autour de ces processus de rendre compte.

Pour que l'évaluation soit un réel outil de changement

Au-delà de la redevabilité vis-à-vis des différentes parties prenantes, l'implication dans l'évaluation pour les OSI repose souvent sur une volonté d'améliorer les pratiques et les projets qu'elles mettent en œuvre. Pour produire du changement, l'évaluation doit être véritablement portée par l'association, elle doit être endogène et s'inscrire dans une stratégie globale.

L'implication des acteurs depuis la conception et l'élaboration des termes de référence, le choix de l'équipe et jusqu'à la restitution des résultats de l'évaluation, est un élément indispensable pour que l'évaluation soit réellement un outil de changement. Au niveau de la restitution, les OSI font remarquer qu'il faut dépasser la simple restitution des recommandations et essayer de trouver les moyens d'accompagner leur formulation et leur mise en œuvre.

Il faudrait peut-être également, en accompagnement de l'exercice de l'évaluation, une préparation des différentes ressources humaines impliquées, au niveau des méthodes, sur les référentiels dont on peut disposer pour mettre an œuvre des évaluations pour les différentes activités qu'elles réalisent, puis sur un référentiel permettant de comparer les résultats des évaluations à d'autres travaux existants. Tout cela doit être mis en forme par le biais de capitalisations et après la systématisation des résultats des différentes évaluations.

On peut donc dire que pour que les évaluations soient un outil de changement, elles doivent être menées de façon très différente que les évaluations qu'on voit trop souvent, très dépendantes des bailleurs de fonds et très courtes dans le temps, qui font appel à quelques experts externes venus sur le terrain pour quelques jours sans considérer tout ce processus d'accompagnement qui démarre dès les discussions entre les parties prenantes sur les termes des références et peut prendre des mois.

Les OSI françaises font état d'un certain nombre de menaces dans la pratique de l'évaluation

L'effort de normalisation et de standardisation de l'évaluation qui prévaut chez un grand nombre de partenaires, en particulier les agences de coopération, peut poser question. Pour mieux formaliser l'exercice, des systèmes de notation sont introduits, qui ne prennent pas en compte la diversité, l'hétérogénéité des contextes des actions de développement. Dans le domaine de la micro-finance par exemple, on introduit le critère de rentabilité financière des institutions, et l'on applique le même pour les institutions rurales et urbaines, alors que les conditions d'exercice de ces institutions sont radicalement différentes.

L'évaluation est souvent un passage obligé pour le renouvellement du financement et elle devient en quelque sorte un rituel formel qui ne va pas forcément au fond des choses, et qui n'apporte que peu d'éléments aux différentes parties prenantes.

Différents enjeux et défis autour de l'évaluation

Des difficultés peuvent se présenter en interne, au sein de l'OSI évaluée qui voudra garder la face vis-à-vis d'un acteur externe comme l'agence de financement ou les donateurs. Il y a alors conflit entre différents objectifs de l'évaluation qui peuvent rendre difficile à la fois l'exercice de rendre compte et celui de questionnement pour le changement.

Du point de vue des OSI, en particulier françaises, , un élément ressort de la réflexion : il s'agit de faire de l'évaluation un moyen pour construire et refonder des politiques publiques qui soient concertées entre les différents acteurs impliqués dans les processus de développement.

Ce questionnement prend un caractère nouveau et actuel dans le cadre particulier des stratégies de lutte contre la pauvreté et de réduction des inégalités. Ces stratégies, en tout cas de notre point de vue, ne se construisent pas comme des filets sociaux de protection qui ne touchent pas aux conditions d'accès aux ressources. Il s'agit au contraire de politiques intermédiaires, au point de rencontre en les dynamiques sociales à la base et leur prise en compte dans des décisions de politique nationale. .

Il faut prendre particulièrement en compte les initiatives de base qui existent et faire négocier et discuter les différents acteurs. Alors l'exercice de l'évaluation est conçu réellement comme un moyen de faire dialoguer et devient un espace pour refonder les politiques de coopération qui soutiennent cette stratégie de réduction de la pauvreté.

Le chemin est évidemment encore long pour y parvenir et l'amélioration des techniques d'évaluation n'est pas l'axe majeur de progrès. Il faut en effet lutter contre la confidentialité qui, la plupart de temps, bloque tout apprentissage collectif autour de l'amélioration des pratiques. Il faut ainsi essayer de construire un dispositif de régulation des politiques de coopération, par la diffusion des résultats, leur mise en débat et leur réinvestissement dans les plans stratégiques et les nouvelles orientations de politiques.

Si l'on arrive à construire des évaluations concertées et discutées entre les différents acteurs, évaluations qui permettent de mettre en débat non seulement les actions des OSI, mais également les politiques de coopération bilatérales et multilatérales, on pourra notablement contribuer à la pertinence et à l'efficacité des politiques de lutte contre la pauvreté.

Débats

Ted Kliest (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands)

From the presentations it seems to me that the dichotomy is between evaluations carried out for accountability reasons and those conducted mainly for learning purposes. The last presentations were more on the learning mode whereas the first presentations were more on accountability and learning. The question is how NGOs, partner countries as well as donors may work together in joint evaluations when such an apparent dichotomy exists? Or maybe it does not exist ?

Massimo d'Angelo (UN-DESA)

Khalid Malik gave an accurate illustration of the evaluation function within the UN organisation and I would just like to complement that presentation.

A very specific dimension of **the evaluation function of the UN** which may be added is a composite set of semi-autonomous organisations with separate inter-governmental governing bodies and mandate organisational structure responsibilities. Therefore, evaluations that are undertaken within each organisation address efficiency, effectiveness and relevancy factors in sustainability in the context of each organisation and not in the system as a whole, even though several times today was raised the irrelevance of our duties in the more global context.

Evaluations are undertaken also by other UN entities, for instance, the Office for International Services and the Joint Inspection Unit. I would like to highlight here all the dimensions of the evaluation function that has been entrusted by the General Assembly of the United Nations to the Secretary General, the overall effectiveness of the development co-operation activities of the UN system, as a triennial comprehensive policy review that the General Assembly undertakes every three years. The report prepared by the Secretariat for this triennial policy review is based on our evaluation activities that are undertaken in close consultation with the member states, based essentially on country-level experience. It is the basis for the formulation of policy guidance from the General Assembly to member states and the UN system. This function has been the subject of a specific report that we submitted to the Economic and Social Council last July that summarises the future direction in which this evaluation will evolve.

The system-wide dimension of the evaluation is the aspect I would like to stress because it is a particularly challenging task that we are facing as a system. It is becoming particularly relevant in the current climate of international co-operation which recognises the need to define common parameters for collective effort through partnership and mutual commitment.

These evaluations are also facing political challenges with regard to methodology, as well as the purpose of operational activities.

When international development action is defined through guidelines and parameters, MDGs and other international agreed objectives, there is a significant shift of **emphasis from accountability on the use of resources to results after they have been implemented**. At the same time, accountability on the use of resources will continue to play a critical role in our evaluation. I would like to ask if these evaluations can benefit very much from a very collaborative approach within the UN system, but also from the dialogue within the participative approach with actors that are beyond the UN system, national and international stakeholders, including bilaterals and representatives of the NGOs and civil society.

Question de la salle

We heard Mr. Khalid Malik talking about the MDGs as a driving beacon. We also heard the civil society organisations talking about assessment as a learning tool. Could the civil society organisations elaborate a bit more on how they take up **the challenge of the MDGs** and how they can assess in how far they contribute to these ?

François Grünewald (URD)

J'aimerais avoir l'avis des panélistes sur la question de **l'indépendance des évaluateurs**. Depuis une quinzaine d'années l'évaluation est devenue une fonction fondamentale et il y a un business très florissant autour de ça, mais on voit dans le même temps une masse très considérable de rapports sur les étagères, qui ont coûté évidemment beaucoup d'argent et ont relativement peu d'impact ; tout cela souvent au nom de l'indépendance des évaluateurs qui doivent, avec leur grande sagesse, promouvoir tous les jugements et tous les conseils nécessaires. J'ai moi-même fait beaucoup d'évaluations comme indépendant et j'ai eu la grande frustration de l'inefficacité de ce processus dans bien des cas.

Question de la salle

This is a question to people who have experience of projects carried on by NGOs. How do you actually link the evaluation to the decisions with regard to the project studied ? In the presentation of the project carried on in Peru, there are parts of the evaluation which finally led to some improvement in the overall strategy of the project. How was this link organised ? How did the results of that evaluation actually lead to certain decisions with regard to the strategy of the project ? And how was the decision-making process organised ?

Nat Ketlele (Confederation of South African Unions)

There is a proposition to eliminate the bureaucrats between the donors and the stakeholders. That is a very progressive position, but the current thing here that one has not been able to establish is how the people at the grass roots may be able to access, to link up with the funders in different continents, particularly in Africa.

Dasgupta Jashodhara (Healthwatch UP Bihar)

My question is addressed to Mr. Van Den Berg. Thank you for a very illuminating framework of evaluation. However, I would like to point out that the whole evaluation framework was based on a very **donor-centred evaluation of development assistance**, and I wanted to know where there is space within the framework for evaluating the donors and their commitment to MDGs or to agreements made at the UN conferences, like Copenhagen, Paris, Beijing and so forth. I felt that the whole framework is not moving towards aid but trade and the investment kind of approach to development assistance, as you talked about getting better returns for money. I felt this violates the social contract between the North and the South and your framework of what is good governance does not include any social justice or equity.

Cunningham Ngcukana (National Council of Trade Unions, RSA)

I refer to Mr. Van Den Berg discussion and some of the others, particularly in relation to the idea of **micro-successes and macro-failures**. I think this is also likened to the inevitable chicken as nobody wants to describe development as imposing solutions on people who didn't yet know they had problems. Perhaps one of the issues that we had to look at is first of all who is being developed ? Are we developing the right people or we are actually developing capacity in the right people ? In my experience, it is not always the grass roots people who are the key deservers and needers of development. Very often the key partners in ministries actually need it and the evaluation becomes skewed because these people have little conception of what was really being asked.

Jean-François Lanteri (MAE, France)

Je voudrais que soient clarifiées pour qu'elles ne nous soient pas imposées les notions d'apprentissage et de rendre compte, que l'on débatte de l'étymologie du mot évaluation et de la valeur. Lorsqu'il s'agit du processus de changement social qui nous intéresse, c'est bien des valeurs au sens philosophique et non économique du terme qu'il s'agit. L'évaluation devient alors un débat sur le sens du changement social à des moments donnés des actions qui s'appellent des projets ou des programmes. Je crois que la question de l'évaluation pose est celle des protagonistes : comment associer les bénéficiaires qui sont, quand même, les exclus des débats sur le changement social.

Osvaldo Feinstein

The three presentations on civil society's experiences are interesting in several ways. One of them illustrate issues that are relevant from the demand side, whereas the others are interesting from the supply side of evaluations..

In the case of the production of evaluations, the presentation on Peru mentioned something about **the way to document processes**. They realised that there was a need to do this and there but no way was found. There was also a reference to micro-finances and the issue of indicators. The point I want to make here is the challenge to identify available methodologies that have been developed (such as "process documentation research", in the Philippines and the work done by CGAP on micro-finances) and only then to show gaps in methodologies that require further work. It may be interesting to discuss these issues a little.

The presentation on the French experiences pointed out something particularly relevant concerning **disclosure and learning**. One of the important roles of civil society could be to intensify demand for evaluations that already have been done so that they become public, i.e. disclosed. Secondly, the first presentation made as very interesting reference to intelligent accountability. There is a risk of diluting accountability, so it is important to take this into account.

Question de la salle

Mention has been made in this conference on **partnerships and evaluation** between different agencies, between UN agencies, partnership between the IFIs and between the UN agencies and the NGOs, occasionally partnerships between NGOs and stakeholders, and sometimes UN agencies and stakeholders to a more limited extent as well perhaps.

What I find missing is about partnership in the role of **national evaluation associations**, the professional associations of evaluators in development countries. They are more than 30 of these professional associations now. The membership of these associations is probably far greater than the number of evaluators working in and for all these agencies, and if we are talking about capacity development in the country, it seems very often that we are talking about development of capacity of the consultants that we use ourselves, rather than the capacities of the national associations that are actually based and rooted in the country. There has been hardly any mention of the national associations up to now.

Furthermore, we have quite some descriptions of the DAC evaluation criteria. With respect to the DAC evaluation criteria, if you look at the name, it comes from the development community. The African Development Association has worked on, adapted and endorsed the **programme evaluation standards** for use in development evaluation. I find it unfortunate when we are talking about partnership in development assistance that we are stressing the DAC evaluation quality criterion to the exclusion of the programme evaluation standards which is a set of standards that the indigenous state developed, adapted and adopted in Africa.

Jean Quesnel (UNICEF)

L'organisation de cette conférence est un évènement tout à fait historique qui permet à **cinq constellations** de se parler. Il y a la constellation des pays qui sont des sujets de développement mais qui font l'objet de l'évaluation des pays donateurs, celle des banques, celle des Nations Unies et la constellation de la société civile. Ce séminaire présente le défi pour ces constellations de se parler et d'échanger, tant au niveau micro que macro. Actuellement ces constellations sont très séparées au niveau macro et sont limitées au niveau micro, et, selon le macro, ne comprennent pas la micro. Le défi est d'échanger les leçons apprises.

La thèse de fond est : est-ce que l'on va autoriser que l'évaluation perdure du côté de l'offre, du côté du planificateur, de celui qui a de l'argent ? Lorsque le planificateur est au début de son modèle de développement ? L'évaluation appartient au côté de la demande, aux bénéficiaires, aux acteurs, aux sujets même du développement.

Question de la salle

Dans un sens on peut prévoir un peu de place pour ceux que l'on appelle les acteurs et les bénéficiaires des changements ou des interventions. Mais dans la mesure où l'on continue à croire et à penser qu'il y en a qui reçoivent, on continuera toujours à voir ceux qui reçoivent comme n'ayant pas de responsabilité.

Masa Kato (FAO)

From my own experience, we find **evaluation quite costly** and with all these demands and expectations on evaluation, the one thing that is not diminishing is the cost. A pertinent question may be, taking advantage of the partnership issue, how can we come up with a sensible, practical division of labour ? We will be looking at individual activities, projects, programmes, countries, sectors, in fact development across the board. How are we going to do this ? A lot of resources are being spent and this is an element that needs consideration.

Gilbert Aluoch (Care International, Kenya)

Il y a un risque à réduire l'évaluation à une seule évaluation multiforme. **Chaque forme d'évaluation a sa spécificité**, son utilité dans le processus de changement. Nous devrions essayer, non pas de réduire, de trouver des normes et des procédures communes, mais plutôt de comprendre comment ce puzzle de la diversité des évaluations comme celle des acteurs va effectivement pouvoir fonctionner et s'enrichir des uns et des autres et non pas s'opposer. L'évaluation de l'aide dépend du contexte dans lequel elle s'exerce. Par rapport aux revendications tout à fait légitimes des populations et des structures bénéficiaires d'une aide soumise à une évaluation, je soulignerais que l'intelligence n'est pas d'importer les normes, mais d'avoir la capacité d'inventer soi-même ses propres normes et procédures.

Un syndicaliste du Bénin

La société civile a plusieurs composantes, et pour parler d'évaluation je crois qu'il faut avoir bénéficié d'une aide. Les syndicats, marginalisés jusqu'à maintenant, ont également de l'expérience en matière de contribution au développement.

Synthèse

M. Henri Rouillé d'Orfeuil

Des questions de fond sont posées : qui sont les vrais acteurs ? Quelle est la place de ces acteurs ? Nous avons tendance à valoriser les débats opérateurs/bailleurs de fonds, mais ni les uns ni les autres ne sont les vrais acteurs du développement.

Puis, en lien avec cela, apparaissent des questionnements sur le développement comme changement social : sommes nous en mesure d'analyser ce changement social ? Une telle analyse dépasse souvent les frontières des projets et la notion même de projet est remise en cause : mode d'organisation du travail un peu artificiel, petit morceau de temps, d'espace et de sociologie…

Au delà de la coopération, nous revenons ainsi à la réalité du développement. Les MDG représentent-ils des objectifs universels ? Les ONG s'y retrouvent-elles ? S'agit-il d'une cible commune qui va permettre aux uns et aux autres de converger vers un même but ?

La question du partenariat dans l'évaluation est alors posée ainsi que l'identité du décideur. Nous situons nous dans une politique de l'offre ? Y a t-il une politique de la demande ? En matière d'évaluation les clients ou les acteurs peuvent-ils avoir un rôle moteur ?

Nous considérons enfin cette balance entre « learning process » et « accountability », puis la question de l'indépendance des évaluations et des évaluateurs et de leur statut, interne ou externe. Des questions sont également posées sur l'utilité des évaluations, leur coût, la production de rapports, leur utilisation et leur accessibilité. Serait-il possible de diviser le travail, de se spécialiser par type d'évaluation, par secteur géographique, par thème… ?

Qu'en est-il de la diversité des évaluations versus leur normalisation, qui peut évidemment contraindre cette diversité ? Quelle serait la référence ? Est-ce que les normes sont établies au niveaux des institutions mondiales, multilatérales… ? Est-ce que la réalité et la diversité des terrains doit primer ?

C'est donc toute une série de questions sur l'évaluation elle-même qui est posée, puis sur les acteurs de l'évaluation : qui sont les évaluateurs ? Quelle est cette communauté ? Peut-on parler de « business » ? Quelle est la place des pays du sud ou des évaluateurs du sud, des sociétés d'évaluation de ces communautés ?

Finalement, évalue t-on les bailleurs de fonds et qui en est responsable ? Est-ce que les ONG, par exemple, pourraient évaluer des ministères ? Est-ce que les gens du sud peuvent évaluer des gens du nord ? Puisqu'au fond nous sommes partenaires…

M. Hans Lundgren

The presentations we have heard cover a wide range of material and ideas coming from the various evaluation communities represented at the workshop. I will attempt to highlight some of the main features of the papers and then summarise the main suggestions emerging from the discussion.

Accountability and Learning

The papers presented today demonstrate the important role that civil society can play in furthering the level of thinking around evaluation and developing its use. But they also reveal interesting differences in how evaluation is conceptualised.

The paper by F3E described the evolution in civil society organisations in France, where significant developments have taken place in the last decade. Considerable progress has been made from the early and more limited views on the role of evaluation to a broader approach. However, as noted in the presentation, many challenges lie ahead, relating in particular to the increased involvement of partners and beneficiaries and the strengthening of utilisation of evaluation results.

The Norwegian paper is interesting for its strong emphasis on the learning and participatory aspects of evaluations and at the same time, the accountability dimension is toned down. This paper probably goes furthest, in the sense that is suggesting a redefinition of evaluation with learning as the main purpose.

It is however important to recognise that accountability remains a fundamental aspect of evaluation and has been the driving force behind the strengthening of evaluation units in many bilateral and multilateral agencies. The independence of evaluation vis-à-vis management remains crucial for providing credible evaluations in multilateral banks and agencies and bilateral DAC members.

In this regard, an interesting aspect of the BOAG presentation was the notion of upward and downward accountability. In this framework, participatory evaluation remains at the centre, with independent assessments complementing it to ensure robust, external scrutiny for mainly accountability purposes.

Need for further work

Several interventions highlighted the need for more evaluations dealing with the current challenges in development; key concepts mentioned were partnership, ownership, good governance, coherence, social justice and equity. Others emphasised the scope for a strengthened role of evaluation as a means to rethink development co-operation as such.. It was suggested that we need to move away from an overemphasis on individual agency or NGO attributions and shift our attention towards our joint contributions to development outcomes.

Some participants stressed the importance of devising new methods for evaluating participatory policy work, while others highlighted the need for evaluation of donors, and for elaborating a clearer code of ethics for the evaluation community. There were demands for less focus on aid as such and more attention paid to processes and policies that influence development.. It was also argued that we need evaluation to be more demand-driven.

An important point was made on the need for diversity in approaches and that we should stimulate research and experimentation. We need to identify gaps in methodology and work together to fill them and share openly our work so we can benefit from each other.

The ideas and suggestions emerging from the papers and the discussion constitute a rich agenda for reflection on the prospects to improve the use and impact of evaluation. We need to find out how we can best work together to reap the benefits of the opportunities that lie ahead.

CHAPITRE 2 : NOUVEAUX DÉFIS DU DÉVELOPPEMENT ET ÉVALUATION

Cette session aborde les défis de l'évaluation au regard des nouvelles dynamiques du développement et vise à identifier les meilleures pratiques de chaque communauté. L'atelier a été divisé en quatre sous-groupes pour permettre une meilleure participation. Les exposés qui suivent sont les synthèses exposées en session plénière par les rapporteurs de chaque sous-groupe.

Président : M. Hans Lundgren, Conseiller, Direction de la Coopération au développement, OCDE.

CHAPTER 2: NEW DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES AND EVALUATION

This session, divided in four parallel subgroups, aim at addressing challenges for evaluation emerging from current trends of development and identifying best practices coming from each community. Short presentations and roundtable discussion highlight the methods used. The following presentations are the summaries exposed by rapporteurs in plenary session.

Chair: Mr Hans Lundgren, Advisor, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD.

ATELIER 1 : ÉVALUATION PARTICIPATIVE

Président : Mme Ros David, Action Aid.

Rapporteur : M. Goberdhan Singh, Directeur de l'évaluation, Agence Canadienne du Développement International.

Contributions :

- « Où en sommes nous ? L'évaluation participative dans la pratique de Handicap international », Nick Heeren, Directeur des programmes de Handicap International.
- « Une évaluation par des partenaires du Sud des programmes norvégiens d'éducation au développement », Stiann van der Merwe, Afrique du Sud.
- « L'évaluation du changement de deux projets d'éducation namibiens », Ursula Van Harmelen, Université de Rhodes, Afrique du Sud.
- « De l'évaluation participative aux fonds d'expertise en évaluation des pays partenaires », Caroline Guillot-Marchi, consultante, Fondation de France.

SUB-GROUP 1: PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION

Chair: Ms Roz David, Action Aid

Rapporteur: Mr Goberdhan Singh, Director of Evaluation, Canadian International Development Agency

- "How are we doing ? Participation evaluation in the practice of Handicap international", Nick Heeren, Director of Programmes at Handicap International.
- "An evaluation conducted from the South of Development Education in the North", Stiann van der Merwe, South Africa.
- "Evaluating change in educational development, a case study of two Namibian education projects", Ursula Van Harmelen, Senior lecturer, Rhodes University, South Africa.
- "From participatory evaluation to specified Funds for evaluation in partner countries", Caroline Guillot-Marchi, consultant, Fondation de France

Mr. Goberdhan Singh, Director of Evaluation, Canadian International Development Agency

I opted to take a less traditional narrative sort of descriptive approach to reporting. I have gone a little bit of the unorthodox way, perhaps maybe a more risky or controversial approach to try to be a more analytical about what was discussed. The intent is, of course, to stimulate further thinking about discussions on methodological approaches, evaluation of projects, etc., to give people some food for thought.

Background on the session

There were four case studies that were presented. One was a presentation by Handicap International, that was an evaluation of community approaches to handicap and development. The focus of the evaluation was on various aspects of the effectiveness, efficiency, impact, of the training in community development organisations, their staff, their managers, etc.

The second one was an evaluation of the northern development related organisation called RORG, a Norwegian organisation and its network, a southern partner. It focused on the efficacy of RORG's development education initiatives in Norway, rather than their development activities in the South.

The third initiative was an evaluation of change in educational development in Namibia and this one focused on the objectives, the achievements of the programme's objectives, the impact and overall a critical assessment of the institutional learning that happened. The methodology tried to move away from the « How much ? » kind of approach which is a quantitative approach to « How well ? », a more qualitative approach.

The last case was from the Fondation de France, a commitment to enhance the competence of development organisations and experts in the South. There we were seeing a shift from participatory evaluation to funds for enhancing the capacity and participatory expertise of organisations and their staff.

The perspective

In a broader scheme of things it is useful to remember, and we need to always remind ourselves that, first of all, evaluation is a management tool. It is not an end in itself, it's a means to an end, and as a tool for improving the quality or the effectiveness of our development interventions, it's important to recognise that there's a bigger stake here.

The second aspect that I want to outline is that we need to see evaluation as an applied research initiative. We have in that sense choices on the mix of methodological approaches we can use, and the participatory approach is essentially one of several. In terms of approach, it is really at one end of the spectrum.

The third point I want to bring is that, in many ways, we talk about participatory evaluation as if it was something new. It is not really. The whole concept of participatory evaluation is really the extent to which participation, how that participation, and who participates. Traditional evaluations are participatory to a certain extent because they do involve people and take information from information providers: the beneficiaries, the programme people, etc. Involving people as providers of information forces which is where the whole discussion on participatory evaluation goes, involving them more in the decision-making of the process at various stages. That is, when we talk about participatory evaluation, what we refer to.

A few criteria

As we look at evaluations, how do you know whether they are good ? This is sort of a theme that struck a lot of people. I was struck by the fact that we never really got a sense from the presentations about the content of the evaluation, whether in fact they were good.

I am proposing four criteria to look at evaluations. One is the accessibility to the audience, and that means the evaluation, whatever is done, can be easily understood, it is clear about the why's, the what's, the who's, the when things were done, etc. The second criterion is the credibility, the methodological quality. This is where the whole concept of participatory approach comes in. When we talk about this kind of criterion, it is really a composite of a number of things: the issue of balance between what is positive and what is not positive ; the level of engagement of stakeholders, whether it's the beneficiaries, the programme staff, etc.; the reliability and validity of the data or information, etc. ; good coverage of evaluation issues such as, are we talking about relevance, are we talking about coherence, are we talking about effectiveness, efficiency, impact and so on; and finally findings and conclusions should be substantiated by the evidence, and therefore be more convincing to the reader. The third criterion is about utility and utilisation. When in fact evaluation is used for enhancing knowledge, whether it's learning or whether it is used for accountability and reporting, programme improvement, etc. The fourth and final criterion is the value for money that we do derive from this exercise based on the kind of resources and level of effort that has been expended, whether the costs associated with what you have got for it are reasonable.

From laying this down, from the discussion and questions in the session, a number of on-going challenges of the participatory approach emerge.

Feedback from the session

Participatory does not mean undisciplined or unstructured. There seems to be some perception or belief that participatory evaluations are kind of loose and not as systematic. A lot of the work that has come out recently, the literature, basically says that participatory evaluation can be a very structured and systematic approach.

The second issue of the second on-going challenge is that good participatory evaluations require a certain kind of expertise. Evaluation is applied research but participatory evaluations would require skills and generally about various types of research methodology.

The third area goes back to my criteria about the methodological credibility of evaluations. We have a number of methodological issues which more or less pertain to issues of balance on various continua. You can think of one continuum for example, as the level of participation or the level of engagement of the various stakeholders in this, from providers of information or involvement more significantly at various points in the initiative, whether it is the design of the evaluation and decision-making at various points. The discussion was on qualitative versus quantitative. The methodologies of some of the case studies, at this point, in 2003, reminded me of the kind of discussion that was going on in the nineteen-sixties, early sixties, when the behaviourist revolution started to talk about things like « if you can't count it, then it doesn't count ». I thought we had moved away from things like that, but we still seem to be stuck on things like that.

Formative and process-focused evaluation versus summative or results-focused evaluation. These are dichotomies that I'm kind of surprised that still exist. Traditional normative versus new approaches, the whole issue of northern donor versus recipients southern perspectives, and interesting issues of unequal partnerships and power.

A point relates to what was called the micro/macro linkage. The need to move from micro success to macro success, as opposed to micro success, the whole issue of macro failure is an area that still is going to be a big challenge for evaluations.

Finally, «can you do participatory evaluations if the design of those initiatives were not done in a participatory manner?». My answer is, yes we can do it, but the real issue here is, maybe not participatory evaluation, but participatory planning.

Those are some of the issues and challenges that came out in our discussion on the session about participatory evaluations. I probably have not reflected very faithfully what was discussed, and in that case, perhaps during the question period, some of the participants in that session might be wanting to complement what I have said here. I've taken a bit of an unorthodox perspective.

Additionnal Commentary

Ms. Ursula Van Harmelen, Rhodes University, RSA

Discussions around evaluation approaches and practices were, as mentioned by Karen Odhiambo, affirming rather than revolutionary. In this regard the emphasis on the need for evaluations to articulate methodology clearly and to justify methodology was seen as important. The latter being closely aligned to the idea of setting standards and norms for evaluation practices. This affirmed the recognition of methodology as a shaping mechanism of and for evaluation.
Issues around standards and norms beyond the selection of methodology is something that would need more than simply setting these from a purely technisist position but would need to be considered from within guiding principles located in ethics. The impression from the various presentations is that such principles ought to be determined by collaboration between the 'client-s', the programme and the evaluators. The extent to which standards and norms for evaluation can be seen as generic is a moot point and would need further discussion in the organisations concerned.

The following challenges can be related to the first focal area and struck me as being worthy of more thought as they have considerable implications for evaluation approaches and practices:

- the fact that we should be evaluating development not aid,
- the need identified for consistency and coherence within evaluations that focus on development,
- the importance of selecting appropriate evaluation teams so moving to 'participatory expertise' and not only focussing on participatory evaluation processes,
- the important role of evaluation as and for learning was a continuous focus underpinning the conference.

The biggest challenge of all facing not only evaluators but development agencies is the question of where development ought to start - included in this is the development of the developers, the development of the partners as well as the traditional development of the beneficiaries (or actors as seems to be the more favoured term) –much of this centred around discussions around the catch `phrase micro successes –macro failures´.

In the area of accountability, key issues that emerged were related to aspects such as the need for evaluations that will lead to ‘better spending’ of aid money. Key questions that needed to be addressed were identified as:

- Who is accountable? To whom are they accountable? Why are they accountable? What mechanisms are in place to ensure accountability? Added to this was the need for reaching consensus on accountability as both an internal and external process between the evaluators and the other actors in the process.
- What I found particularly interesting was the manner or tone related to the discussion on accountability and quality assurance – the emphasis being on joint responsibility and fairness and justice – an approach that focused on enhancing the credibility of M&E .

Within the discussions around accountability and quality assurance interesting insights were revealed pertaining to the use of indicators and their intrinsic reliability as they cannot identify why things happen, also relating to the traditional input-output-outcome-impact model , which as a linear model has limitations in assessing social changes. The feeling here was that this model while producing useful guidelines needs the addition of participatory narratives (using a variety of tools) that are interpreted and assessed by evaluators –again placing a high premium on the expertise of evaluators! These too are aspects that need further thought and discussion.

Evaluation costs were an undercurrent permeating the conference and the unspoken consensus was that if evaluation is to have credibility and to meet the expectations of the donors etc… then it will cost –BUT this increases the responsibility of the evaluation community to produce evaluations that DO meet the expectations.

Another key area for me was the issue of evaluation as a learning mechanism. This has considerable implications regarding the dissemination of evaluation reports- their accessibility and their audiences. Institutional learning raises questions about which institution? So often the people that learn most are the evaluators. Who reads the reports who learns from them. The feeling was that reports ought to be widely disseminated and available, that the whole evaluation process should be far more transparent and open for discussion much as is the case in the academic world. – this would on the one hand lead to the tradition of peer reviews and would hopefully also leads to greater accountability NOT just among evaluators but in the whole development community. Here I know I would want further discussion vis a vis reporting in my own institution and with IBIS as well as with DANIDA.

Finally, relating to capacity and collaboration in and for evaluation - collaboration and partnerships were often used phrases but a number of the presentations revealed that this was simply rhetoric in the case of many organisations -given the number of partners present as well as presentations from China and Australia! The problem is that this is a tricky area and is not simply a North – South thing but is as relevant internally between donor agents and implementing agencies. This is another area that I need to think more about in relation to my own institution.

In summing up, nothing startlingly new but considerable food for thought.-Certainly too much to digest in two days and will need careful reading of papers. I learnt an enormous amount about the evaluation ‘community’, the aid community and development and I feel that I was extremely privileged to be party to these discussions. The responsibility of evaluators was forcibly brought home and while I have always recognised this, I feel even more nervous about my role a formative evaluator than ever before –particularly in my situation where that buck really stops with me.

ATELIER 2 : ÉVALUATION DE L'IMPACT

Président : Mme Karen Odhiambo, Présidente, Kenya Evaluation Association.

Rapporteur : M. Michael Hippler, Chef du département de l'évaluation, MISEREOR.

Contributions :

Partie 1: Etudes de cas sur l'impact social

- « Les approches de la mesure de l'impact et du reporting. Le travail de deux ONG norvégiennes en Ethiopie et au Sri Lanka », Marit Haug, Norwegian Institute for Urban & Regional Research (NIBR).
- « Renforcer les structures d'évaluation des ONG de femmes travaillant dans la santé en vue d'améliorer le suivi et l'évaluation des engagements internationaux en Asie », Jashodhara Dasgupta, SAHAYOG, India.
- « Une perspective syndicale en matière d'évaluation », Bandula Kothaloawala, Trades Union Congress (TUC), Grande-Bretagne.

Partie 2 : Nouvelles approches de l'évaluation de l'impact

- « Comment sélectionner les indicateurs pour évaluer l'impact ? », Nurul Alam, PNUD.

SUB-GROUP 2: IMPACT EVALUATION

Chair: Ms Karen Odhiambo, Chair, Kenya Evaluation Association

Rapporteur: Mr Michael Hippler, Head of Evaluation and Quality Management Department, MISEREOR

Part I: Case studies on social impact

- "Approaches to measuring and reporting on impact. The work of two Norwegian NGOs in Ethiopia and Sri Lanka", Marit Haug, Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research (NIBR).
- "Building Capacities of Women and Health NGOs to monitor and evaluate international development commitments in Asia", Jashodhara Dasgupta SAHAYOG, India.
- "Evaluation: a trade union perspective", Bandula Kothaloawala, Trades Union Congress (TUC), United Kingdom.

Part II: New approaches on impact evaluation

- "Selecting indicators for impact evaluation", Nurul Alam, UNDP.

Mr. Michael Hippler, Head of Evaluation and Quality Management Department, MISEREOR

Group two was by far the largest group, which was an indicator that this topic is really moving us. We started with three case studies that tackled different issues. We had one impact assessment on a project level, one on a more institutional level and the third one which was more directed towards monitoring state policy.

These three studied revealed the very elusive character of impact, although we know that we have the DAC glossary, defining what impact means. Nevertheless in chasing what impact is, we found it is elusive in view of its changing nature in time, its difficult measurement, and its relativity « who is going to ask for what ? », and also « do we measure impact on micro or macro level ? ».

We found out that there is a requirement for a very creative mix of methods in order to capture all facets of impact. This includes also stories, story-telling, case studies, and in the discussion it was brought out that this poses questions with regard to the selection criteria of those stories and the impartiality. There was also discovered a need for a very wide multi-dimensional look, which goes beyond programme level, in order to see the impact on the macro level.

Fear was expressed as there is the emergence of another expert industry due to the complexity and methodological difficulty, which, as a consequence, produces increase in costs. There was also fear that there is a greater distance between the experts and the stakeholders as a consequence of it.

The discussion also highlighted that impact statements need to be viewed against the overall development. Somebody spoke about « the real impact ». Therefore the question was also « would the MDGs entail all impact factors at all ? ».

We learned that, especially through the India case, monitoring impact and sharing its results with the public is also an intervention, and therefore observation becomes itself an intervention.

It is important for PIA that capacities are built up before, so that the communities can actively participate and nevertheless, this can give rise to doubts regarding the vested interest, maybe, of the trainers, or the NGOs dealing with the communities.

Lastly, the impact assessment should clearly state the concept and understanding of impact by each stakeholder and their interpretation of the results, and thus adding that we get a multi-faceted analysis of the impact interpretation.

It was clearly stated by southern participants that the principle of reciprocity demands to evaluate state policies and northern partners as well, and to measure it against their own standards and responsibility.

The question remained in how far we can admit to learn from unsatisfying impact, but at the same time remain accountable, as we could not have done better at the beginning of the process. This is a question which comes definitely out and where we didn’t find an answer yet.

The whole discussion was very much more on accountability than on learning, so this is why we put at least here one element, or one reference to learning in the report.

The second part of our session was dealing with indicators, starting from the UNDP’s experience. It was clearly found out that indicators are signposts for change, no more, and also not less, but they do not explain the why. Therefore the discussion dwelt a lot around caution and scepticism about the use of indicators. There was expressed fear that their use may lead to dominate the whole process of analysing the impact. How much energy goes into finding meaningful indicators and measuring them and does the same energy go also into the policy-making and analysis ?

Finally, there were few questions about indicators « when are they useful and when not ? » and it's very important to notice that a lot of indicator systems do not fulfil the requirements as a lot of participants could quote examples. And last but not least, defining indicators needs the involvement of all stakeholders and this was reiterated several times.

M. Hans Lundgren thanks the reporter to remind us of some of the difficulties in designing indicators and the fact that we have to be very careful how we do that work. He mentions that the working party on aid evaluation has made a start with the work on results-based management and come up with some good criteria for the selection of indicators, but that there is further work to be done in this area and also in chasing the elusive impact.

One participant comments that there were many interventions on issues related to indicators in this session, but also that at no point people said that indicators are not useful.

ATELIER 3 : INTERNALISATION DES RÉSULTATS D'ÉVALUATION

Président : M. Jean Quesnel, Directeur, Bureau d'évaluation, UNICEF.

Rapporteur : M. Paolo Basurto, ICU.

Contributions :

- « L'appropriation des résultats de l'évaluation grâce aux leçons apprises : perspectives complémentaires, dilemmes et quelques enseignements », Paul G.H. Engel, Directeur, Centre européen pour la gestion de la politique de développement (ECPDM).
- « Apprendre et croître à travers un projet de développement: l'expérience d'un syndicat aux Philippines », Patricia Rizon Quiaoit, PSLink, Philippines.
- « Quelles conditions pour une appropriation optimale des évaluations ? », Patrick Durish, Fondation Terre des Hommes, Suisse.
- « Le suivi et l'évaluation du Civil Society Challenge Fund », Mike Battcock, Department For International Development (DFID), Grande-Bretagne.
- « L'évaluation, un enjeu pour l'avenir de la coopération », Sergio Marelli, Président, Association des ONG italiennes.

SUB-GROUP 3: INTERNALISATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS

Chair: Mr Jean Quesnel, Director, Office of Evaluation, UNICEF .

Rapporteur: Mr Paolo Basurto, ICU.

- "Internalising evaluation results through learning: complementary perspectives, dilemmas and some lessons learned", Paul G.H. Engel, Director, European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM).
- "Learning and growing through development project: a Trade Union Experience in the Philippines", Patricia Rizon Quiaoit, PSLink, Philippines.
- "What conditions for an optimal internalisation of evaluation?", Patrick Durish, Fondation Terre des Hommes, Switzerland.
- "Assessing the performance of the Civil Society Challenge Fund", Mike Battcock Department for International Development (DFID), United Kingdom. >"Evaluation, a key point for future cooperation", Sergio Marelli, Chairman, Italian NGO Association.

M. Paolo Basurto, Expert, ICU - Italie

Une idée a certainement dominé pendant toute la réunion : il faut un changement profond, « a radical shift », dans notre considération de l'évaluation. Il faut un changement de perspective. Il faudrait créer un lien intime et prioritaire entre l'évaluation et le processus d'apprentissage et d'assimilation de résultats que l'évaluation produit. En effet, l'évaluation devrait être surtout pour l'apprentissage, sans que les processus se confondent.

Cet apprentissage doit se produire à trois niveaux : la formulation des politiques et de la programmation, la structure organisationnelle et la société elle-même. Dans cette perspective, l'évaluation cesse d'être seulement une technique puisqu'elle devient une attitude, une mentalité, une véritable culture qui permet de s'interroger de façon continue pour trouver ou créer de nouvelles solutions sur la base des résultats des évaluations. Il s'agit donc d'un processus ouvert à tous les protagonistes qui devrait leur permettre de trouver d'une façon conjointe comment résoudre les problèmes, comment reconnaître les situations de conflit et leur faire face avec des solutions viables et durables. C'est ce que l'on a appelé le développement de la capacité de négociation.

Trois cas concrets ont été illustrés et ont donné des exemples très riches de la force de l'évaluation pour le changement et l'amélioration des structures de gestion, la méthodologie opérationnelle, mais aussi le contenu même des actions.

Aux Philippines, une organisation syndicale a réalisé avec la coopération d'une organisation danoise un projet qui a permis à ce qui était une petite organisation ouvrière de devenir l'une des institutions les plus importantes au niveau national dans son domaine. Cette croissance, basée sur la transparence des règles et des activités, est surtout dû à l'emploi d'un système intégré d'évaluation interne et externe.

L'autre cas présenté est celui d'un organisme de coopération qui a lui aussi révolutionné sa structure de gestion en introduisant le concept de l'apprentissage à travers l'évolution comme règle normale de son organisation, et qui est ainsi devenu plus flexible et plus efficace.

Le troisième cas était basé sur l'utilisation des données de l'évaluation pour innover le système de gestion d'un fonds destiné à réduire la marginalisation des pauvres. Il s'agit là d'une sérieuse tentative pour abandonner ce que l'on a appelé la micro gestion des interventions individuelles et passer à une gestion plus compréhensive d'un portefeuille de projets, grâce à l'évaluation qui permet de considérer le projet et les risques qu'il y a de ne pas atteindre les objectifs.

Comme les trois cas l'ont démontré, la dissémination des résultats est nécessaire pour favoriser une dynamique d'amélioration et pour promouvoir un processus de mobilisation sociale basée sur l'apprentissage au niveau local, national et, pourquoi pas, international.

Comme corollaire à cette véritable nouvelle conceptualisation de l'évaluation comme apprentissage, ou **pour** l'apprentissage, d'autres idées ont été discutées : a) l'importance de l'évaluation interne et de l'auto-évaluation comme moyen pour se préparer à l'évaluation externe et la rendre constructive ; b) l'importance de changer d'optique et de considérer que l'on gère des processus plutôt que simplement des projets et qu'un bon système de monitoring pourrait aider à évaluer si certains résultats sont durables dans un cadre de changement profond, typique des sociétés en développement ; c) l'importance de savoir capitaliser l'apprentissage d'une façon systématique et homogène pour le rendre institutionnel et pas seulement individuel ; d) l'importance de choisir des évaluateurs ayant une capacité de médiation et de négociation.

On pourrait penser que l'on a peut être idéalisé les potentialités de cette nouvelle conception de l'évaluation comme instrument d'apprentissage, mais, au contraire, le groupe a bien tenu compte du fait que l'évaluation, et l'apprentissage encore plus, présentent toujours un risque ; que l'évaluation de projets sociaux reste une technique ambiguë, dont les critères se prêtent à être manipulés ; que l'évaluation bien faite avec un bon mélange de techniques appropriées peut coûter.

Je termine mon rapport avec cette phrase un peu provocante « finalement, si l'apprentissage évaluatif a des coûts, combien seront-ils à rester dans l'ignorance ? ».

ATELIER 4 : ÉVALUATION DE L'AIDE HUMANITAIRE ET DE L'ASSISTANCE EN SITUATION DE CONFLIT

Président : M. Colin Kirk, Chef du Département de l'évaluation, DFID.

Rapporteur : M. Ted Kliest, Evaluateur, Ministère des Affaires étrangères des Pays Bas.

Contributions :

- « Evaluation de l'impact des programmes de coopération politique en contexte de crise », Ulrich Storck, Friederich Ebert Stiftung (FES).
- « La pratique rend elle parfait? L'évaluation par ALNAP de la qualité de 165 évaluations d'action humanitaire, 2000-2002 », John Mitchell, Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP).
- « De l'évaluation à la formation à travers la recherche opérationnelle et la capitalisation d'expérience », François Grünewald, Président, Groupe Urgence Réhabilitation Développement (URD).

SUB-GROUP 4: EVALUATION OF HUMANITARIAN OR CONFLICT-RELATED ASSISTANCE

Chair: Mr Colin Kirk, Head of Evaluation Department, DFID

Rapporteur: Mr Ted Kliest, Evaluator, Ministry of Foreign affairs in Netherlands

- "Assessment of the impact of political cooperation programmes on the development of conflicts", Ulrich Storck, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES).
- "Practice makes perfect? ALNAP's assessment of the quality of 165 evaluations of humanitarian action, 2000-2002", John Mitchell, Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP).
- "From evaluation to training through operational research and capitalisation of experience", François Grünewald, Chairman, Groupe Urgence Réhabilitation Developpement (URD).

Mr. Ted Kliest, Evaluator, Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Netherlands

Group four discussed the challenges posed to evaluation of humanitarian assistance in complex emergencies as well the monitoring evaluation of projects and programmes which are aimed at preventing and mitigating crisis and conflict situations.

Our group was fairly small and consisted of evaluation experts from NGOs, from donors, from humanitarian aid agencies, as well as researchers and private consultants engaged in humanitarian action and in policy research on conflict issues.

Two presentations were related to the growing practice of evaluation of humanitarian assistance. The third presentation covered efforts to develop instruments for analysis, planning and monitoring and evaluation of social-political programmes aimed at preventing and mitigating crises and conflicts.

The presentations related to the evaluation of humanitarian assistance were discussed together and a number of points were raised.

First of all, evaluation of humanitarian assistance started only recently, in the early nineteen-nineties, with in fact an evaluation of Dutch humanitarian assistance to Somalia followed by the well-known Danish-led multi-agency system-wide evaluation of humanitarian action in Rwanda. The nineteen-nineties were furthermore characterised by standard setting within the humanitarian system and the growing body of knowledge of evaluation work in this sector. The number of evaluations in the sector increased dramatically, which was, for instance, shown by thirty evaluations which were conducted in parallel during the Kosovo crisis.

ALNAP, the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action, was established five years ago. ALNAP is an agency forum working to improve learning, accountability as well as quality in the humanitarian sector. Among its major activities, ALNAP carries out every year a meta-evaluation of the quality of evaluations of humanitarian assistance. The results of this meta-evaluation were presented by John Mitchell who is the coordinator of ALNAP. It is a recent analysis of 120 evaluation reports which revealed a number of challenges.

First of all, strengths and weaknesses of this type of evaluations are not unlike those of evaluations of structural development co-operation. The translation of the guidance for evaluating humanitarian assistance of complex emergencies, prepared by the OECD/DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation a few year ago, is showing that these elements in the guidance are progressively adapted in humanitarian aid evaluation. However, the analysis also showed that particular attention should be given to improving evaluation methodology. There also appears to be a need for greater transparency of evaluation methods used, so that readers can really discern what the evaluation was about and how the methods were applied. Furthermore, the evaluations of humanitarian assistance commonly follow a standard model. There seems not to be enough experimentation in the style of evaluation. Finally, the evaluation reports witness a lack of attention to the social processes in focusing on the « what has happened ? » rather than explaining why the interventions did succeed or did not succeed, and if they succeed to benefit the target population.

One of the questions raised in the discussion was whether the OECD DAC standard evaluation criteria were indeed sufficiently modified to suit evaluation of humanitarian action, and if not, what could be done to rectify the situation. At the same time, ALNAP also pointed out that not all evaluations showed systemic deficiencies. It appears that most deficiencies seemed to be related to the so-called « one shot project » evaluations.

A number of good practices were mentioned, mainly related to the wider, system-wide or sector wide programme evaluations, so the picture doesn’t seem too bleak. ALNAP's annual review of the quality of humanitarian aid evaluations can provide agencies with a useful insight in addressing these deficiencies. Last year and the year before, it appeared that some agencies really picked up these kind of analyses and improved their evaluation practice.

Following-up on the presentation of meta-evaluation, the French Groupe URD pointed out a number of very interesting experiments and innovations in evaluating humanitarian assistance. Humanitarian aid evaluation should be considered a fairly recent type of evaluation and it is also just coming to maturity, after having started with the major studies already mentioned. The value of the real time evaluation was pointed out as being enormous. This allows feeding in results into on-going activities and also allows for necessary adjustments in operational strategies. This type of evaluation is essentially formative and mainly focuses on learning.

Another very innovative form of evaluation adopted by Groupe URD consists of participatory evaluation with continued and repeated fieldwork as well as seminars involving field staff. These evaluations, which should be carefully balanced in terms of independence, accountability, learning, advice and even advocacy, allow a formative approach and training on the job and on the spot of those who are engaged in humanitarian action.

These two presentations and the ensuing discussion showed that challenges facing evaluation of humanitarian action can be met by innovative approaches which combine the following elements : flexibility and transparency of methods used ; mixed evaluation teams with sufficient local knowledge ; and relatively long and intensive contact between evaluators and those who are in fact implementing humanitarian aid. This allows learning, innovative ways to involve beneficiaries in the evaluation, and finally, but importantly, beneficiaries should not merely be engaged as respondents in a shallow survey kind of work, but as knowledgeable interlocutors which can provide first-hand and meaningful insights in the often volatile and fast-changing contexts and conditions in which humanitarian aid is provided.

These were the two reports on humanitarian aid evaluation. The third report was essentially different. The paper Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment from the German political Friederich Ebert Stiftung Foundation described the approach of the Foundation to analyse conflicts, to come up with relevant project and programme planning tools and monitoring and evaluation instruments. This work should result in guidelines for conflict analysis, for developing action plans and for social-political cooperation programmes. This work is still in progress and involves three conflict analyses conducted last year in Macedonia, Uzbekistan and Afghanistan.

The foundation now tries to lay the necessary analytical basis for systematic conflict sensitive planning of social-political programmes and project activities in crisis countries. The following key questions are central : what are the main causes of conflict and where is the threat escalation? What are relevant sectors and methods for diffusing conflict? Which are prospective partners to be involved in programmes and projects ? And which instruments must be used, at which level ?

A conflict impact analysis entails a number of steps needed to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate interventions, and these are political conflict analysis, analysis of the international response, or non-response, developing intervention levels and approaches, identifying suitable partners in country, conflict sensitive planning including development impact and hypothesis, as well as an overall strategy. The process is not yet advanced enough to really provide insights on monitoring and evaluation, although it was said that the monitoring instruments should be included in the planning instruments and in the policy and the strategy. The discussion focused on the need to develop these innovative, issue-oriented planning, monitoring and evaluation tools and to search for methods and approaches.

M. Hans Lundgren notes that it is interesting that the ALNAP meta evaluation was found useful for overcoming some of the quality problems and that it may be interesting to look at collectively how we can use meta evaluations of this kind to increase quality.

He also emphasis that this is a theme on the Agenda of the working party on aid evaluation, as probably on other international groups, and that there might be scope for joint work, joint taskforces or collaboration across these frontiers.

CHAPITRE 3 : L'ÉVALUATION COMME MOYEN DE RENDRE COMPTE

Cette session est l'occasion d'explorer les différences et similarités de l'exigence de rendre compte et des différentes approches développées. Elle permet d'explorer par ailleurs comment les agences multilatérales et bilatérales peuvent évaluer l'action des ONG qu'elles soutiennent.

LES MOYENS DE RENDRE COMPTE

Président : M. Niels Dabelstein, Chef de département, Secrétariat de l'évaluation de Danida.

Rapporteur : M. Mahesh Patel, Conseiller régional, Suivi et évaluation, UNICEF.

Contributions :

- « Le suivi des organisations caritatives : critères et méthodes d'évaluation », Burkhard Wilke, Secrétaire général, International Committee on Fundraising Organizations (ICFO).
- « L'évaluation, un instrument de la redevabilité », Noria Mezlev, Humanitarian Accountability Project (HAP).
- « Développement d'un cadre de suivi-évaluation pour la mise en œuvre de la Déclaration d'engagement sur le SIDA : Session spéciale de l'Assemblée générale des Nations unies sur le SIDA (UNGASS) », Michel Caraël, Responsable de l'évaluation ONUSIDA.
- « Les moyens de rendre compte », Communication de François Senemaud, Chef de Service, Ministère français des Affaires Etrangères.
- « La dimension manquante du développement : l'impact des politiques des pays riches sur les pauvres », Robert Picciotto, Directeur, Global Policy Project.

CHAPTER 3: EVALUATION AS A MEANS TO ACCOUNTABILITY OF PARTNERS IN DEVELOPMENT

This session aim at exploring differences and similarities of demands and approaches of the accountability concept. It also addresses how bilateral and multilateral agencies can evaluate the NGOs they support.

APPROACHES TO ACCOUNTABILITY

Chair: Mr Niels Dabelstein, Head of Department, Danida's Evaluation Secretariat.

Rapporteur: Mr Mahesh Patel, Regional advisor, Monitoring and Evaluation, UNICEF

- "Monitoring charitable organizations: criteria and assessment methods", Burkhard Wilke, Secretary General, International Committee on Fundraising Organizations (ICFO).
- "Evaluation a tool for accountability", Noria Mezlev, Humanitarian Accountability Project (HAP).
- "Development of a monitoring and evaluation framework for the implementation of the Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS: United Nations General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS (UNGASS)", Michel Caraël, Chief Evaluation UNAIDS.
- "Means to accountability", Communication by François Sénémaud, Head of Service, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- "The missing dimension of development: impact of rich countries' policies on the poor" Robert Picciotto, Director, Global Policy Project.

Introduction

Mr. Niels Dabelstein, Head of department, Danida's Evaluation Secretariat

From yesterdays discussion, it appears that, apart from the two languages that we are speaking here, the language of evaluation have many different dialects. I will therefore do a little advertising for the "Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation" prepared by the DAC working party on Aid Evaluation. If we are going to have close cooperation, it is important that we at least understand our different dialects.

Accountability is one side of evaluation, learning is the other. We will have this morning five presentations, each of which will look at accountability from a rather different angle. That should provide for an interesting session because these angles are not competing, they are complentary ways and means of exercising accountability.

Contributions

« Monitoring charitable organizations : criteria and assessment methods »

Mr. Burkhard Wilke

Secretary General, International Committee on Fundraising Organizations (ICFO)

Today we will primarily be talking about accountability, and I'm sure that NGOs are already at home since a rather long time. Donors, I mean those who donate voluntarily, have always been requesting information about the activities and the reliability of their charities. That's why the first information and monitoring agencies for donations soliciting organisations has been founded more than a hundred years ago.

ICFO members and purpose

In 1958, ICFO was founded as a sort of umbrella organisation of those national monitoring agencies working in relation to charities. The primary purpose of ICFO is not to make audits itself but to help exchanging information and experiences among the members, and that's one reason why ICFO has no full-time staff and is a rather low level in the sense of costs, but, I think, rather efficient in information exchange. At the moment ICFO has ten full members, although during this meeting I have met several colleagues from other countries in which I've learned there are initiatives which we did not know before, and we are convinced that in no more than ten, or maybe fifteen countries world-wide, this kind of accreditation scheme are established.

The main purpose of the national members of ICFO is to promote, to bring transparency and integrity in relation to the charities and to bring reliable information to donors and interested media, for example, and even public administration. To give some examples of the structure of the full members of ICFO, let me say that we have members which are organised as a membership organisation and the fulfillment of a code of conduct is the requirement to be a member in that organisation. There are also members, for example the German organisation and the Swedish one, which have no members. The German one is a foundation which provide information to donors and it sometimes has begun to issue a seal of approval, to award a seal of approval, so who also do accreditation. The Swedish member has a very special approach. They don't issue a seal, but every accredited organisation is allowed to use a giro account in Sweden which starts with a nine. So everyone in Sweden, and they have a very high public awareness, knows that if the bank account starts with the number nine, it's accreditted by all Swedish colleagues.

Accountability

Our main issue today is accountability, and of course, it's a little bit of a rehtoric question, but why should charities be accountable ? One reason is accountability is a sort of unique selling point. Only reliable organisations can afford to be really accountable, to be open, to practice disclosure of information and that's why they should be accountable, in order to give the public, the donors, the opportunity to divide them from those organisations who can only make good advertising, but there is nothing behind this advertising.

A second reason of course, is that public benefit organisations, especially those who ask for public donations, are ethically obliged to be accountable. And there is a sort of self-interest. One could say, « Accountability creates trust » – « Trust creates long term success ». Sometime fundraising organisiations can feel the temptation to replace accountability by emotional appeals. There is an experience that emotional appeals for donations can be bery successful, but only on a short time. On a long time, doners will be frustrated about too much emotional content in the fund raising appeals, and only real accountability creates the stable basis for a longterm success and that's exactly what is also the professional fundraisers aim. One more reason, connected to the others, is our experience. The donors are not going to give blind trust anymore. That has been the case for many decades in many countries, but donors are requesting more and more information. That's one reason why so-called « case restricted funds » are going to be more and more popular in organisations, so that donors are given detailed information about the use of their funds. But every « case restricted fund » is very expensive to administer and that's why many of the charities are convinced that they should be accountable in a general sense, so that donors also in the future will go on to give non-restricted funds, donations to the organisations, in order to give flexibility to the organisations in respect of the use of the funds.

Accreditation standards

When we look at the standards within our national organisations we see that there are several common standards and our international association ICFO has made the attempt to create the smallest common denominator of this common point in the national accreditation standards. Our international ICFO standards are detailed on the website.

The common national standards refer to the fact that, of course, no conflicts of interest for the Board members exist. The financial statements must be audited. In most countries there is no legal obligation for charities to present their financial statements in a certain standard, but the accreditation schemes require a certain standard. For example, in Germany if a charity gets more than € 250,000 in donations a year, it must be audited by a Chartered Accountant, due to our criteria in Germany. An important point is that information to the public, and that includes fundraising advertising, must be accurate and no misleading and not too emotional. This criteria is a rather soft criteria, but in the recent decades our members have developed suitable assesment methods related to the single national charity system, the national donation systems. The charity systems are still very much differing from country to country, but they have learned to manage this sort of criteria, even when you know it has a rather smoother, softer direction. Fundraising has also to respect people's dignity, not only the dignity of the people in need, for which the donations are raised, but also the dignity of the donors. And of course, disclosure of information has to be practised.

There are also differences, of course, in relation to the criteria. Let me only name one important example. Most donors are very keen to be informed about the percentage of administration costs to know which amount of money comes directly to the field. I'm sure there are different opinions within this audience, as well as among our members, as there are different approaches in that sense. Within my institute in Germany, we are calculating the percentage of administration advertising costs very accurately because we anticipate that there is a very strong need for this information within the donors, as well as in the field of public administration, but we also always say to the public that this benchmark must not be over-estimated because of the very differing structure of the charities. You really cannot compare 5 % in one organisation and 15 % in the other organisation and you should be rather careful in respect of the use of this criteria. Anyway, organisations, especially donation soliciting charities, are responsible and have to feel an obligation to be as efficient as possible. They must not deny to answer this question, beside of all technical difficulties.

The monitoring procedures

Some of our members practice on-site visits, not in the field, in the projects world-wide, but on-site visits to the headquarters of the respective charities, of the applying charities and nearly all of them use questionnaires. Some others rely primarily on questionnaire and on debt control, which has also proved to be rather efficient. For example, the German member does not make on-site visits, except for those cases where there are major problems, but the percentage of non-successful applications is 30% of the first applicants of the organisations, which does not mean that all these organisations are really bad apples, but they do not fulfill the requirements at that time. In general the audits are annual audits, but some of our members make routine audits every year and in-debt audits, for example every three or five years.

« L'évaluation, un instrument de la redevabilité »

Mme Noria Mezlev

Humanitarian Accountability Project (HAP)

Nous venons d'entendre que les ONG s'engagent à être redevables vis-à-vis des donneurs. Le travail du HAP est de voir comment les ONG peuvent être redevables vis-à-vis des bénéficiaires eux-mêmes.

Le Humanitarian Accountability Project (HAP) ou « projet redevabilité humanitaire » est une initiative qui a été lancée à Genève en 2001. C'est un projet de deux ans qui se termine fin avril et qui vise à renforcer le principe de redevabilité vis-à-vis des bénéficiaires et à améliorer les activités et les actions humanitaires sur le terrain. Les organisations qui font partie du projet sont Oxfam, Care International, WorldVision International, Danida, DFID, la Fédération de la Croix Rouge, la Croix Rouge britannique, le HCR, Caritas International et d'autres encore. Toutes ces organisations (ainsi que ALNAP qui a également travaillé avec nous) essaient de trouver des mécanismes de redevabilité vis-à-vis des bénéficiaires.

Les activités de HAP

Nous avons essayé, en trois étapes, de voir quels étaient les mécanismes que les ONG pouvaient mettre en place sur le terrain pour pouvoir assurer la redevabilité vis-à-vis des bénéficiaires. Nous avons aussi mené un certain nobmre de recherches afin d'étudier, par exemple, ce que l'on voulait dire par une organisation qui devait être redevable, et ce qu'elle devait faire pour être redevable. Nous avons observé comment les secteurs économiques, médicaux, juridiques, fonctionnaient dans le domaine de la redevabilité vis-à-vis de leurs propres clients, ainsi que les obligations légales des acteurs humanitaires.

Le troisième axe de travail du HAP est d'essayer de promouvoir un consensus dans le milieu humanitaire pour renforcer la redevabilité des ONG dans ce secteur.

La notion de redevabilité

Nous avons une définition qui n'est pas exclusive, il en existe plusieurs autres. La redevabilité englobe deux ensembles de pratiques et de mécanismes, ceux par lesquels les individus, les Etats, les organisations rendent compte de leurs actions ou de leur non-action et engagent leur responsabilité. Il existe des évaluations, des rapports, des audits, un système de régulation.

Le deuxième mécanisme, de principe, si l'on veut, est celui par lequel les individus et ces organisations, ces Etats, peuvent se sentir en toute sécurité et légitimité pour exprimer leurs préoccupations, leurs plaintes, tous les abus eventuels, et garantir une réparation s'il y a lieu. Cela peut également se faire via un système d'évaluation, d'association du personnel et la mise en place d'un médiateur au niveau organisationnel ou sectoriel.

Questions pour la mise en pratique de la redevabilité

Pour que la redevabilité soit mise en pratique, le HAP préconise de se poser un certain nombre de questions, que l'on a ici limitées à cinq.

« Qui est redevable ? » : ce sont avant tout les instances qui sont porteuses de responsabilité vis-à-vis des populations qui sont en situation de crise, donc les gouvernements, les agences des Nations Unies, les forces armées ou les ONG.

« Envers qui sommes nous redevables ? » : envers les individus et les communautés qui sont affectés par ces crises - crise militaire ou désastre naturel.

« Pourquoi sommes nous redevables ? » : on revient un peu à cette idée d'ethique, c'est pour respecter les engagements que nous avons souscrits en tant qu'acteurs humanitaires, aux normes et aux directives juridiques, aux normes ethiques que l'on s'impose, et professionnelles.

« A travers quel mécanisme peut-on être redevable ? » : par l'établissement d'un certain nombre de mécanismes d'intervention, de supervision, qui définissent les responsabilités de chacun.

« Pour quel résultat ? » : avant tout pour améliorer les projets que nous mettons en place sur le terrain, et pour l'application de systèmes éventuels de sanctions et de réparations si les obligations n'ont pas été accomplies.

L'évaluation comme outil de redevabilité vis-à-vis des bénéficiaires ?

Une définition de l'évaluation que le projet HAP considère comme étant la plus proche de notre travail reprend quelque peu celle de ALNAP. L'évaluation des actions humanitaires peut être définie comme un examen systématique et impartial visant à tirer des leçons et à améliorer les activités que nous menons sur le terrain, et à renforcer la redevabilité vis-à-vis des bénéficiaires.

L'évaluation considère aussi l'amélioration de nos pratiques sur le terrain, mais les évaluations dans le secteur humanitaire peuvent-elles assurer la redevabilité vis-à-vis des bénéficiaires ? Nous pensons que non pour un certain nombre de raisons, car pour que ces évaluations puissent effectivement être un outil de redevabilité vis-à-vis des bénéficiaires, il faudrait avant tout : déterminer les obligations et les responsabilités des personnes et des organisations et savoir si elles ont vraiment été respectées par ces organisations et les individus ; inclure systématiquement les bénéficiaires dans tout le processus d'un projet, et donc effectivement dans le processus de l'évaluation ; étudier la relation entre l'organisme d'aide et les bénéficiaires ; restituer systématiquement les conclusions des évaluations aux parties concernées, et donc également aux bénéficiaires ; mettre en place des mécanismes permettant de restituer ces informations aux bénéficiaires ; s'assurer que ces recommandations sont effectivement mises en place sur le terrain.

Cela doit permettre trois choses : entre autres, d'évaluer la qualité de l'aide ; d'évaluer la qualité de l'impact ; et d'évaluer la qualité des relations entre les organisations humanitaires et les bénéficiaires.

Si la qualité des évaluations dans le domaine humanitaire est analysée à la lumière du concept de redevabilité, on peut dire aujourd'hui que seulement quelques une d'entre elles sont effectivement un outil pour assurer cette redevabilité vis-à- vis des bénéficiaires. Ce que recommande le HAP, c'est d'abord d'assurer une rigueur systématique dans la définition des termes de référence pour les évaluations et les études élaborées.

La mise en place par les ONG d'un système d'auto-régulation qui permettrait d'assurer la redevabilité et le successeur du HAP

Qu'est-ce que l'on entend exactement par «système d'auto-régulation?». L'une des recommandations du projet HAP, qui prend fin en avril, était de créer un mécanisme permanent où les ONG se regrouperaient pour travailler ensemble à la mise en place de mécanismes de redevabilité.

Nous allons créer à partir du mois de juin une organisation qui aura un secrétariat basé à Genève et qui va s'appeler HAP International, ou PAH International. Il s'agit de la première association professionnelle internationale d'auto-régulation dans le secteur humanitaire. Le but de HAP International est d'établir des normes les plus élevées possibles en matière de redevabilité afin d'en promouvoir le respect, par le biais de mécanismes d'auto-régulation mis en place par les membres de cette organisation qui sont liés par un respect commun, le droit, la dignité des destinataires de l'assistance humanitaire. Le secrétariat va d'abord développer et maintenir les principes de la redevabilité et les normes et mettre en place un guide avec l'accord des ONG, puis assister les ONG pour le renforcement de leur propre mécanisme de redevabilité, soit par des formations, soit par la promotion de ce que l'on entend par redevabilité, et par l'audit des bénéficiaires dans leurs propres projets. Le secrétariat va assurer le suivi, l'évaluation et la restitution des membres par rapport à leurs mécanismes de redevabilité. Il pourra également éventuellement assurer une « peer review » que les organisations vont accepter, ou non, de mettre en place. Il y aurait obligation de mettre en place un système de traitement des réclamations que les bénéficiaires auraient éventuellement vis-à-vis de la mise en place d'un projet. Il s'agira enfin de faire la promotion et de continuer à développer le consensus face au concept de redevabilité.

Les attentes de HAP International vis à vis de ses membres

Ce que l'on attend des agences humanitaires qui vont être membres de HAP International, c'est d'abord un engagement sur les principes de redevabilité, de préparer un plan de travail sur les mécanismes de redevabilité qu'elles vont mettre en place dans leurs propres projets et d'identifier les mécanismes et l'assistance technique dont elles auront besoin. Puisque l'idée est qu'aucune des ONG n'a le même niveau de connaissance et de mise en place des mécanismes de redevabilité, et que chacun va devoir développer des mécanismes propres.

Un autre engagement concerne le suivi et l'évaluation : les ONG vont devoir suivre ce plan de travail et rapporter au secrétariat et aux autres membres de l'organisation comment ces mécanismes sont mis en place, et les résultats qu'elles obtiennent.

Finalement, il leur faudra assurer l'examen des réclamations et fournir des rapports au secrétariat et aux autres membres pour savoir comment, à partir du moment où se présente un problème, celui-ci est résolu.

Les bénéfices pour les membres qui participeraient à cette initiative

Il s'agit d'abord d'un support technique et stratégique, de l'amélioration de la qualité de l'assistance sur le terrain, d'un partenariat – et l'idée est vraiment de travailler collectivement afin de pouvoir apprendre les uns des autres, de renforcer la rigueur du travail sur le terrain et de respecter les principes de redevabilité, comme de s'engager à démontrer que ces principes sont respectés, et enfin de renforcer la crédibilité des actions humanitaires sur le terrain.

La mise en place du PAH International correspond aussi à un engagement des ONG, par le système d'auto-régulation, de vérifier qu'à tous les niveaux de la mise en place d'un projet, jusqu'à l'évaluation, on assure la redevabilité vis à vis des bénéficiaires.

« Development of a monitoring and Evaluation framework for the implementation of the Declaration of Commitment on HIV-AIDS (UNGASS) »

Mr. Michel Caraël,

Chief of the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, UNAIDS

UNAIDS is a unique joint programme of 8 United Nations organisations that work together to fight HIV/Aids, the most devastating epidemic of this century, and to support countries to implement programme activities.

The efforts of UN-Aids to increase learning and accountability in the fight against HIV/Aids

I would like here to report on an attempt to increase accountability of governements, civil society and UN organisations, by developing an evaluation framework for the UN General Assembly Special Session in the Declaration of Commitment signed by 189 countries. This was one year and a half ago.

The UNGASS declaration of commitment established a number of goals and targets in ten areas. All these areas would be critical to develop the framework for evaluation and also for follow-up and accoutability.

What were the principles to develop this M&E framework ? First of all we tried to build on existing indicators, meaning that there are already indicators that are used by countries, there are several guidelines on nationalised programmes that were already developed and that should be used. A second principle would be to assure multi-sectoralism, meaning that we want to involve sectors such as health, education and workplace. This framework should be comprehensive, but simple. For example, at first, we developed more than 50 indicators for countries to measure and for sure, in the end, we ended up with less than 20. We also tried to harmonise with other frameworks, for example, 4 of the indicators of the Millennium development goals. Only HIV/Aids would be a similar in the UNGASS declaration avoiding having different indicators. It has been the same for the MAP programme of the World Bank and Global Fund.

There was also a need to address country situations. The difficulty when you develop indicators at the central level is to make them relevant for many different situations.

Finally, we tried not to develop parallel mecanismes. The priority is the national Aids programme and the UNGASS declaration of commitment measurement should follow under the national strategic priority. There should be no contradiction here.

What was the process that we followed-up to develop these indicators ?

In October 2001 we developed the first set of indicators. That was discussed with the Aids co-sponsor of UN-Aids and then at a monitoring and evaluation reference group – this is an international group with experts in evaluation, co-sponsors, civil society and academic institutions. This first set of indicators was later refined in a workshop in Senegal with more than 20 countries represented. Finally, it was again discussed at this reference group and approved by the PCB (Programme Coordinating Body) of UN-Aids who gave a green light for these indicators.

What was the rationale to develop these indicators ?

At a global level, it is expected that if you increase resources, if you put in place policies and if you have a high level of advocacy, you may then influence the national commitment and action with increased resources and adequate policy in place, you may then improve prevention, access to treatment and mitigation of the impact and finally reduce, hopefully, HIV prevelence and mother to child transmission.

We have two indicators at the global level of funding, international funding for HIV/Aids. The level of funding has a proxy for commitment at the global level. We have also a public funding for vaccine and macrobicides, two indicators on workplace policy, including international NGOs and measurement of the level of HIV global advocacy. At the country level, we have one indicator on government funding and one composite policy index indicators assessing the policy in prevention care and human rights.

We are now coming to nine indicators at national level that will present the core of the measurement tools. We have a series of indicators covering the various sectors I mentioned. For example, a school-workplace policy, but also case management of Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STDs), access to care, several indicators on young people, one specific on Injecting Drug Users (IDU) and one on orphan school attendance. These indicators should be measured, most of them at least, by surveys or special studies and a few, by monitoring data. Finally, we have two indicators on impact with reduction in HIV prevelance among young people, and reduction in mother to child transmission.

What were the guiding principles when it comes to implementation ?

First of all, there is this idea that the implementation is a collective responsibility. It is first the responsibility of government, but also of the private sector of NGOs, civil society, and finally the UN. Another principle is that the emphasis should be on strengthening existing mecanisms and not a separate system. Finally, this declaration of commitment should be a sort of motivational tool, an opportunity to strengthen implementation of prevention and care programme activities.

In terms of accountability, we try to identify specific roles for specific international UN agencies. For example, it is clear that when it comes to education, UNESCO has a particular role to play and should be accountable for progress on this issue, or ILO for the world of work, and the secretariat in UN-Aids for vulnerable populations, an area that nobody wants to touch.

The steps for the implementation of these M&E frameworks

First we disseminate the guidelines from the construction of four indicators. Secondly we try to build capacity of key resources. For example, we had six regional training with the National Aids Commission and many experts. We had several workshops for training and we, hopefully, expect that in each of the countries there would be a national workshop with government, civil society and the UN to plan for the necessary steps to measure these indicators. So in a few weeks the countries are expected to report on these indicators and in April 2005, when many targets are coming, we hope that all the indicators will be measured.

What are the future directions that we are seeing here ?

We know that in 2003 there was limited support at national level, and we expect in two years time to expend this support. Today the focus is more on reporting and not on learning, but we expect that in two years time this exercise will lead to a better and improved evaluation of national strategic plans and more learning.

« Un exemple de l'approche de la redevabilité par une administration d'un pays membre du Comité d'Aide au Développement : la France. Les moyens de rendre compte »

M. François Senemaud,

Chef de Service, Ministère français des Affaires Etrangères

Je voudrais vous présenter la façon dont, en France nous concevons et nous pratiquons l'évaluation dans le cadre de cette obligation de rendre compte, dans une perspective de redevabilité comme étant une composante tout à fait essentielle d'un système démocratique.

Pour ce qui nous concerne, c'est une obligation qui nous vient de temps déjà anciens, de la période de la Révolution française, époque à laquelle la déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen imposait comme principe que la société a le droit de demander compte à tout agent public de son administration. Ce principe, qui est évidemment très général, trouve une application pour ce qui nous concerne dans le domaine de la politique du développement.

Je voudrais donc vous faire part de notre expérience, de notre exemple, qui n'est en aucun cas un modèle, parce que naturellement chaque pays, chaque institution doit pouvoir mettre en place des procédures qui correspondent à son propre système politique et administratif, mais qui naturellement s'inscrivent dans le cadre plus vaste des critères internationaux auxquels vous contribuez tous à participer. Nous mêmes nous n'avons pas été les derniers à nous inspirer des expériences de nos collègues pour avancer sur le chapitre de l'évaluation.

Notre dispositif national en termes de politique du développement

Nous avons connu une réforme, en 1998, au terme de laquelle deux ministères sont en charge principalement de ce secteur - le Ministère de l'économie, des finances et de l'industrie d'une part, qui compose ce que l'on appelle le pôle économique et financier de notre coopération, et le Ministère des affaires étrangères d'autre part, qui structure le pôle dit diplomatique – ainsi qu'un grand opérateur, dit pivot de notre coopération, qui est l'Agence française de développement.

Notre système s'articule donc entre ces trois composantes qui ensemble gèrent notre aide publique au développement qui correspondait en 2002 à 0,34 % de notre produit national brut, contre 0,32 % l'année précédente. Nous avons un objectif politique qui est d'arriver à 0,5 % de notre PNB consacré à l'aide publique au développement en 2007 et nous conservons cet objectif politique très important du 0,7 % du PNB consacré à l'aide publique au développement pour une période de cinq ans au-delà de 2007.

Les modalités de notre système d'évaluation dans ce contexte politique

Pour ce qui concerne notre sphère nationale, l'évaluation, considérée comme un moyen de rendre compte, s'apprécie dans le contexte des relations entre le gouvernement et le parlement, comme dans la totalité des pays démocratiques. Naturellement donc, le gouvernement est responsable devant le parlement, et doit lui rendre compte régulièrement de ses activités. En particulier, au moment de la préparation du budget, de la loi de finances, un nombre important de comités - du Sénat et de l'Assemblée nationale, les deux chambres qui composent le parlement - s'intéresse à nos activités, nous envoie des questionnaires, souvent très précis, et notre administration passe une bonne partie de l'été chaque année à rédiger des rapports et des comptes rendu pour nos députés et nos sénateurs, qui à leur tour produisent des rapports qui sont publiés et qui naturellement peuvent critiquer les directions des politiques de l'Administration et suggérer de nouvelles orientations. Tout au long de l'année, les parlementaires adressent à l'Administration, dans tous les secteurs, des questions écrites et orales, qui sont autant d'aguillons, de stimulations auxquelles nous devons répondre.

J'ai insisté sur le caractère institutionnel de ce devoir de rendre compte qui est le nôtre, du gouvernement vis-à-vis du parlement. Il ne faut naturellement pas oublier les autres objectifs, les autres publics, si j'ose dire, du compte rendu, qui sont l'opinion publique et les citoyens en général, soit directement, soit à travers les médias. C'est naturellement une dimension qui est aujourd'hui extrêmement importante dans l'ensemble de nos pays. L'évaluation vise aussi ce public plus large dans le cadre national, et naturellement il existe un devoir de rendre compte au niveau international, et vous en êtes les acteurs et les témoins en même temps. L'évaluation en soi constitue au niveau international un élément extrêmement important de la crédibilité des actions que nous menons. Dans le monde d'aujourd'hui, plus aucun donateur bilatéral ou multilatéral ne peut se contenter de mener des actions selon ses propres critères sans en rendre compte et sans mesurer leur efficacité à l'aune des mêmes critères que ceux qui sont utilisés au plan international.

Quel est notre dispositif légal d'évaluation en France ?

Ce processus s'inscrit dans une démarche plus large, qui est celle de l'évaluation de l'action des pouvoirs publics dans leur ensemble. C'est une démarche qui s'est développée depuis une vingtaine d'années. Depuis 1990 l'évaluation a été officialisée dans le cadre d'un décret qui vise à amplifier des pratiques qui existaient déjà et à les généraliser au sein de l'Administration.

Quels sont les objectifs de l'évaluation ?

C'est naturellement d'améliorer l'efficacité et le rendement de l'action publique. C'est aussi une exigence politique, face à nos citoyens et face à nos parlementaires. En soi nous concevons que c'est une composante importante de l'exercice d'un pouvoir dans un cadre démocratique. L'évaluation a été de façon très claire affichée comme l'un des objectifs et une composante importante de la réforme de notre coopération de 1998. Par ailleurs, l'évaluation constitue également un moyen important de rapprocher l'Administration de la société civile, en particulier en faisant participer des représentants de la société civile au Comite de pilotage de nos évaluations. Nous le faisons aujourd'hui de façon assez systématique, au Ministère des affaires étrangères comme chez nos collègues d'autres institutions.

Pour ce qui concerne le Ministère des affaires étrangères, nous avons donc un bureau de l'évaluation qui fait un travail systématique sur la base d'un programme annuel. Donc d'une part ce bureau gère l'évaluation - évaluation externe par des cabinets spécialisés - de l'ensemble de nos politiques, qu'il s'agisse de politiques sectorielles, qu'il s'agisse des instruments de notre coopération, ou encore de bilans pays, sur des périodes relativement longues. Par ailleurs, ce bureau mène également, ou assiste, l'ensemble des services qui concourent au développement à mener une évaluation systématique de l'ensemble des projets que nous menons dans le cadre de notre aide projet, dite traditionnelle. Nous avons par exemple en ce moment plus de 500 projets de développement, de tailles diverses, qui sont en cours, et chacun d'entre eux doit faire l'objet d'une évaluation finale externe.

Le Ministère de l'économie, des finances et de l'industrie dispose, lui aussi, depuis une quinzaine d'années, d'une unité d'évaluation qui procède également de façon systématique à l'évaluation des projets qui sont mis en œuvre dans les pays émergeants, et dont le financement comporte une part d'aide au développement. Cette évaluation s'est étendue récemment aux contributions françaises aux organisations multilatérales. Elles sont menées également par des consultants privés ou par des experts de l'Administration.

L'Agence française de développement est également dotée d'un service d'évaluation qui procède à l'évaluation systématique des projets conduits par l'Agence.

Notre objectif est de rapprocher ces trois entités qui procèdent à l'évaluation du projet de développement et les faire travailler ensemble. Nous sommes arrivés à un stade où nous procédons de plus en plus à des évaluations croisées ou à des évaluations menées conjointement par ces acteurs de développement, l'objectif étant d'aboutir à un dispositif aussi cohérent que possible.

« The missing dimension of Development : impact of rich countries' policies on the poor »

Mr. Robert Picciotto,

Director, Global Policy Project

Le thème de cette session est de rendre compte et ma thèse est simple, je vais la résumer en français et l'élaborer en anglais.

Les comptes du développement, tels que nous les tenons, sont incomplets

Khalid Malik a souligné hier que les politiques nationales au niveau macro ont une influence considérable sur les résultats des projets au micro. Ceci dit, exécuter de bons projets dans des contextes politiques difficiles est l'essence même du développement et il vaut mieux ne pas faire de mauvais projets dans des environnements de politiques propices au développement.

Nous avons appris qu'il faut également prendre en compte le contexte des politiques nationales pour assurer un bilan précis des performances au niveau des projets. Mais il est également utile d'aider les pays à améliorer le cadre politique de développement.

Cette même logique devrait éclairer l'analyse des programmes au niveau des pays. En effet, il n'est pas possible d'expliquer les résultats des programmes de coopération pour le développement au niveau des pays sans prendre en compte la qualité des politiques des pays riches vis-à-vis des pays pauvres. Cela semble évident. C'est une lapalissade, mais en pratique, les logiciels des évaluateurs, leurs modèles et leurs cadres méthodologique, ne traitent pas aujourd'hui de façon explicite les impacts sur la pauvreté des politiques globales.

Si l'évaluation du développement, comme toute évaluation qui se respecte, se doit de dire la vérité aux pouvoir, nous nous devons d'élargir le cadre de notre travail bien au delà de l'aide. L'aide demeure un facteur très important pour le développement, particulièrement pour les pays les plus pauvres, et son fonctionnement doit être mieux compris et mieux géré, mais ce n'est que l'un des couloirs de transmission de la globalisation et il est maintenant nécessaire d'évaluer les autres mécanismes principaux qui lient les pays riches aux pays pauvres. Il s'agit des politiques de commercialisation, de l'investissement privé, de la propriété intellectuelle, de l'immigration et aussi des politiques d'environnement global.

In a « nutshell », development results cannot be attributed solely to the quality of individual projects or to the policy performance of individual developing countries

Monterrey consecrated the notion that the development corporation is a two-way street, and partnership implies shared objectives. This is why the MDGs represent a historic achievement. Partnership also implies distinct accountability and reciprocal obligations, and this is where the current development consensus is flawed. It is flawed because it has focused on the policy weaknesses in poor countries. It is important, but it has neglected the impact of rich countries' policies on developing countries, which is even more important. The rich countries exercise control over the institutions that oversee the global economy, their rules, their standards that regulate the flows of capital, people and ideas. It is the production and consumption patterns that pose the greatest threat to the global environment.

Evaluation of policy reform so far has been asymmetrical

It has not focused enough on the policy dimension which is missing, as also the dimension of evaluation, and this unbalanced approach to performance assessment has undermined the quality of our evaluations. As project level resources cannot be explained without reference to the quality of country policies, slowly country level evaluations that increasingly are being done, and rightly so, are incomplete without reference to the international enabling environment. This is the direct result of globalisation which has crept on us. Which country's policies matter particularly because of globalisation ? And yet donors and evaluators have lavished attention on only one side of the development partnership, the poor countries. Only one of the eight development MDGs addresses the obligations of rich countries. Virtually all the performance indicators are pointed South. Consider the resources represented in this room have been mobilised to track the progress of developing countries towards these goals and to assess country policies in the South. No similar effort is under way to evaluate policies in the North. As a result, noisy, anti-capitalist protests and market fundamentalist doctrines have mobilised public attention, instead of evidence-based research and evaluation, while idiosyncratic domestic political considerations have shaped global policy-making.

Aid has absorbed the lion's share of evaluation resources and the results have been mixed

Aid effectiveness has improved, but public perceptions about aid remain unfavourable. This is in part because aid agencies make exaggerated claims in order to sell their programmes, while public opinion over estimates the actual amount allocated to aid. Some surveys suggest that this over estimation is by a factor of ten or even a hundred, and people really think that governments are allocating 10 % of their budget to aid, where in fact it is not the case. In fact, official development assistance, as a share of national income, has declined from 0.6 % in 1967 to 0.2 % in 2001, notwithstanding the endorsements by the numerous UN conferences of the 0.7 % national target. It was good to hear the Minister yesterday highlighting France's commitment to reach that level. Currently only one of only five of the twenty-two rich countries have reached the target.

Asymmetrical focus on recipients of aid may explain why the aid industry has been so slow to reform. Tied aids adds 20 % to the cost of goods and services which are procured under aid, yet it still accounts for over half of aid flows. Technical assistance of dubious utility still accounts for almost 30 % of aid.

The proliferation of aid channels, the fragmentation of aid across hundreds of projects, increasingly small organisations, impose high transaction costs. Aid coordination remains a problem. Harmonisation of aid practices is proceeding at a snail's pace and it was good to hear his Excellency Francis Mer highlight the efficiency aspect of aid as a central focus for evaluation. In other words, there are problems of aid quality on the supply as well as the demand side.

Beyond aid, the quality and measure of private investment requires independent evaluation. Aid matters a great deal, particularly for sub-Saharan Africa, but it is only one of the policies of the rich countries that should be tracked. Private capital flows towards developing countries are now almost three times far larger than aid flows,. Of course, the distribution is highly skewed. These developed countries only receive 0.5 % of those flows, of this 86 % is concentrated in ten countries, over half of which goes to four oil-producing countries. Africa is a marginal recipient receiving less than 2 %. Within Africa, the distribution rate of the aid flows is limited to a few countries, and mostly directed to natural resource extraction. This is why foreign direct investment or FDI needs more evaluation, particularly since some of the projects are so capital intensive , involve corrupt use of royalties, limited linkages to the local economy, negative social impacts and inadequate involvement of local communities. Evaluation by the civil society and the official agencies would help enhance the quality of foreign direct investment. More needs to be done too in reducing the risks that private investors face in the poorest developing countries.

The development impact of trade should be evaluated more systematically

On a per capita basis, exports generate thirty times as much revenue as aid, twelve times in case of least developed countries, and developing countries suffer from high tariffs precisely in the areas where they are the most competitive - cereals, sugar, fish, fruit and vegetables, clothing and footwear. The social consequences are highly detrimental, since these products are produced largely by subsistence farmers, small farmers and small enterprises. A 40 % reduction in tariffs on manufacturing goods would generate an expansion in volume of global trade of $ 380 billion, three-quarters of which of those gains according to developing countries. Take agricultural subsidies in OECD countries, it is a sensitive topic, but the New Zealand government has estimated that you can take the 41 million cows of the European Union and give them first class travel one and a half times round the world with a thousand euros still left for their expenses for hotels and meals. This is a bit scandalous. Consumers in the US pay almost 60 % more, a mark up of 27 billion dollars, for textiles and clothing, than they would under a free-trade regime. It is a paradox, that these policies are as hurtful to developed countries as they are to developing countries.

Evaluation should also be directed to the management of intellectual property rights

They are protected increasingly without adequate consideration of basic human needs in developing countries. The Trade Related Intellectual Property System (TRIPS) is restricting access to essential drugs and other intensive products and services, and there is a strong pressure on developing countries to increase intellectual property protection based on the practices of developed countries, which are really not adapted to countries that are poorly endowed in skills and in technology.

Migration has not been subject to much research or evaluation

Yet, the importance of migration to the economic prospects of developing countries is becoming very high, remittances of five times the amount of aid in Latin America and the Caribbean. They account for a fifth of Jordan’s national income.

Migration is also good for the rich countries, because you have an extraordinary demographic transition taking place in OECD countries. Between one quarter and one third of migration flows move through illegal channels, and yet, despite the rhetoric of populist politicians, neither the US nor Europe can be considered full. There are more deaths than births in 43 % of the 211 regions that make up the European Union.

Environmental policy should be evaluated

Finally and I will not elaborate this since the case is well knows from global warming to fisheries, rich countries’ policies are inducing enormous stress on the natural environment on which the poor depend to sustain their livelihoods. .

Let’s take the case of Bangladesh to illustrate what I have been saying. About ten years ago, Bangladesh earned 1.6 billion from foreign aid, 2 billion from exports and 0.8 billion for medicines. Since then, it has shrunk. Exports have gone up by more than three times and despite reduction in terms of trade, remittances have gone up by more than twice, and FDI has gone up by 7 times, so it's a different ball-game. Aid is important, but not as important as it used to be, even for countries like Bangladesh, and the biggest constraint to Bangladesh development is protectionism. Bangladesh pays the United States as much in tariffs as France, even though Bangladesh exports a tenth of what France exports. This simply is not fair.

Je crois donc avoir démontré que l'évaluation du développement doit aller bien au delà de l'aide au développement et qu'elle devrait aider a instituer un cadre de développement intégré au niveau global conçu sur la base d'évaluation de cohérence des politiques des pays riches et de leur impact sur la pauvreté. C'est une des priorités que cette conférence devrait endosser.

Rob D. van den Berg a décrit l'évaluateur qui observe les poulets qui traversent la route. Mais dans certains cas le poulet ne traverse pas la route, même si son bien-être en dépend. Il est temps que les évaluateurs traversent la route vers une évaluation plus globale qui permettra des évaluations plus précises, plus honnêtes et plus justes.

Niels Dabelstein indicates that an evaluation is under way in the context of the European Union. It is called the three C's which and will be looking at the coordination, complementarity and coherence. The coherence part is about the coherence of European policies in the context of development.

Débats

Peter Ellis (AusAid)

I have a question for Robert Picciotto. Australia's point of view on this is that **policy coherence** is something which we would greatly like to see more in the context of development. The reason for that is at least in part because Australia would like to see this as an issue for the Europeans and the Americans and there is no secret of the fact that the agricultural subsidies issue is one that Australia's national interest happens to coincide with developing countries.

It is all very convenient for Australia to join in and laugh at the cows travelling first class, but it sort of leads on to my point, which is that in terms of accountability, the key difference between the policies you are talking about and aid policies is that the aid policies are explicitly setting out to promote development, whereas the policies you are talking about are setting out to achieve other objectives, such as keeping immigration within socially acceptable or politically acceptable levels, or promote the interests of particular groups within particular countries, in terms of trade policy for example. Clearly those policies sometimes meet those objectives admirably.

The question is, in terms of **accountability** : who should the people setting these policies with all their admitted adverse impact on development be accountable to ? They can say, and it is hard to argue with them, that they are accountable to our own farming community. We are not setting out to promote development here, we are setting out to achieve something else altogether.

Ros David (ActionAid, UK)

I would just like to add a quick rider to the previous question to Robert Picciotto. How do you think the research that you are proposing about the impact of rich countries on developing countries will influence the work of your former organisation, the World Bank ?

Dasgupta Jashodhara (Healthwatch UP Bihar, India)

My first question is for Noria Mezlev who presented the Humanitarian Accountability Project. It was interesting to see the ways in which you were trying to put up **the framework for accountability to the beneficiaries**. I just want to bring up a small case. In India we have a state called Gujarat which faced a major earthquake two years ago, and there was a considerable influx of humanitarian aid, leading sometimes to unwanted results. Last year we had a state-sponsored programme against the Muslims of that region, of that state, in which about 3 000 Muslims were killed and a few hundred thousand of them were displaced, economically as well as physically, from their homes. There was a deafening silence from the humanitarian agencies, perhaps because it had been a state-sponsored action, and the state government of Gujarat happens to be the same as the government in power in India, the majority, although it is an alliance, but it is the main government in India. This was a situation where the humanitarian agencies did not choose to give attention to what we felt was a major and human-made humanitarian crisis. I would like to know where the accountability framework brings in situations like this.

My second question is addressed to Michel Caraël from UN-Aids. In your framework of indicators I did not notice any **indicator regarding violations of human rights**, and I think that when we are talking about HIV/Aids this is a major concern that a lot of us face in developing countries.

I also found it really nice when you talked about **involving the NGOs in the monitoring of the indicators**, but I am keen to know how many NGOs and which kind of NGOs were actually involved in the process of formulating these indicators and if there was any kind of consensus building before we expected the NGOs to actually come and monitor them.

When you talked about the different UN agencies at the end, you talked about all of them taking responsibility for monitoring different parts of the entire accountability framework. I didn't get the name of any UN agency which was going to monitor human rights violations regarding HIV/Aids.

Pat Bourne (Ireland Aid)

I would just like to ask a brief question to François Senemaud who referred briefly to the point that the French government see **evaluation as a way of bringing civil society closer to the Administration** and made a reference to the involvement of civil side representation on a steering group. Could you elaborate a little bit on that process and how it worked ?

Sulley Gariba (IDEAS)

I would like to make a comment directed to Robert Picciotto, on **changing the paradigms for evaluating involvement**, and in particular focusing the attention as well on developed countries trade policies and related policies.

In the current context we should be realistic in assuming that the impetus for evaluation will continue to be focused on developing countries, and part of the challenge will be to reconstruct the matrices under which development evaluation is measured. In constructing the Human Development Report and constructing development effectiveness indices we need to factor in the coefficients that account for global policies, so that in focusing attention on country policies of developing countries we may then factor in the effect that these categories of aid, trade, direct investment as well as migration policies, impact on developing countries.

Many of the **new paradigms for development**, poverty reduction and strategy, are driven by certain **global perspectives**, certain global imperatives which in some ways already, rather indirectly, account for the key pillars described by Robert Picciotto. One might begin to ask how these affect what the World Bank and other multi-lateral agencies do, but in particular how we translate these considerations into the tools that we apply.

François Grünewald (URD)

Ma question pour le HAP est en trois parties.

On a vu avec le fameux scandale des camps de réfugiés, ce « sex for food scandal » l'année dernière qu'il y avait là un **problème d'ordre pénal**. Comment est-ce que le HAP se positionne par rapport à l'«accountability» ou la redevabilité par rapport aux bénéficiaires et les cas concernant le respect de la loi et donc du juridique ? Où est l'interface ?

On a également vu dans le cadre de nombreuses évaluations qu'une grande partie des problèmes de la qualité de l'action étaient plus liés à des **contraintes imposées par les bailleurs** qu'aux difficultés de l'ONG elle-même - contraintes de calendrier, contraintes budgétaires - contraintes qui impliquent des rotations rapides des équipes. Comment le HAP souhaite t-il gérer ces contraintes sur la qualité de l'action qui ont évidemment des répercussions et qui sont fortement liées à des acteurs extérieurs. En juridique, c'est ce que l'on appelle le problème de « préposé commettant ».

Finalement, une grande partie des problèmes que les ONG humanitaires, mais parfois aussi de développement, rencontrent sur le terrain est liée aux **stratégies des acteurs locaux**. Le HAP a bien vu dans son étude en Sierra Léone toutes les problématiques posées par rapport aux chefferies locales, par rapport aux élites locales, qui représentaient un problème plus important pour les populations que les petites erreurs techniques des ONG. Comment est-ce que le HAP se positionnera par rapport à ces problèmes qui peuvent évidemment affecter la qualité de l'aide, mais dont les vrais responsables sont les acteurs de la violence, les structures qui violent le droit humanitaire international, etc.

Laura Hawken (WHO)

My question is to Michel Caraël. **The framework for monitoring the situation of UN-Aids** across the world seems very comprehensive and went through an extensive series of processes. My question relates to a comment that was made yesterday, about attribution being a « red-herring ». **How does accountability fit with this concept of attribution being a « red-herring » ?** Given the enormity of the HIV/Aids problem and the relative scarcity of resources to apply to it, How do we know which mechanisms are actually being effective ? In what way does the framework that is being outlined actually help us decide which are the best actions to take, and who is best placed to take those actions ? The listing of the organisations showed a series of what was headed « accountabilities », but they seemed like a list of areas of responsibility without actually saying in what way those organisations would be made accountable for any of those particular areas. The framework could be monitoring work that is being done by NGOs, it could be monitoring work that is being done by the government itself, it could be monitoring work that is being done by globalised funds which we now have, or it could be monitoring work that is being done by members of UN-Aids. I would like to raise the point about this apparent dichotomy of attribution being a « red-herring » and how it does fit with accountability.

Robert Picciotto

Basically all the questions revolve around the fact that **globalisation has created a policy and governance gap**. Unless this gap is filled, and unless gradually a new governance architecture emerges, which addresses problems connected to irreversible demographic, technological and environmental trends, there will be a backlash. We are perhaps witnessing it right now. The fairness of global policies will not improve unless public opinion begins to raise questions about the effect of current policies and why they are in fact set up in the way they are.

Part of the existing global governance is of course the World Bank, and we can already see the President of the World Bank addressing issues of trade, global public goods and I know that the research agenda of the World Bank is starting to move, slowly admittedly, in some of the directions I mentioned, particularly with respect to migration. But there e are limits to what the World Bank can do, given the attitudes of its shareholders.

The same question that was addressed to the World Bank could be addressed to the United Nations or to the OECD: who is accountable to whom and for what ? **Accountability of the multilaterals** in the end rests largely on the accountability of the member governments of all those same multilaterals. Of course they are elected through democratic processes in industrial democracies, and this is precisely the point I am making : research and evaluation should demonstrate, and can demonstrate, that it is in the interest of everybody, rich and poor countries, to change their policies to benefit the poor, and to deal with the costs of adjustment in rich countries. Because there will be costs of adjustment in rich countries, but those can probably - and this requires evaluation research - be financed quite effectively out of the enormous benefits which should come from changing the policies.

In effect, the same logic which has been quite successful in getting the developing countries to connect to the global economy, should d be practised in rich countries as well. Unless evaluators, researchers and civil society address those questions frontally, we are getting into diminishing returns with our development evaluations. We are repeating the same lessons again and again. We have got to get out and start looking at the genuine constraints to development at the policy level, both in the developing countries and, in a symmetrical way, in the developed countries. Poverty reduction is indeed a partnership which needs urgent and fair evaluation since it is in the interest of the whole world to start adjusting to globalisation and give it a human face.

François Senemaud

Par rapport à la question qui concernait les modalités selon lesquelles nous associons la société civile à notre processus d'évaluation, c'est effectivement un objectif que nous essayons d'atteindre en demandant de façon systématique, au Ministère des affaires étrangères, à un ou des représentants de la société civile de participer à nos **Comités de pilotage**, qui sont dans notre processus responsables de la rédaction des termes de référence de l'étude, puis de la sélection du cabinet d'experts, puis du suivi de l'évaluation elle-même. C'est une procédure que nous suivons maintenant de façon aussi systématique que possible, et nous pensons que c'est une bonne chose en soi parce que cela nous permet à nous, administration, d’avoir un regard qui est extérieur et qui est donc calé sur des critères qui sont par nature différents - les institutions gouvernementales et non gouvernementales étant par essence de nature différente. Nous pensons que ce regard extérieur est utile pour affiner ce processus d'évaluation.

Noria Mezlev

En ce qui concerne le cadre de travail du HAP, il s’agit avant tout de se dire que l’on travaille avec des bénéficiaires qui ont un certain nombre de **droits** : le droit d'être informés, le droit de participer aux projets, le droit, éventuellement, de se plaindre si le projet ne répond pas aux besoins de la population. En s'assurant donc qu'il y a des droits, il y a de toutes façons une **obligation de rendre des comptes**. C’est dans le cadre de la mise en place d'un projet où il n'y a pas de participation, ou bien qui ne réponde pas à ces besoins que l’on essaie de promouvoir l'idée qu'il faut rendre des comptes.

En ce qui concerne les questions juridiques soulevées, il ne fait aucun doute que le HAP ne va pas prendre en compte un problème juridique et pénal. Ce que l'on souhaiterait faire, par rapport à ce qui s'est passé dans les camps en Afrique de l'Ouest, c'est faire **une vraie sensibilisation** pour que les responsables prennent en compte les plaintes des bénéficiaires, au niveau des leaders sur le terrain, des managers, des directeurs de programme, pour qu’effectivement. Pour le moment, ce n'est pas quelque chose qui se fait. Tous les cas d'abus sexuel doivent être référés à la structure pénale du pays, si c'est possible.

En ce qui concerne les bailleurs de fonds, beaucoup de projets sont complètement liés au calendrier et au financement. Il y a également tout un débat au niveau des bailleurs de fonds qui vise à remettre en question leur propre comptabilité, leur propre redevabilité vis-à-vis des projets. Je crois que l'on a tout un lobbying à faire pour qu'effectivement les bailleurs de fonds se rendent compte qu'il y a **des financements à mettre en place pour assurer une meilleure**

redevabilité, que cela va coûter de l'argent et du temps, et que tous ces concepts-là doivent être pris en compte lorsque l'on approuve un projet.

En ce qui concerne les partenaires locaux, ce que l'on demande aux agences qui vont travailler avec le HAP, c'est qu'à partir du moment où elles travaillent avec des partenaires locaux, elles s'assurent qu'effectivement ces partenaires rendent des comptes par rapport aux projets dans lesquels elles sont impliquées. Cela ne va pas se faire facilement, mais à partir du moment où l'on s'engage à appliquer ces principes-là, on conçoit déjà sur **une nouvelle approche de l'action humanitaire**. Il s'agit de partir du principe que l'on a des comptes à rendre et des devoirs vis-à-vis des bénéficiaires pour lesquels on a perçu des fonds.

Niels Dabelstein

It was a comment which does not pertain directly to the HAP, but more to the issue of when, or why, do international aid agencies react to disasters, whether it is a conflict or a natural disaster. The example of Gujarat was brought out, where there was an influx of foreign aid on occasion of a natural disaster, but not in the case of a later different kind emergency - a conflict. I think we have to realise the power or influence of the press, and in this case it could even be the Indian press that did not bring this to the attention of the international community. The problem we have is that we tend to forget all the **hidden disasters**. Very often governments, NGOs and aid agencies do rely on the press to make sure that attention is brought to the issue, otherwise they cannot react, or, in some cases, they do not wish to react.

Michel Caraël

The first question was about the **involvement of the NGOs in the development of indicators**. Formally, I can say that several international NGOs were participating, but I should also say that the process was quite frustrating and it that has not been done properly.

With regard to the **measurement of indicators**, it is difficult for NGOs to make a contribution because most of these indicators are core and are national, which makes the participation of NGOs difficult. One of the most interesting aspects for NGOs is the fact that we have a cumulative policy index reviewing the policy at the country level. There the NGOs have a particular role to play in scrutinising what policies are in place. In regard to this concern, there are four indicators on human rights, and this is probably a window for NGOs to make a contribution. The violation of human rights as an evaluator is a difficult index because most of the violations are not formally reported. NGOs have a critical role to play there by bringing this to the attention of the national and international levels. What we recommend is that when countries are writing their national reports on UNGASS they associate civil society. We are, as an organisation, supporting this process. In some countries it appears difficult and it is just lip-service. In such a case, we recommend a parallel reporting, meaning that NGOs would write their own report of the situation if the government is not willing to take their comments into account. All the national UNGASS reports will be advertised on the Web site, meaning again that civil society, national civil society organisations may have the opportunity to comment on these reports.

There was a second question concerning **the effectiveness of pro-government intervention to fight AIDS**. Fifteen years after the start of this epidemic, we know enough about what is effective and what is not. We have had very few successes at national level, probably two or three, like Uganda or Cambodia, enough on what is lacking, the skilling up of interventions. It is not that we don't know what works, it is more a matter of level. Now, we have this global fund with $ 2.2 billion which gives an opportunity for countries to skill up. It is not enough, we would like to have $ 9 or $ 10 billion a year in five year's time. At least there is a hope that the programme will skill up soon.

With regard to your question, and it's a difficult question, about **governments**, you are right, we are more talking about process, of **increasing responsibility, rather than accountability**. The only organisation that has a clear mandate on HIV/AIDS is the UN secretariat, with governing bodies where civil society, donors, other UN are represented. If you take UNICEF, from their global mandate, HIV/AIDS is only one of their specific activities. We are trying to modify this, and this year there would be a country level, in the most affected countries, there would be one UN coordinator, under the UN Secretary Khofi Annan, that would be directly a coordinator, and the role of the UN would be to make them more accountable to a specific body. But again, this question of the governance of the UN and their accountability in a specific area is unclear. It is true also for government, and what is striking is that in the face of this deadly epidemic, there is the fact that civil society has not expressed itself, except in South Africa. We have not seen huge demonstrations in the developing, in the most affected countries. The silence of civil society is astonishing. There is no pressure from civil society to make their government accountable for the prevention and access to care for this HIV/AIDS epidemic.

Synthèse

Mr. Mahesh PATEL, Regional Advisor, Monitoring and Evaluation, UNICEF

The introduction by Niels Dabelstein set the scene by talking about the two sides of evaluation, the learning and the accountability, and this session was very much on the accountability side. Many of us are not only evaluators but have a responsibility for monitoring and evaluation, and a lot of the work that was presented was actually about monitoring, as much as it was about evaluation.

I very much appreciated Burkhard Wilke's presentation on monitoring charitable organisations, and the criterion assessment methods. I particularly liked this very clear definition of the six good reasons for charity to be accountable. Those sorts of checklist approaches simplify things. Approaches are easy to use, when you have the main points in lists. The main points covered efficiency, dealing with weak points, that emotional appeals only work in the short run, that blind trust in charities is something that is fading, that a more pragmatic approach is needed, that advertising is expensive, and the importance of donations overall as the basis of the functioning of the NGOs. It was very helpful to have the common standards for the NGOs to be defined in that way, and I was particularly impressed that 30 % of initial applications for certification were unsuccessful. I thought that was a good benchmark for the kind of work that's being done there.

Noria Mezlev did a very interesting presentation that was a little closer to evaluation as a tool for accountability, and there again I appreciated the conceptual framework, where we had a definition of accountability based on two principles. It is helpful to have these principles and definitions, by which individuals, organisations, and the State account for their actions and are held responsible, and to give examples of evaluation and audits. The second definition is about how individuals and States may satisfy and legitimately report concerns, so that there are channels for communicating information. This was even placed in a right framework. We are hearing increasing mention in development circles of rights-based conceptual frameworks, where the people who are accountable, a group, are referred to as duty-bearers, and the people who they are accountable to, are referred to as the stakeholders, or some people would say the rights holders. This falls into "What is the role of evaluation in that kind of accountability framework: what is accountability? What is an accountability framework? And therefore how does evaluation fit into that, as a necessary but not sufficient tool for accountability to exist?" The paradigm of necessary conditions actually matches something we are hearing a lot about, which is the results-based management. There, we define a number of necessary conditions to achieve a given target.

Michel Caraël framework is incredibly impressive: 189 countries have signed on to a common monitoring framework at the governmental level. When have we had that scale of enterprise on a pressing human concern before? In a period of one and a half years only, the progress that they have made is absolutely remarkable. I also appreciated his elucidation of principles from monitoring. It is very easy to find papers on evaluation, and much more difficult to find good conceptual frameworks for papers on monitoring. He has set up a list of principles that they are using which have general applicability in monitoring frameworks. They should be based on existing indicators and they should assure multi-sectoralism. The indicators should be comprehensive but simple, they should harmonise with other existing frameworks, they should adjust to country situations, and there should be a balance between the purpose of the monitoring framework and national priorities. I thought this was an excellent elucidation of principles for a monitoring indicators, and fully plan to use that in a training workshop, starting as early as next week.

François Senemaud presented a very interesting paper from a French governmental perspective. I particularly appreciated the article 10 of the Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen: “Every public agent is accountable for his administration to society”. 1789! This is wonderful! I do not know if we have anything that predates that statement in the evaluation literature? This is possibly the earliest historical and verifiable reference to accountability. This is part of the Old World culture, and there is a deep sense of history there that is almost inescapable. We all appreciated very much the French government's target to gradually phase towards 0,7 % of GDP over the next 10 years, and particularly the participation and process elements. The groups were very interested in the windows to civil society to participate in the evaluation processes of French ODA. We hope those open windows will become open doors, more and more.

The presentation from Robert Picciotto was so packed full of facts and analysis that it is hard to separate out one bit or another. Is it the 50 % or the 40 % or the 1.35 %? What is it that one reports from this globalised presentation of what the role of evaluation could be in the world today? But the basic message is the one that hit home with everybody. Development evaluation has to go beyond looking at aid. One has to consider things such as intellectual property rights, which have hit many walls with the AIDS drugs in the developing countries, and which interestingly enough shareholders of pharmaceutical companies are taking up, according to the Financial Times, really holding meetings about and putting pressure on the companies themselves, from the shareholders' perspective. About issues of migration and environmental stability, I would mention that one of our colleagues here, Stiann Van der Merwe, presented an upside down evaluation yesterday, which was called an Evaluation conducted from the South of Development Education in the North. He gave a very entertaining account of how that evaluation was conducted. There were a lot of new paradigmatic encounters and intuitive work going on as well. There was one question that particularly seized my attention. If attribution is a red herring, how does accountability come into play? I suppose it is a question we have to think about for all time, and it leads me back to the introduction to this meeting, when we were asked about “Why did the chicken cross the road?”. How would you translate this into a chicken crossing the road analogy? Perhaps we should ask what the result was, from the chicken crossing the road? If it got run over, whose fault was it? And if it crossed successfully, who should be praised? I certainly think that all these papers crossed the road very successfully!

L'ÉVALUATION DES ONG – SUIVI ET RÉTROACTION

Président : Mme Nancy Mac Pherson, Responsable de l'Initiative suivi-évaluation, IUCN.

Rapporteur : Mme Elisabeth Barsacq, Chef du bureau de l'évaluation, ministère des Affaires Etrangères.

Contributions :

- « Les ONG australiennes et AusAID – des partenariats pour l'assurance qualité et l'amélioration de l'efficacité ».

  Partie I : Peter Ellis, Directeur, Program Evaluation Section, AusAID.

  Partie II : Linda Kelly and Rhonda Chapman, Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA).

- « Les agences néerlandaises de cofinancement et leur pratiques communes en matière d'évaluation », Yvonne Es et Dieneke de Groot, Gemeenschappelijk Overleg Medefinanciering (GOM).

EVALUATION OF NGOS - FEEDBACK AND MONITORING

Chair: Ms Nancy Mac Pherson, Head, Monitoring & Evaluation Initiative, IUCN

Rapporteur: Ms Elisabeth Barsacq, Head of Office of Evaluation, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- "Australian NGOs and AusAID – partnerships for quality assurance and improving effectiveness",

  Part I: Peter Ellis, Director, Program Evaluation Section, AusAID

  Part II: Linda Kelly and Rhonda Chapman, Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA).

- "Dutch co-financing agencies and their common evaluation practices", Yvonne Es, Gemeenschappelijk Overleg Medefinanciering (GOM), Netherlands.

Introduction

Ms. Nancy MacPherson, Head, Monitoring and Evaluation Initiative, IUCN

This session focuses on the experience of two large umbrella non governmental organizations in introducing and using quality assurance processes. We will look at the introduction of quality assurance instrument and processes and their results, and the reactions of the NGOs to this process.

The first presentation is in two parts. It looks at both sides of using quality assurance process – from the government agency perspective and the NGO perspective. Peter Ellis will introduce the experience of AusAID in undertaking a quality assurance process with NGOs in Australia. Then Linda Kelly and Rhonda Chapman from the Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA) will describe the reactions to this process and the initiatives that resulted.

The second presentation given by Yvonne Es assisted by Dieneke de Groot will look at the experience of a consultative body of NGOs in the Netherlands that have used new policy frameworks and quality assurance processes to trigger self-regulating systems and processes.

Contributions

« Australian NGOs and AusAID – Partnerships for quality assurance and improving effectiveness »

Mr. Peter Ellis

Director, Program Evaluation Section, AusAID

There are two parts to the Australian presentation, that are really covering two different angles of what we thought was a very interesting case study, in the context of this project, which is a partnership between AusAID, as the official government aid agency in Australia, and the NGO community. As in most other countries, there is a reasonably large amount of funds which is channelled through the NGO's by the government, and there is a simply mutual interest in determining the effectiveness and finding ways to improve that.

Our approach to accreditation

The essence of AusAID's engagement, in partnership with NGOs, is a risk management process, which is centred on what we call the accreditation process, whereby NGOs meet a certain set of criteria that show that they are professional, competent, well-meaning development organisations. They go through this accreditation process which is renewed every five years. The NGO community is heavily involved through peer assessment and through a peak level body which involves representatives from both AusAID and NGOs. Once the agency is accredited, it has access to various sorts of AusAID funding. There are two different types of accreditation, full and base. The full accreditation goes to the agencies which have got the strongest credentials in terms of being development organisations.

Why are we using quality assurance ?

The principles of quality assurance, which we talked about, in some ways differ from your traditional evaluation. Most people would be familiar with them, but the essence is that, instead of trying to determine effectiveness and impact at length in the evaluation process, we are trying to articulate what is good practice, which is based on findings from previous evaluations, and we can then use that articulation of good practice to measure what our actual practice is. The advantages of doing this over more traditional forms of doing evaluation is that once you have developed your statement of standards, that can be done very timely, you can get feedback while the activity is still going. It is cheap, and also in this particular context, it can be partnership based.

AusAID developed in conjunction with our government, a quality frame which is basically our articulation of what good practice is, and those are the four key attributes of good aid practice, according to AusAID. Underneath them, there are about forty or fifty particular standards which refer to some of the actual details of attributes. For example, involving beneficiaries in particular ways is one of the standards for appropriate objectives and design.

How we did that from AusAID's perspective of a quality assurance study, with the NGO community ?

The quality framework, as it was originally designed, was for bilateral projects. The first step was that we involved the NGO community in a modification of the quality frame to suit the particular needs of NGO activities. This was not a trivial process. It took quite a few months, and a fair bit of effort, but eventually we reached some degree of agreement that actually articulated what the standards of good practice were, for NGO delivered aid.

The second phase of the study : we applied those standards to a random sample of 20 NGO projects. We selected 20 projects which received AusAID support, one from each of 20 NGOs, and then we sat down with panels, which consisted of a couple of AusAID staff, an independent consultant and a representative of the NGO community, on each panel. Each panel then looked and examined their projects against the quality frame, which had previously been determined. That gave ratings against all the different standards and identified strengths and weaknesses. The evidence from the data which was before those panels consisted of all the various documents which applied to those projects, interviews with the implementing NGO, and where possible, teleconferences with the field implementing partner. There were all sorts of potential weaknesses there. It was not a participatory process which involves beneficiaries, for example, and we are certainly not pretending that it is, but what we do think that it tells us, is a good, rapid, cheap assessment of exactly how NGOs are going against various attributes of the quality frame.

Some of the findings and where that led

The basic finding of the report is that there was an opportunity to improve, but there were both strengths and weaknesses. Some of those, when proved, were applied to AusAID's own procedures, and some applied to NGOs. We had a list of some of the strengths of NGOs. None of them will come as a surprise to anyone who had been involved in the aid industry. And we had a list of weaknesses which were certainly a bit more of a surprise, particularly for instance in terms of things such as social and contextual analysis of the broader development context. I have to emphasise that these weaknesses were not universal. I will draw emphasis to the fact that some of the findings apply to weaknesses with NGOs, and some of them are problems with AusAID.

This particular process found problems on both sides, and, in particular, we found a rather shocking finding, from AusAID's point of view, that there was limited contribution to quality, from AusAID's own systems. The report was able to make some recommendations as to what we could do to fix that. Those involved AusAID moving away from more of a current process, which was perhaps a little bit too concerned with rigid accountability, particularly financial accountability, towards finding ways to put the quality agenda into our relationship with NGOs, which meant things like including the quality frame within the accreditation process. From AusAID's side those recommendations basically have been implemented. There were seven recommendations for NGOs to take up. The recommendations were fairly practical and it was in the power of NGOs to implement them.

So what happened to the report after we had gone through it ? First it triggered a lot of dialogue and in a sense this dialogue is still continuing now. You will be hearing later what some of the NGO perspective is on the finding. As I said before, AusAID made changes to our procedures, but we were a little bit disappointed to find that the quality frame, which we had made a real effort to develop in partnership with the NGO community, was still not fully accepted. I am mentioning this in the sense that it is an admission that things didn't work out perfectly. I am trying to put in front of us all some of the difficulties of really working together, in true partnership. From AusAID's perspective, we thought we had done everything right in terms of involving the NGOs and adapting the quality frame, and involving them in setting NGO projects against it, but there is still some sense in which we may have missed the point.

Perhaps the key issue was that we set up a partnership based process, to set up standards and assess NGOs against them, and try and engage in a mutual learning experience. The experience did come up with some good, practical suggestions. It certainly triggered a lot of dialogue and triggered some action on AusAID's part, and some action on the NGOs part. Generally, we regard it as a success.

Ms. Linda Kelly and Rhonda Chapman

Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA)

My presentation will be from the perspective of the NGOs, represented by the Australian Council For Overseas Aid (ACFOA). ACFOA brought together the NGOs in discussion and in response to the Quality Assurance Process (QUAP) process to discuss about what the NGOs thought about it and how they wanted to respond to the various recommendations. I want to point out the two key issues that came out in the NGO response.

The major issue was first to say « yes, we actually think that what the research has shown is valid, and is worth consideration, and we have to take these criticisms seriously, but we actually think that there is more to NGOs than you have captured in this process, and we think you have missed some key points that are quite critical to understanding the effectiveness of NGOs ».

Secondly, it is good that you allowed us to participate, we value that and we respect the work that AusAID has done, but if NGOs are going to move to owning this process, and therefore acting and changing as a result of it, they need to work on some of their own processes. They need to own the research, some of the results and some of the outcomes. That is a very clear development principle. If you do not feel ownership of something, then you are less likely to act on it and change. If people are not prepared to act, change and improve, then accountability mechanisms are only going half the way. The NGOs set about a fairly involved research process of their own. Essentially, what makes effective NGO practice among Australian NGOs ? How do we develop a framework that describes and captures that ? What do we do about it, in terms of improving our quality of practice ? And finally, what does that mean in relationship to donors and to accountability ? It has been a long process going for about 18 months until now.

Two key outcomes

At the point of completing the first stage of research, we basically came to two key outcomes.

The first was that we did get a participatory process. We set out to work with the 90 NGOs that operate in Autstralia, the 90 members of ACFOA, and it is probably fair to say that 80 % of the NGOs were actively involved in the process, and the entire peak council of ACFOA have now signed off on the process and have agreed to it.

But perhaps the most important finding and outcome, and the key thing, is that we decided, after a lot of work and research, that NGO effectiveness defined more than the designs, the plans or the areas of programme engagement that NGOs are actually involved in. If you want to understand why NGOs are effective, you have to go beyond looking at their operations. You have to look at other elements and aspects of them as organisations.

In order to make sense of this going beyond operations, we established a framework which has three basic areas. The first area is around standards of operations. The NGOs did decide on a whole list of standards that they thought were important to their work. There were thirteen key standards that relate to operational work and were captured by the NGOS at a conference in their own language. They were committed to by the NGOs and there was a recognition by the NGOs that there was a very strong overlap and similarity to the elements that came out of the QUAP process. It was also recognised that the number of NGOs did not match up to these different standards. NGOs committed to them are now committing to a number of practices to try and improve practice among Australian NGOs against theses standards.

What we also decided was that if you wanted to understand effective practice, you also needed to look, not just at what happened in terms of the field work, or efficacy work or humanitarian relief, as it was clear that you also needed to understand the programme approaches the NGOs used.

The research we undertook was fairly a rigorous research. It backed up some of the literature that had been written by other people in other parts of the world. We found it to be true, of effective NGO practice, that Australian NGOs were effective when they worked in a way that was adaptive, they were there for the long term, they worked on very high quality relationships, they learnt as they went, made mistakes and actually learned from them, and so on. But that wasn't enough, we still needed to understand effective practice. It was also clear that NGOs that were undertaking things in an effective way had good standards, they had good programme approaches, and they were also very clear, consistent and coherent with their principles. NGOs tend to be principle-driven organisations, and have lots of missions and principles. The NGOs that were more effective were those consistent and coherent with their principles and their values.

So the NGOs endorsed a number of principles, the code of conduct that they had already signed up to, which encapsulated most of those principles. They also endorsed a further one. They suggested that they really needed to identify their values, communicate them to all their key stakeholders and reflect them in their work. Those key values had to do with beneficiary ownership, respecting human rights, high quality gender and diversity practice. Essentially what we said was that unless there was consistency and coherence across the values and principles, programme approaches and actual operations of NGOs, then you were likely to see less effective practice.

What were the implications ?

We thought there were two major implications.

The first was that there was a mismatch between the Australian NGO experience and to some extent the donor accountability requirements, which focussed largely on the operations procedures of NGOs. What we were saying is « if you want to hold us accountable for effective practice, you have to go beyond that ». It is actually bigger and more complicated, it is more multidimensional than the approach that you are taking. We could spend some time debating logframe and results-based management approaches to development planning, and how that leads to a particular dimensional approach to development understanding. What the NGOs had stumbled upon, without setting out to critique logframe and other approaches, was a more multi-dimensional approach to understanding their work, which we are still trying to make sense of.

The second major implication was that maybe this didn't have any implications for us as NGOs, but maybe for AusAID, UN agencies, and maybe in particular - given that the Australian aid programme is largely managed through private contractors, the Australian NGOs account for a tiny percent of Australian aid delivery - it had implications for those contracting agencies and the coherence between their values and principles and ways of operating and approaches.

Next steps

There are three next steps that are happening.

We are now in the stage of doing quite a large programme of on-going research, to validate our findings, to really look at the field and to see whether what we think makes for effective practice does make for effective practice.

We have just completed a very large research programme in Papua New Guinea, looking at the work of three NGOs there, from the perspective of the beneficiaries, which includes the communities and the local government officials, tracking what has been effective in that work, and then seeing if there has been any overlap with the framework that we have developed. The work is not published yet, but the preliminary results suggest that there are quite strong overlaps and we are quite pleased about that. That research was undertaken by an independent consultant on a participatory based research, and we involved communities researching their own definitions of effectiveness.

We have also started some research around advocacy work of agencies and humanitarian relief to look at overlaps with the framework. We feel very strongly that NGOs are very good at rhetoric, they are not necessarily very good at proving and validating some of the claims that they make, and we don't want to be guilty about that. We need to work very hard at validating this research.

The second thing we are doing is that we have begun a programme to try and build the capacity of Australian NGOs. No one is claiming Australian NGOs measure up to all these different standards and approaches all the time, and so we have a programme of training that is setting out to look at the weak areas. We are in the process of developing an organisation assessment tool so that key processes can actually start to measure themselves against this framework, and identify their own areas of weakness. We are also targeting the governance sectors of the NGOs. We have on board the operational people and to some extent the very senior management of the NGOs in Australia. We are still getting on board the Boards of governors.

Finally, we are continuing an on-going dialogue with the Australian government about this process. Part of that dialogue was agreeing to come here and present our differences to you, open them up and have a conversation about them. We are also looking for other ways to talk together and perhaps undertake some joint research to further illuminate the area.

« Dutch co-financing Agencies and their common evaluation practices »

Ms. Yvonne Es, Dieneke de Groot

Gemeenschappelijk Overleg Medefinanciering (GOM)

The consultative body of co-financing agencies in the Netherlands (GOM)

I'm speaking here on behalf of the evaluation and policy working group of the GOM, that is the consultative body of co-financing agencies in the Netherlands. We are non-governmental organisations. Our common interest is that we all take part in the co-financing programme of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and currently 11 % of the Netherlands budget for development cooperation is spent through this programme, which is a quite considerable amount.

A recent experience with joint evaluations

« Joint » means here that two or more co-financing agencies are participating.

The changes in the structure of the co-financing programme as of 2003 and the change in the relations between the Dutch government and the co-financing agencies

About the changed structure of the co-financing programme. Previously, the percentage of the Foreign Affairs annual budget for development cooperation was allocated to the co-financing agencies as a group, and the co-financing agencies had an internal distribution agreement. Now, in the new scheme, financing is no longer allocated to the group of co-financing agencies as a whole, but to each co-financing agency separately. To qualify for the subsidy, we must each submit a business plan, once every four years, and then based on this business plan, the Ministry decides whether this organisation is eligible to participate in the co-financing programme and the level of financing granted depends on the quality of the business plan. The new policy framework of the co-financing programme is of a rather general nature. The co-financing agencies have the autonomy to develop their own policies, but they have to fit within the main objective of this programme, which is structural alleviation of poverty in the South, and in the poorest central and eastern European countries, and to achieve universally recognised human rights. The goal of structural poverty alleviation is pursued through three intervention strategies : direct poverty alleviation, civil society building and advocacy. We all work with a large range of partner organisations, both in the North and in the South, and we work on various sectors and themes and address the millennium development goals.

The quality assurance system adopted by the co-financing agencies and how we want to organise our joint evaluation : themes tackled and the minimum quality standards adopted

One of the conditions established in the policy framework is that the co-financing agencies develop their own quality assurance system. What we have done is that we have adopted a total quality management model, which is called INK - it is equivalent to the European EFQM model - and it is characterised by a focus on learning and improving. Basically, it consists of nine areas. Five of the areas of the INK management model check the internal organisation, and four of these areas cover the results of the organisation. We have jointly developed minimum quality requirements which serve to ensure the quality of the organisation in each of the blocks of the management model. These criteria establish the minimum that a co-financing agency must have achieved, or is expecting to achieve in the near future. These criteria form the basis for further implementation of the INK model, at the co-financing agencies. We ourselves are responsible for integrating these minimum requirements within our own quality assurance systems in the different agencies. We are expected to hold each other accountable for the fulfilment of these requirements, through peer review. It is important to mention that we have integrated criteria on good donorship in the minimum quality requirements. For instance, when you look at the area of customer satisfaction, we have agreed that once every four years the co-financing agency conducts a satisfaction survey among its partners. Each organisation incorporates the results of these surveys in its policy with respect to financing and communication with partner organisations. We also try to build on existing quality standards. We all strive for ISO 9001 certifications as a minimum requirement, which is a quality system that covers the internal processes and procedures in an organisation. In each of the blocks, ISO is covering a part, but basically it is about the processes and procedures of the organisation.

Our joint evaluation programme comes in the area of key performance results. As co-financing agencies, we have a long tradition of joint evaluation. What is new is that, as from this year, we have the full and collective responsibility for organising these evaluations, without involvement of the Ministry. Joint evaluation means that at least two agencies, but it can be more, are participating in one evaluation of the key themes of the co-financing programme.

We develop for each theme a master terms of reference, and then at the level of the individual co-financing agencies individual programme evaluations will be held, guided by these master terms of reference, but offering possibility for the organisation to include its own interests. Then at the end of the process, the different individual evaluation reports on a specific theme will be synthesised in a synthesis report.

The programme evaluation sheds light on the different ways the different co-financing organisations are contributing to the objectives of the co-financing programme. The joint evaluations are combined with other types of evaluation each co-financing organisation is implementing. These are project evaluations at the level of the individual projects, and programme evaluations on themes of specific interest to a co-financing agency. The overall goal is quality control and quality enhancement of the co-financing programme.

We have developed standards for the quality of the evaluation: standards on the terms of reference, on the reports, on how to judge consultants, on the evaluation process. External quality assurance is assured through an external reference group, which will advise on different aspects of the evaluations, and the Policy and Operations Evaluation department of the Ministry will inspect the work we do.

Challenges

The Co-Financing programme has a policy framework within which each co-financing Agency is working. It is of a very general nature and leaves a great deal of autonomy to the co-financing agencies to formulate their own policies. This affects the evaluability of the co-financing programme, and it has also methodological consequences.

As an example, two of the co-financing agencies are planning this year an evaluation on basic education. While we both adhere to giving a contribution to the MDGs, our ways of working are quite different, so we have to find how we can really guarantee that we can produce a good evaluation.

The choice to conduct individual evaluations, which will be combined in synthesis, governed by a master terms of reference, will present a special challenge because there will always be a danger that, at the individual level, there will be a lot of pressure to include the learning needs of the organisation in a specific evaluation. This implies that the coherence between the master terms of reference and the terms of reference of individual studies has to be safeguarded, in order to be able to produce the synthesis study.

Another risk is that we will be accused of a biased selection of evaluation topics and cases, in order to produce positive review results. .

Adopting a quality assurance system, as such, is a new element in development cooperation, and a new view on accountability among our organisations. Evaluation is one part of this accountability, but other parts, such as a customer satisfaction, the appreciation in society, the appreciation of the institutions that subsidise our work, are equally important.

Débats

Question de la salle

I just want to offer a complement of information about the experience in Canada **using a lot of partnership and doing institutional assessment**, jointly together, because the funding has the four levels : those that are not as mature, project by project funding ; those who do programme funding and they allocate money between their programmes ; those who are more mature, based on a business plan with multi-year funding, core funding ; and lastly those with core funding but also having a trust fund, whereby they can themselves according to their norms and criteria approve small projects. The tool to do the institutional assessment, which is done in a very participative way, can be found on the website of three institutions : the website of the International Development Research Centre, the website of the Development Bank, and the consultant one (Universalia.com). It is a holistic approach of doing quality control totally integrated.

Nancy Mac Pherson

It is interesting that from the discussion of the BOAG group, **organisational effectiveness** appears as a major theme in your work. There is a real contribution here, that these organisations are making. We have used ourselves the organisational assessment framework that you refer to which is excellent.

Question de la salle

Both agencies, the ACFOA and GOM, are membership organisations, and I would be interested to hear whether you also fulfil **lobby functions** for your members, and if yes whether you don't see a tension, a contradiction, between evaluation on the one hand, and the lobby function on the other hand ?

Yvonne Es

We have a secretariat which does the lobbying function for us, vis-à-vis the government and other civil society actors. We do not do it ourselves.

Linda Kelly

For ACFOA, we actually see that the public advocacy work on behalf of our members is intrinsically linked into the effectiveness process and no, that we do not actually see any conflict with that at all.

A woman from the floor

There is just a question that worries me. You said that all the NGOs who were part of this process were already the NGOs who had been accredited, which means that all of them were already receiving funds from AusAID.

Linda Kelly

In the AusAID evaluation of NGOs, it was essential that it was AusAID accredited NGOs who were evaluated. In the ACFOA process, we have ninety members and fifty-two of those ninety members are accredited agencies, so there was a large number of participating agencies who actually do not currently receive AusAID funding.

A woman from the floor

This raises the question about **advocacy being one of the notions of effectiveness** and about whether NGOs which are already receiving AusAID funds would therefore be able to hold the Australian government accountable, and to what extent. I find that there was an expectation that civil society should always be able to hold the governments accountable for the various monitoring indicators that have been developed at international level, and it is also a question as to how countries in the North, the developed countries, expect their NGOs to monitor them and to hold them accountable, while directly providing funds for them and working only with those NGOs.

A woman from the floor

Australian NGOs only receive 19 % of their funding from the Australian government overall. The Australian government is not a large donor to Australian NGOs. Australian NGOs have a very robust relationship with the Australian government, and in recent times a number of the Australian NGOs, for example, had refused to receive any humanitarian assistance to work in Iraq and have been quite public about that. There is a constant debate in Australia about whether the **advocacy work** of the Australian NGOs is affecting the relationship with the Australian government, and the answer is yes. We have a conservative government and we have a reasonably vocal group of NGOs in that country, but it is faire to say that Australian NGOs have largely not allowed that to hold them back too much, but they are aware of it. They talk about it all the time, and one of the reasons for looking at a framework like this, is trying to develop a much more **independent means of assessing effectiveness and performance** that goes beyond the measures that the government has set up. I am not saying the that they are wrong, but we need to go beyond those, and part of the framework if you look at all the standards is giving attention to advocacy work in the micro/macro connections and better analysis, and acting on those. It is fair to say that there is a vigorous debate and a fairly strong commitment by most of the Australian NGOs not to allow that to limit their ability to criticise the Australian government, and they haven't.

Ros David (ActionAid, UK)

I would just like to give a comment about going beyond a kind of **one dimensional approach to monitoring our work**, and particularly in talking about the log frame approach, because we are many NGOs these days that have moved beyond working in service delivery. The input/output/outcome model is not really reflecting the nature of our work, or does not reflect in evaluation purposes or monitoring purposes the nature of our work. Much of our work these days is about addressing the fundamental causes of poverty. We are working on supporting people to look at their rights, raising awareness, supporting people to have a voice. This is work which is flexible, has to be responsive, has to be context-appropriate and has to take opportunities as opportunities arise. Therefore we need to have methods and approaches which enable us to understand this work better and not reduce our work into boxes and not close down possibilities, but open up possibilities. In our work within Action Aid we try to see **monitoring and evaluation as tools which help our work**, which encourage people to have a voice, which encourage people to monitor their work in appropriate ways, and we need to really, as a development community, think better about modern ways, about intelligent ways of monitoring the new work that we do across the world.

Peter Ellis

I absolutely agree with that and I also agree with what ACFOA is saying, that there is more to **NGO effectiveness** than was picked up in the QAG. There is much more to NGO effectiveness, or any other form of aid, than just looking at their individual activities, but the weaknesses that were found in the QAG review of NGO aid activities weren’t because they were out there in some other advanced paradigm involved in long term programmes and so forth. There were very basic incompetences, and this was particularly the case with some agencies which had not moved beyond a service provision basis - AusAID is only meant to be funding NGOs to do development work, not just to provide welfare and so forth - but significant numbers of NGOs were out there still doing welfare work. It is all very well to say that the quality frame is crude and that it only picks up a linear view of development, but the fact is that a lot of aid is not even doing that old, crude, linear development well. We have got to remember that when we - and this doesn’t just apply to NGOs, it applies to us as bilaterals as well - get talking about high ideas of **paradigm shifts**, and we are moving to new forms of aid and programme swaps, sometimes what we are doing wrong is that we are just stuffing up very basic principles.

Synthèse

Mme Elisabeth Barsacq, Chef du bureau de l'évaluation, Ministère des affaires étrangères

Les contributions australienne et néerlandaise nous ont permis d'aborder une question plus globale, celle des relations entre les institution publiques chargées de l'aide publique au développement (ministères des affaires étrangères, de la coopération, agences d'aide,…)et les ONG. A la lumière de ces expériences, plusieurs idées sont à retenir, s'agissant de ces relations et de leur mode d'organisation.

La première idée est celle d'une sorte de contrat liant l'ONG qui reçoit une subvention et la puissance publique. Ce lien aboutit à la création de procédures (suivi, évaluation, contrôle qualité) dont le respect conditionne le cofinancement ultérieur des actions des ONG par les institutions publiques.

La deuxième idée est celle de l'appropriation par les ONG de ces procédures. En effet, l'ensemble de ces outils destinés à assurer la redevabilité ne peut être vraiment utilisé et ainsi ne peut être vraiment utile, que si l'ONG est parvenue à s'approprier ces outils. Il est donc important qu'elle travaille elle-même, en concertation avec les institutions publiques, à l'élaboration de ces outils.

La troisième idée, c'est que la relation institution publique/ONG soit fondée sur l'autonomie de l'ONG. Le respect de cette autonomie par l'institution publique est un principe de base, y compris lorsqu'elle utilise l'ONG comme opérateur.

CHAPITRE 4 : COLLABORATION ET TRAVAIL EN COMMUN ENTRE LES DIFFÉRENTES COMMUNAUTÉS DE L'ÉVALUATION

Les participants examinent comment les capacités en évaluation peuvent être améliorées. La discussion est ensuite consacrée aux avantages et rôles comparatifs des différentes communautés et aux possibilités de travailler davantage en commun.

RENFORCER LES CAPACITÉS EN ÉVALUATION

Président : M. Hans-Rimbert Hemmer, Responsable du département de l'évaluation, Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KFW).

Rapporteur : M. Graham Walter, Directeur de la Direction de l'évaluation, Banque asiatique de développement.

Contributions :

- « Améliorer les capacités en évaluation, l' exemple du réseau norvégien », Turi Hammer, conseillère technique, Norwegian Development Network.
- « Faciliter le renforcement durable des capacités en suivi évaluation », Jean-Charles Rouge, PNUD Niger.
- « L'aide des bailleurs pour le renforcement des capacités en évaluation: le point de vue d'un pays bénéficiaire », Chen Zhaoying, Directeur général, National Center For Science and Technology Evaluation (NCSTE), Chine.
- « Du renforcement des compétences en évaluation des Organisations de solidarité internationale à la construction d'une culture de l'évaluation, l'expérience du F3E en France », Nathalie Schnuriger, Président F3E et France Pays du Mékong.

CHAPTER 4: COLLABORATION AND JOINT WORK BETWEEN THE VARIOUS EVALUATION COMMUNITIES

Participants look at how evaluation capacities can be further enhanced. The discussion is devoted to the comparative advantages and roles of the various evaluation constituencies, the possibilities to work together, and issues for the future.

ENHANCING EVALUATION CAPACITY

Chair: Mr Hans-Rimbert Hemmer, Head of Evaluation Department, Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau

Rapporteur: Mr Graham Walter, Director Evaluation Division, Asian Development Bank.

- "Enhancing Evaluation Capacity, the example of a Norwegian Evaluation Network", Turi Hammer, Technical Advisor, the Evaluation Network of the Norwegian Development Network.
- "Facilitating Sustainable Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity Development",Jean-Charles Rouge, PNUD Niger.
- "Donor support for Evaluation Capacity Development: from the perspective of a recipient country", Chen Zhaoying, Executive Director, National Center for Science and Technology Evaluation (NCSTE), China.
- "From enhancing evaluation capacities of NGOs to building an evaluation culture, the F3E French experience", Nathalie Schnuriger, President F3E and France Pays du Mékong.

Contributions

« Enhancing Evaluation Capacity, the example of a Norwegian Evaluation Network»

Ms. Turi Hammer

Technical Advisor, Norwegian Development Network

The Norwegian Development Network is pleased to present an example of collaboration and capacity building in evaluation. It represents a very small effort in a wide context, but still it is an effort that we, who are involved, find meaningful.

The model entails a general overlap in values between NGOs and our development authorities. No matter what political parties that have been in power so far, it entails the basic feeling of trust and close consultation between the development authorities and the NGOs, including controversial issues like presently the humanitarian assistance to Iraq. As much as one third of our ODA is channelled through NGOs.

The evaluation network

The idea of an evaluation network came from a 1997 OECD report which recommended that donors should assist NGOs to network with respect to evaluation. Our Ministry of Foreign Affairs decided to accept this challenge.

The evaluation network was established three years ago, as a project under the Norwegian Development Network (NDN). NDN is a resource and competence milieu for Norwegian NGOs engaged in development cooperation. Our task is to bring together organisations, and other development actors, and to discuss and learn from each others. It’s up to the NGOs to take action with respect to their own evaluation practices, alone or in groups.

Everybody interested are welcome to participate and the network activities should benefit also partners in the South. A network model was chosen to facilitate exchange of experience. One did not aim at standard courses to be presented according to a defined plan. All activities should be developed according to identified needs and wishes among network members, and all activities should aim at capacity building.

The Board of NDM is responsible for the project, leaving the daily management to a technical advisor working about half-time with this project. The Board reports to the NDN members and to the Ministry. The Ministry provided € 300,000 for a three start-up period. The members and other participants match this funding by providing 12 % of total costs, plus some extra. The network was planned for twenty member organisations and many more have registered, including all the bigger Norwegian NGOs.

Results

In the first three years of operation, our main activity is seminars in Norway. Most seminars bring together participants from a variety of backgrounds giving possibilities for discussion and collaboration between NGOs, public servants from many ministries, politicians, consultants, researchers and students. So far, we've had only one seminar in the South – a three-day event in Rwanda, for partner organisations in several countries in Central and East Africa.

We have a newsletter. We support members and their partners to take part in capacity building activities arranged outside of the network, we have a homepage and we have tried to establish working groups.

We are about to launch a database of resources persons, and will draw them from our member organisations and their partners. Others, like external consultants, may register, but only on the invitation by members. It will be quite an exclusive base.

We are also about to launch a base on registration of evaluations interesting from the methodological point of view.

Challenges and action taken

A major challenge to us is relevance. The work we - as development actors - are engaged in, is unfortunately of great importance. To some countries, to some communities, to some individuals, it's vital. Therefore, when we engage in capacity building activities, we should always think of its usefulness for the people we are trying to assist to get a better life. We think that the persons who can best judge what is relevant are the ones closest to the target groups of development assistance. We therefore let the users of our network decide our programme.

Quality of our product is important. Our direct target groups - people in the development communities - tend to be very busy. If we take their time, it should be for a good reason. We work with quality primarily prior to our events and other activities, but also during seminars, we try for instance to keep speakers on track. In general, we have not found quality to be a difficult challenge. There are many resourceful people who have valuable contributions, whether with new ideas for approaches to evaluation or with approaches already tested in the field.

What I term « subject matter development » is quite a challenge. It would perhaps have been nice if all our members had had the same needs for capacity building at the same time. We could have a curriculum approach and arrange seminars to be sequenced, starting, for instance, with basic introduction and ending with organisation and monitoring and evaluation strategies and systems. But this, of course, is not the case even if to some extent, we have, over the three years of operation, gone through such a programme.

Institutional learning is a major challenge. Our development community consists of people on the move. We are often on short or long-term assignments. We change jobs. How can we ensure that the competence gained by one person benefits his or her organisation, is sustained? We repeat some activities for new staff, we work extensively with seminar reports, which we distribute widely, and we try and inspire our participants to share the knowledge with their own milieu.

Support to other activities is a challenge to us. According to our project document we can support our members to participate in activities that we do not organise ourselves, but the interest has been fairly small, and we are not quite sure why.

Benefiting partners in the South may be a big challenge, at least directly, for our network as such. But our members argue that capacity building for partners in the South is the natural ingredient in all their development co-operation. They see any direct intervention by the e

Evaluation network as an extra administrative link, which would mean more bureaucracy. They also argue that it may be difficult for a Norwegian-based network to assist needs for capacity building and to ensure relevance and any form of sustainability. The Board has agreed with its members. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, however, points at the project document where direct involvement is listed and asks us once again to look for ways for direct involvement in the South. We try and comply with this, by informing our members again of the possibility that they assess the needs and arrange events in the South, with our support.

We have not found institutional sustainability to be a big challenge. The idea that the network is the members has taken root. Members willingly take responsibility for seminars and provide speakers. The majority of seminars have speakers from the members and from their international networks. They are complemented with external speakers when required. The culture of openness and trust that has been developed makes small and inexperienced members participate on line with larger and more professional ones.

As for the Evaluation network as such, which started as a project, the Board now intends to integrate it with other NDM activities and to make evaluation part of all NDN capacity building activities.

Neither are we much concerned with financial sustainability. The funds provided by the Ministry were ample. We spent only 60 % of the budget for the first three years and have kindly been allowed to keep the rest and use it at our own pace. We have increased our participant and membership fees so as to be able to build up funds for future activities and we make our seminars inviting for external participants who pay much higher participant fees than our members, but first and foremost we draw on indirect support from members. Member organisations are not paid for input, such as speakers, participation in seminars, report writing, practical organisation of seminars and so-on.

When it comes to the way ahead, we need to be constantly aware of the challenges already mentioned and open to new challenges. We are planning a participatory self-evaluation, focusing on relevance, usefulness and future directions, which may help us become a better device for development. Concurrent with this, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will instigate an external evaluation of the network, which we are very much looking forward to.

« Faciliter le renforcement durable des capacités en suivi évaluation »

M. Jean-Charles Rouge

PNUD Niger

Ma contribution à cet atelier vise à donner un éclairage sur la façon dont les communautés d'évaluateurs, au niveau international, se sont constituées, avec un regard particulier sur le Sud et sur l'Afrique.

Cette présentation est basée sur un article co-rédigé avec trois autres collègues, Marco Segone de UNICEF Brésil, Mahesh Patel, ici présent, du Bureau régional de UNICEF à Genève, et Graig Russon de la Fondation Kellogg.

Ce papier a trois objectifs. Tout d'abord examiner les principales caractéristiques de la prolifération rapide, depuis la deuxième moitié des années quatre-vingt dix, des organisations nationales et régionales de suivi évaluation dans le Sud. C'est également présenter quelques leçons tirées de ces organisations et observer leur dynamique sur le terrain. Enfin, tester le cadre conjoint de développement des capacités qui a été élaboré à la fois par le PNUD et l'UNICEF en 1999 au cours d'un atelier qui s'est tenu à Harare. Ce cadre conjoint a servi, pour bon nombre de ces réseaux, de base théorique et conceptuelle pour se développer. La question principale que nous allons nous poser tout au long de cette présentation est quelle est la contribution des réseaux nationaux et régionaux au renforcement durable des capacités de suivi évaluation des pays.

Pour commencer, deux phénomènes conjoints sont à constater. D'une part, la rapide prolifération, à partir des années 1995, de ces réseaux qui étaient au nombre de six avant 1997, et qui sont maintenant au nombre de quarante-huit ; d'autre part, un regain d'intérêt de toutes les organisations bailleurs de fonds, Nations-unies, gouvernements, ONG sur les initiatives novatrices en matière de développement des capacités en suivi-évaluation.

Pour illustrer la répartition de ces réseaux au plan géographique, le graphique que vous voyez montre clairement qu'ils étaient principalement basés, jusqu'aux années 1995, dans les pays du Nord et qu'aujourd'hui près des deux-tiers sont dans les pays du Sud, avec une prépondérance en Afrique anglophone, l'Afrique francophone étant encore en marge de ce processus.

On observe ainsi que ces réseaux s'animent partout dans le monde et la plupart ont également tiré les leçons des expériences de leurs aînés des pays du Nord. Les plus anciens sont l'Association américaine d'évaluation, la Société canadienne d'évaluation et la Société Austral-asiatique d'évaluation. Plus récemment, se sont créés la Société européenne, la Société italienne et la Société française d'évaluation. Certaines de ces organisations ont également servi de base pour développer des réseaux dans le Sud sur des modes de fonctionnement similaires. A noter cependant que certains réseaux du Sud ayant voulu se formaliser en association ont finalement perdu en activités et dynamisme. Il faut également souligner qu'il y a encore un manque de coopération entre les réseaux, bon nombre de sociétés du Nord considérant leurs approches de suivi-évaluation spécifiques par rapport à l'évaluation des interventions de développement au Sud. L'ouverture aux questions de développement international commence tout de même, mais timidement.

Les premières sociétés du Sud à être créées et les premiers programmes à se mettre en place, l'ont été en Amérique latine, avec l'Association centraméricaine d'évaluation, soutenue par l'Agence canadienne internationale de coopération. En 1996, le PREVAL, programme régional appuyé à l'époque par le FIDA, a aussi servi de réseau list-server pour regrouper le plus de spécialistes en suivi-évaluation dans cette région et renforcer leurs capacités.

C'est à partir des années 1997 et 1999 que se sont créés des réseaux en Afrique qui se sont réellement animés autour de fora de discussions et de réunions pour partager des bonnes pratiques au sein des communautés locales d'évaluateurs. Les premiers sont ceux de Nairobi, du Rwanda et du Niger. En Afrique particulièrement, l'UNICEF a montré la voie en soutenant la création de ces réseaux et en organisant leurs premières réunions. Dans le cas de Niger, le PNUD a pris la relève dans l'animation et la coordination du réseau national.

La contribution du Système des Nations-Unies au développement des ces réseaux est importante, notamment par mise en place d'un cadre neutre d'échanges entre professionnels locaux de suivi évaluation, tous secteurs confondus. Cet environnement fut propice au ralliement rapide d'un grand nombre de ces experts aux activités de ces réseaux.

Ainsi, toute la dynamique générée par ces groupes a été rendue possible pour deux raisons : l'image de neutralité des agences des Nations Unies a permis de regrouper les experts et facilité des échanges libres sur des sujets de politiques publiques parfois sensibles, et le cadre conceptuel conjoint PNUD UNICEF a permis de définir et de s'entendre sur les concepts de capacités et de développement des capacités.

Le RENSE

Partant de ce cadre conjoint, le ReNSE a pu définir un certain nombre de finalités, d'objectifs, et mettre en place sa dynamique. Le réseau du Niger est le réseau le plus dynamique d'Afrique francophone. Son forum de discussion permet, une fois tous les deux mois, de réunir sur un thème spécifique, par exemple l'éducation ou la bonne gouvernance, tous les spécialistes du secteur afin de présenter des travaux, d'échanger des bonnes pratiques, de discuter de normes, standards, méthodologies, etc. C'est une expérience qui permet d'aider les communautés locales à rompre leur isolement, à échanger entre elles et à se développer professionnellement.

Le ReNSE mène également des activités de formation, des activités d'échange d'information, et est une interface entre l'expertise locale et les bailleurs de fonds à la recherche de consultants. Ces réseaux nationaux de suivi-évaluation ont la capacité de construire et maintenir des bases de données d'évaluateurs et de promouvoir ainsi l'expertise locale.

Enfin, les pratiques en termes d'évaluation et autres thématiques comme les normes sont énormément discutées au sein du réseau.

Que peut-on retirer de ces expériences de réseaux ?

La plupart des réseaux en Afrique et dans le Sud sont à l'image de ce qui se passe au Niger. Cela fait déjà deux ou trois ans que ce réseau existe. C'est un forum de discussion qui permet de se développer professionnellement et personnellement, de rompre l'isolement des évaluateurs qui sont sur le terrain, dans les régions, qui n'ont pas un accès facile à l'information. C'est aussi une organisation non-étatique, ce qui est très important pour initier des échanges libres sur des problèmes de politiques publiques notamment. C'est un réseau qui permet de disséminer un nombre important de documents de suivi-évaluation à des coûts très faibles, puisqu'il suffit d'avoir une adresse e-mail pour les recevoir et un accès à l'Internet pour les télécharger à partir du site du réseau. Il permet également de promouvoir les experts locaux, en dehors des frontières, pour leur permettre de développer leurs méthodes dans des contextes différents. Nous avons des cas très intéressants de développement de méthodologies, à la fois dans les structures étatiques ou dans les structures privées, qui sont à promouvoir et à faire connaître.

Les leçons tirées de l'expérience du ReNSE et de ses homologues en Afrique

Ce type de réseau fonctionne relativement bien en demeurant dans un cadre et un mode de fonctionnement informel. Les experts se rendront et contribueront plus facilement aux réunions si des thèmes techniques et méthodologiques y sont débattus, plutôt que si leur temps de présence est consacré à débattre des statuts de l'association, de questions administratives, etc.

Le Comité de coordination du ReNSE est multi-sectoriel et a un rôle central à jouer. Un Comité de coordination tel que celui de ReNSE est composé de cinq représentants de la communauté d'évaluateurs : un représentant pour les agences des Nations Unies, un pour l'Administration, un pour les institutions d'apprentissage, un représentant pour le secteur privé et les consultants freelance, et un représentant pour les ONG et les agences de coopération bilatérales. C'est aussi grâce à cette diversité du bureau exécutif que l'on arrive à regrouper une palette riche et diversifiée de personnes et à animer une dynamique basée sur la diversité.

Il est également très important de faire connaître ces réseaux aux autres partenaires. On a beaucoup parlé de partenariat depuis le début de cet atelier et ces réseaux ont besoin d'appuis et d'alliances avec d'autres réseaux et d'autres bailleurs qui leur permettront de se développer davantage et d'organiser, notamment, des ateliers de formation, étant donné que la demande de formation est extrêmement importante sur le terrain.

Ces structures nationales sont appuyées de plus en plus par des structures parapluies régionales, telles que l'Association africaine d'évaluation, créée en 1999 sur une initiative de l'UNICEF. Il y a également eu en 2002 le lancement de l'Association Internationale pour l'Evaluation du Développement (IDEAS).

L'Organisation internationale pour la coopération et l'évaluation (OICE), dont l'assemblée inaugurale sera lancée dans les jours à venir au Pérou, vise à renforcer les liens de coopération entre tous les réseaux nationaux et régionaux de suivi-évaluation, pour, une fois encore, accroître la dimension des échanges de bonnes pratiques et organiser des événements à caractère régionaux visant à renforcer les réseaux nationaux et les évaluateurs.

Les expériences récentes de ces réseaux nationaux et régionaux de suivi-évaluation dans le Sud permettent d'affirmer que ces activités contribuent au renforcement des capacités des évaluateurs locaux et développent une véritable culture de l'évaluation dans toutes les sphères professionnelles - étatiques, ONG ou consultants indépendants. Cela dans le but d'accroître la capacité à rendre compte, à s'approprier, à développer des projets plus efficaces.

« Donor support for Evaluation Capacity Development : from the perspective of a recipient country »

Ms. Chen Zhaoying, Executive Director

National Centre For Science and Technology Evaluation (NCSTE), Chine

China is the biggest receipt of the World Bank group and a strong partner for many donors, but unfortunately, in terms of evaluation, China has no systematic contact with the work. I do not know why. My speech is from the perspective of the receipt countries. In recent years, the issue of donor support for ECD (Evaluation Capacity Development) have attracted a great deal of attention, and I noticed most of the reports are from the donor perspective and hardly reflect of the experiences of the receipt countries.

ECD in receipt countries

Let us think of two questions. First, how should we understand the ECD in receipt countries ? ECD is a very hard topic in receipt countries. Do these issues attract as much attention in developing countries as it does in donor communities ? If not, why ?

Secondly, since the joint evaluation on the partnership in evaluation is recognised as a very good model, why is it difficult to find the cases that donor and receipt countries undertake a joint evaluation in full partnership ? What are the major barriers for that ?

To understand the ECD in developing countries let us observe what do the people in receipt countries think of the ECD and what does the donor community think of the ECD in receipt countries.

Generally speaking, developing countries have not attached enough importance to the ECD yet. Being a strategic issue, the ECD is still discussed and argued in the donor community. For instance, in China the concept of ECD is quite a new one, and neither evaluators or managers understand the ECD it very well.

To understand what the donors think of the ECD in receipt countries let us look at some assumptions of this question.

Assumptions on ECD

In donor communities the assumption of the donor support for ECD is based on the knowledge transfer. For instance, people assume that developing countries lack of the important scale and ability in evaluation, and that the outsider can fill this gap with the knowledge transfer. They also assume that the evaluation in developing countries has little impact on the policy decision because of a number of barriers and that the knowledge transfer can be a good way to remove the barriers. From my personal opinion, I think the assumption abovementioned is reasonable, but some phenomena in China need to be noted. In recent years, China has conducted a large number of aid projects. Every project had to be evaluated regularly. When conducting the evaluation, the donor sent the senior expert to China to work out a very high quality evaluation report. I interviewed some officials who are in charge of many aid projects and I also interviewed some project leaders for the aid projects, which have been evaluated many times. Most of them do not have a clear understanding of the evaluation guidelines and principle criteria. I believe that in evaluation, the foreign experts have done a very good job, as for example the field study analysis data, drawing conclusions and making suggestions. The ECD in China is not enhanced as much as expected.

We noticed that aid evaluation has not really to test for knowledge in ECD, the evaluation capacity of the local institution as the whole has not enhanced very much. It is impossible for us to list all the reasons for this, but I believe that one reason which could be very important is how much the receipt country is involved in the evaluation activities. Chinese people are actively involved in the implementation of the project, but they are less involved in the evaluation. Some Chinese people are required to provide information, to attend the meetings and to provide some advice, but no systematic idea about the purpose, the procedures, the criteria of the evaluation and the results. Although a number of evaluations of aid projects have been conducted in China, the ECD in China is far from satisfactory.

The evaluation partnership between the donor and the receipt countries

The concept of the evaluation partnership consists of several aspects, but my speech is focused on the partnership between the donor and the receipt countries. We always faced many difficulties to conduct the joint evaluation, such as a lack of interest to work, the time-consuming, the higher cost, the communication problem and delays. Although at some stage of the evaluation the joint work between the donor and receipt has been tried, this cannot be called a joint evaluation in the real sense, so it is difficult to find some cases where donor and partner country have undertaken real joint evaluation.

Cases of evaluation jointly conducted with the donors

As the local evaluation partner, our centre participates in some joint evaluations. For example, the evaluation for Norwegian mixed creative programme jointly conducted with the Norwegian Institute; the evaluation for the Danish mixed creative programme, jointly conducted with the Nordic consulting group, and the evaluation for the Danish industry funding, jointly conducted with the Nordic consulting group.

The roles of the local partner in different stages of the joint evaluation

At the stages of the proposal and the design of the evaluation, the evaluation is proposed by donors, and we are less involved in these stages. At the stage of preparing the evaluation, we do a lot of work. During this stage, one of the important task of the local partner is to contact the local authority to prepare the project. At the end of this stage, we put forward some proposals and the issues for attention for the next stage. At the stage of implementation of the evaluation, activities include the field study, questionnaire, survey, information collection, etc. The local partner and the donor act in close cooperation and conduct different activities together. Then there is the stage of drafting and discussing the evaluation report, providing related information, cross-cutting information. Then we would give the response and comments to improve the quality of the final evaluation report. This is a particular Danish approach, as an example.

In the terms of reference for the evaluation (Danish programme), the role of the local partner is defined as : first being responsible for all practical aspects regarding the planning and the implementation of the field study ; second, preparing meetings with all stakeholders of each of the projects to be evaluated ; Third is acting as the process advisor during the interviews in the field study ; fourth is the report of the minutes of the field study meeting ; last is discussing the findings with the information that comes out and the correct follow-up information.

Some statements

I have some statement on the cases I just talked about. I would prefer calling these cases the joint evaluation, but they are not joint evaluation, if not full partnership. In this case the joint work is mainly limited to the project stage after the TORs have already been given. The local partner has the late participation at the stage of the initiation and the desire of the project. The joint evaluation has a different level.

The other thing is that, in these cases, the local partner is a professional institution instead of individual experts. This way in China is more helpful to develop the evaluation capacity at the institutional level and it is more important to guarantee the quality of the joint work.

In this case, even it is not at a high level as a joint evaluation, both sides of the donors accept and are pleased with our cooperation, and both sides have realised that joint evaluation is a very good model. It benefits in both ways.

Last month, the French experts were commissioned by the French Ministry of finance to carry out an evaluation of the project in the field of energy in China. They also invited us to get involved in some work. The evaluation officer from the Netherlands, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, also invited us to put forward the proposal for the joint evaluation. Hopefully this joint evaluation will involve us in the very beginning as we initiated it.

Development evaluation should finally be bound by evaluators from the recipient countries and under their responsibility. Therefore donor support to the country should play a very important role in the development evaluation. From the perspective of the recipient countries, the traditional ways of donor support, including staff training, conference seminar, are all necessary, but far from enough. I just mentioned for example that although a number of evaluations have been conducted in China, that ECD of China is not satisfactory.

The joint evaluation is a very effective way for the donor to support aid in the countries, and it creates more opportunities for the evaluator to participate in the whole evaluation practice. It helps to improve ECD in the countries, especially for the countries lacking experience in evaluation.

So far, it is difficult to find some cases where the donor and the partner country have undertaken joint evaluation in full partnership. There is a need to identify the major barriers, and to make the evaluation become a real partnership procedure.

The last point is to encourage the recipient country to participate in the discussion of the development evaluation, and maybe developing some guidelines.

« Du renforcement des compétences en évaluation des Organisations de solidarité internationale à la construction d'une culture de l'évaluation, l'expérience du F3E en France »

Mme Nathalie Schnuriger

Présidente du F3E et de France Pays du Mékong

Le travail que je vous présente ici est la synthèse d'un travail collectif mené par le F3E, dont le F ne veut pas dire « français ». C'est une structure associative qui rassemble un certain nombre d'associations. Sur cette thématique du renforcement des capacités en évaluation, nous allons partager l'expérience du F3E qui a pour objectif principal ce renforcement des compétences en évaluation des Organisations de Solidarité Internationale (OSI - Organisations of Solidarity International) pour la construction d'une culture de l'évaluation.

Le Fonds pour la promotion des Etudes préalables, Etudes transversales et Evaluations

F3E comporte trois E, donc trois produits, trois types de travaux sur lesquels les trois E travaillent. Son objectif est le renforcement des compétences et du professionnalisme de ses membres. Il a aussi pour objectif *in fine* l'amélioration de l'efficacité des actions. Nous le concevons donc comme un outil d'aide à la décision et d'amélioration de la qualité des actions à la disposition des acteurs non gouvernementaux.

Ce dispositif est un dispositif associatif et paritaire. Paritaire signifiant que travaillent dans ce dispositif secteur non gouvernemental et puissance publique française.

Le F3E est une association de membres diversifiés. Il a été fondé en 1994 suite à la fusion de deux fonds pré-existants, le Fonds d'Etudes Préalables (FEP), existant depuis 1988, et le F2E, existant depuis 1990. Nous sommes aujourd'hui une cinquantaine de membres, de bases sociales, de mouvements sociaux diversifiés, d'origines multiples. Un certain nombre d'associations sont les ONG - en France nous n'avons qu'un seul statut, c'est la loi 1901 - certaines ayant des activités majoritairement tournées vers l'international, d'autres moins. C'est toute la diversité de la mouvance associative qui se retrouve au sein du F3E.

Pourquoi nous nous retrouvons ? Pour la mutualisation des compétences et des moyens. Comment cela se passe ? Il y a une cotisation, en contrepartie de laquelle vous avez droit à un certain nombre de services, mais vous vous engagez à échanger et à valoriser les résultats auxquels vous aboutissez. Nous avons un Conseil d'Administration, un bureau de huit associations membres, qui s'engagent bénévolement dans un certain nombre de tâches, en particulier l'instruction initiale des études. Ceci représente une gouvernance associative. Et surtout, nous avons ces fameuses décisions sur nos évaluations, concertées avec les pouvoirs publics.

Le fonctionnement du F3E

Avec les pouvoirs publics, la communauté non gouvernementale en France a mis en place cet outil, pour ensemble financer des évaluations, et ce Fonds pour les évaluations est une association au service de ses membres, pour l'intérêt général.

Sa base s'est diversifiée depuis dix ans. Ces fameuses Associations de Solidarité Internationale (ASI) représentent notre côté français, très précis. Pour nous le secteur non gouvernemental se subdivise en subtiles catégories, et nous avons les ASI, les associations dites en voie de professionnalisation, puis les acteurs de coopération décentralisée, et selon que l'on se situe dans une perspective européenne ou française, on ne les nommera pas de la même façon. Lorsque nous parlons, nous, Français, de coopération décentralisée, nous parlons de « city to city cooperation ».

Cette mutualisation, ce bénéfice collectif, sont réellement fondateurs de l'expérience du F3E. Sans cela, nous serions peut-être simplement un réseau ou une association. Ce qui fait aussi son fondement, c'est cette volonté de mutualiser des moyens, et d'avoir du bénéfice collectif. Nous répondons donc à des besoins individualisés, mais les résultats sont partagés et valorisés.

Les deux derniers points de caractérisation, sont l'outil paritaire de concertation, entre le secteur non gouvernemental et les pouvoir publics. Je l'ai dit, une instance associative, les représentants étant désignés en assemblée générale, plutôt classique.

Nous appelons cette instance partiaire la Commission d'Examen ou « *Review Committee* ». Ce comité associe les représentants des pouvoirs publics et le bureau (qui s'occupe des instructions initiales des demandes d'évaluation). Dans la sphère du Ministère des affaires étrangères, il s'agit du bureau qui s'occupe des ONG, du bureau qui s'occupe des évaluations, et de l'Agence française de développement.

Voilà comment, ensemble, nous allons arriver à cette fameuse culture de l'évaluation en France. Pour être sûrs d'avoir des débats où la neutralité, où le respect de chacun est assuré, nous sommes sous la présidence d'une personnalité indépendante, que, vous le comprenez bien, les deux parties reconnaissent.

Enfin, cette instance paritaire détient l'instruction finale et les décisions concertées. C'est alors que, collectivement, nous construisons nos approches, nos conceptions, nos regards sur ces travaux et ces évaluations.

Que faisons-nous concrètement de tous ces outils ?

Ce Fonds, comme son nom l'indique, est un Fonds où il y a de l'argent. Nous apportons donc un soutien financier et technique à des études et des évaluations. Nous avons pour l'instant trois types d'études, ces fameuses études préalables, études transversales et évaluations. Nous avons aussi trois niveaux d'appui : un niveau technique, qui est un appui que nous apportons aux associations membres qui soumettent une demande d'évaluation, sur la rédaction des termes de référence et sur la sélection de l'expertise ; un appui financier, et non des moindres, puisque ce Fonds soutenu par la puissance publique française essentiellement peut contribuer jusqu'à 80 % des coûts ; et enfin la valorisation, ce partage ouvert à tous, c'est-à-dire non seulement aux membres mais également à la communauté non gouvernementale engagée dans les actions de coopération de manière large.

Cette diffusion, ces échanges, cette capitalisation, cette formation, les outils méthodologiques développés, font donc l'objet d'un certain nombre d'échanges, de travaux, de journées de rencontre et de réflexion.

Il ne s'agit pas de dire que toutes les évaluations sont les mêmes, qu'elles sont monolithiques, et ici en France, la pensée monolithique n'est pas de rigueur. L'évaluation promue par le F3E a des caractéristiques et peut-être un jour promouvrons-nous différents types d'évaluation. Celle que nous promouvons aujourd'hui est une évaluation demandée et portée par les membres, ce qui signifie qu'ils sont les véritables commanditaires. C'est une évaluation ex-post, externe et de conseil. Et enfin, les résultats sont reversés au bénéfice collectif. C'est à dire que lorsqu'une association conduit une évaluation, l'ensemble de la collectivité des membres, soit les cinquante membres, ont accès aux résultats de cette évaluation.

Nous conduisons également des actions de formation en programmation, suivi et évaluation. Tout cela permet de renforcer nos propres compétences. Et nous construisons, nous semble-t-il, une culture de l'évaluation qui n'est ni non gouvernementale, ni gouvernementale, mais bien collective, et nous la reconnaissons comme telle au niveau français. Elle comporte une rigueur porteuse d'apprentissage, elle se traduit par l'amélioration de la qualité des études et des actions, elle se construit et se diffuse au sein des acteurs de coopération, qui sont les vrais acteurs.

Nous sommes tous acteurs et nous devons tous participer à la construction de cette culture.

Pourquoi devons-nous construire cette culture de l'évaluation ?

Pour avoir une capacité de produire du changement efficace, ce qui signifie un certain nombre de choses : une évaluation négociée, des enjeux partagés, une implication de tous les acteurs concernés en amont des processus, du temps pour s'approprier les résultats, de la formation pour mieux exploiter les évaluations, et enfin, et non des moindres, des recommandations crédibles. Nous pensons que nous ne sommes qu'au début du chemin, et il nous reste encore de nombreux chantiers à ouvrir ou à promouvoir.

Nous parlons depuis le début de ce séminaire de changement effectif. Il s'agira pour nous d'identifier les véritables changements, et les outils d'arbitrage, d'aide à ces décisions menant au changement effectif. Il s’agira d'avoir les moyens pour conduire ce changement. Il s'agira aussi sûrement d'imaginer des dispositifs pour l'après évaluation, pour qu'elle ne reste pas lettre morte, dans un tiroir, ou sur une étagère.

Il y a, sans aucun doute, de nouvelles formes d'évaluation à inventer. Selon nous, l'exercice n'est pas monolithique, il n'est pas clos. La standardisation de tout processus d'évaluation ne serait pas une bonne chose. Nous revendiquons un droit d'innovation et d'initiative en la matière.

Un autre chantier serait, nous semble-t-il, pour nous Français, le partage européen d'une capitalisation, d'une recherche que nous conduisons cette année, sur l'efficacité des évaluations portées par les ONG. Les résultats seront disponibles fin 2003. Nous pensons qu'il peut être intéressant de pouvoir partager et de prolonger la réflexion au niveau européen.

Enfin, au sein du F3E, nous sommes convaincus de la nécessité d'amorcer une réflexion sur la démarche qualité, en France, au niveau du non gouvernemental.

Débats

Mohamed Manai (BAD)

Je souhaiterais réagir à la présentation de Jean-Charles Rouge sur la durabilité des réseaux de **suivi et évaluation en Afrique**. Le problème est crucial parce qu'en Afrique il s'agit essentiellement de problèmes de demandes d'évaluation. Ce que nous avons constaté, c'est que, tel qu'il se présente, le réseau de suivi et évaluation est essentiellement soutenu par les donateurs, et ceux-ci ne favorisent pas la durabilité.

Le deuxième aspect est qu'il existe vraiment une contrainte majeure au niveau de ces pays-là, car ces réseaux ne voient pas vraiment leur efficacité s'améliorer, s'il n'y a pas un soutien moral de la part de l'administration et du gouvernement ainsi que des donateurs. Les réunions de l'Association Africaine d'Evaluation a été un succès, parce que cette conférence a su concilier l'offre et la demande en même temps, et les débats sur ce sujet-là ont été discutés. Un code éthique a été élaboré, et je dirais même des directives assez spécifiques qui prennent en compte les dimensions culturelles en Afrique ont été développées.

Comment développer la demande ? Les travaux qui ont été fait depuis une bonne dizaine d'année par le comité de développement, par la Banque mondiale et les autres banques régionales doivent être cités. Il existe des tentatives, et même des recherches qui sont allées plus loin pour le développement de cette demande, et je fais référence essentiellement au travaux de la Banque mondiale, de Monsieur Keith Mackay, qui a développé un rapport annuel sur le renforcement des capacités en général, et en Afrique en particulier.

Il faut essentiellement **lier l'aspect du développement des capacités d'évaluation dans le cadre de programmes de lutte contre la pauvreté**. Ceci constitue une opportunité qu'il faudrait saisir et renforcer, parce qu'il ne s'agit pas seulement du renforcement des appareils de statistique, il faut aller au-delà et incorporer des conventions d'évaluation, dans le cadre de la modernisation de l'appareil de l'Etat. Je trouve intéressante l'approche présentée par le F3E, et l'on peut probablement concevoir un fonds d'évaluation au niveau des pays.

Au niveau de la **dimension régionale**, les réseaux doivent s'ouvrir. Nous avons le réseau nigérien qui doit essentiellement contribuer au renforcement des autres petits réseau, ou structures qui ne sont pas encore apparues, en vue de favoriser au moins une dimension sous-régionale et, au-delà, régionale.

Enfin, les évaluations menées par les pays : il faudrait mener des évaluations qui dépassent le cadre de projet de développement, et aille dans le sens du programme d'assistance au pays, d'évaluation des politiques sectorielles. Il existe des travaux qui ont été réalisés dans le cadre du groupe d'évaluation des banques multilatérales, de ECG, Evaluation Corporation Groupe, qui a développé cette thématique dans le cadre d'un atelier en septembre 2002.

Oswaldo Feinstein

I would like to ask a question to the two first presenters. I didn't notice any **reference to the universities or research centres** or think tanks in the two countries. Given that they could play, and that they generally play, a role on the supply side, either in terms of a potential or actual supply, I wonder why you have not considered them.

With respect to the presentation on China, it was mentioned that an assumption of donor support for ECD has to do with the skill gaps, and therefore with the **transfer of knowledge** as the key element. Now in the case of the World Bank, and also the African Development Bank, as my colleague just mentioned, the key assumption of donor support is on the demand side. It is not only the existence of demand, but also the possibility of nurturing demand, and this is really the key aspect, because then the other considerations follow.

Question de la salle

I think we have to recognise as a group how important capacity development is. What I would like to propose is a number of ideas, as ways of entering into partnership with these capacity development initiatives in countries.

In terms of the **network of professional associations**, it is very important to recognise that these are very often indigenous enterprises. Very often UNICEF or UNDP are a start-up in the first year, but these have almost all progressed by now to national leadership.

May I encourage you to use the African Evaluation Association website (www.afrea.org) when you are **looking for consultants**? You have your range of consultants that you use in your own countries, but just to consider looking at the website and maybe you can match the level of quality and experience there; to use the African Evaluation Association guidelines in addition to whatever domestic criterion you have for ensuring evaluation quality. **The African Evaluation Guidelines** are published in the Journal of Evaluation and Programme Planning and they are available on the African Evaluation website: and when you are going to a country which has a national evaluation association, going to one of these developing countries, please consider being a lunchtime speaker there, perhaps do a brainstorming with local evaluators on the protocol, present the first draft to the national evaluation group, they would be delighted to welcome you and to organise meetings.

Funding and budgets is a very difficult area. Most of the professional associations have been operating without donor support other than the provision of a room. Giving them money will certainly help increase the potential to do things, but please, if you are doing that, do not give a one-off sum for one year, or something like that, because a dependency can be created, and when that money evaporates after the first year, that will be the end of what was a sustainable national structure. If one is entering into collaboration, funding national associations, please enter into multi-year long-term partnerships, not just a one-off effort, which would be needed for initiatives like the African Evaluation Association conference.

We already have more than a dozen agencies - NGOs, UN agencies - who are support strands in the **African Evaluation Conferences**. May we please encourage you to support the conference strength of the African Evaluation Association?

Rob D. van den Berg

I am now speaking on behalf of my own evaluation department. We are very interested to explore possibilities for a **true, joint evaluation**, with the institute of Chen Zhaoying and we will follow up on that in the near future.

The joint evaluations that she described are not really joint, are not in the true partnership sphere, and we would like to do that. The interesting aspect is that her institute is an institute in China mandated to do evaluations. The many other efforts in capacity building that we hear about are on the professional level. Perhaps Jean-Charles Rouge could tell us a little about whether the professional expertise that he is noting in Africa is also on the institutional level ?

We need institutions to collaborate with, and at a certain moment this professional expertise needs to be taken up in the government. And perhaps Nathalie Schnuriger can also tell us a bit about that. Indeed, this goes on to the institutional and systemic level.

A specific question to Jean-Charles Rouge was about the proliferation of « M&E » organisations. Our feeling is that this usually is **a proliferation of « M » organisations**. The « E » side is usually left out. Is this indeed the case? Is there sufficient attention for evaluation?

A specific question to Nathalie Schnuriger: her organisation wants to **support evaluations if there is a willingness** to change by those concerned, because if there is not a willingness to change, then there is no scope for any evaluation, the results will not be taken up. But evaluations sometimes take place in areas of conflict where there are different interests. We had a very interesting example in one of the sessions of a case in India, where in effect there was no willingness to listen, but the evaluation took up some very serious matters, which had to be looked into. Is your organisation willing to look into those issues as well ?

Patrick Durisch (Fondation Terre des Hommes)

Cette question s'adresse à Nathalie Schnuriger, notamment sur le dernier point qu'elle a abordé, au sujet de cette concertation, de cette étude européenne sur **l'efficacité des ONG**. Je voudrais savoir si l'on se base sur l'efficacité par rapport à des critères, ou si l'on parle d'efficacité par rapport aux missions respectives de chaque organisation ?

Frédéric Lefevre-Nare (Evalua)

Notre cabinet a une douzaine d'expériences en collaboration avec des consultants, surtout de l'Afrique du Sud. Toutes les limitations que signale le professeur Chen sont selon notre expérience similaires et liées au fait que l'évaluation répond aux questions que se pose le bailleur, et non pas à celles que se pose le pays que l'on appelle bénéficiaire. Or, pour citer Bernard Péret, **la spécificité du métier d'évaluation ne réside pas dans la façon de trouver les réponses, mais dans la façon de trouver, de hiérarchiser, d'organiser les questions**.

Je me permets d'en déduire une seconde remarque concernant le premier exposé. Les démarches de type **assurance-qualité** intéressent directement deux types d'acteur : les ONG, et les structures qui financent ces ONG. Elles vont donc répondre aux questions que se posent ces acteurs, et en premier lieu la question de l'efficience.

Cela m'amène à un paradoxe sur le renforcement des capacités évaluatives au Sud. Nous avons toujours trouvé une offre excellente, et une très grande capacité de nos partenaires à donner d'excellentes réponses aux questions de la pertinence et de l'impact, alors même que la demande qu'il risque d'y avoir, de la part des acheteurs d'évaluation sur place, risque surtout d'être une réponse sur l'efficience.

Massimo D'Angelo (UN-DESA)

Professor Chen, I liked the link between capacity development, evaluation capacity development, and **joint evaluation with recipient countries**. It is a very interesting topic. We, in the United Nations, have been reminded by our member States, several times and since long, that national countries should be heavily involved in evaluation work. As a matter of fact, in spite of this, this is not the reality at the field level. Joint evaluation is often conceived only as a joint effort among donor agencies and when we talked about the involvement of the receiving countries, we talked about some kind of degree of participation, and not the same level, the same role to play in the evaluation. In fact, often, the counterparts at the national level are not asked to have a very active role in evaluation, in the concept or design of it or even in the formulation of conclusions, but mostly as suppliers of information, or just as a possible control for reaction to conclusions that have been formulated by somebody else, but the assumption emerges in the new trend of relationship work, especially if we are going to pursue globally agreed development objectives increasingly in our work. Our evaluation work is going to be particularly oriented in that direction. There is a **growing role for evaluation work**, not only among co-financers, but all those stakeholders, international and national, who are directly or indirectly interested in pursuing those global objectives. This expands the spectrum of involvement of national governments, but also the representatives of civil society, and collaboration between the UN and non-bilateral agencies and so on, in a very complex kind of collaboration.

Marta Foresti (Save the Children, UK)

This is about the question raised by the colleague from China. I have been involved myself in **capacity development and evaluation** in Save the Children where I work. I am very aware of the limitations of the technical approaches to capacity development in evaluation, particularly when it comes to training seminars and technical support. I was wondering whether your experience in joint evaluation, and also the benefits, are to do with the fact that with a real process of evaluation, and doing it together, you actually create a space to look at issues of **roles and responsibilities**, which are so crucial in the evaluation processes, and dealing with the issues of **powers**, and how within a real evaluation process, those are dealt with, as well as the technical, methodological questions.

The second point is an observation about the **African networks**. I was just wondering the extent to which these networks are actually closed to professional development in general. I tried a few times to suggest to field offices in Africa to access the websites and look at consultants, which they have done, but they have never resulted in actually working with evaluators in the networks. Possibly this is simply because of the informal relationships between different development professionals on the ground, and evaluators from the networks are maybe not there.

Finally, something where I call myself responsible for, I have looked at in particular IDEAS, IOCE and the European Evaluation Society, of which I'm a Board Member. They are all about to embark on evaluation of capacity activities, and really this is a plea for these organisations to coordinate and think and work together, and not just go off into capacity development enterprises that do not necessarily serve the needs of the communities they aim for.

Question de la salle

Since we are approaching the end of the workshop, I would like to formulate general considerations to have the reactions of the speakers on those.

There are some **cross-cutting issues** between this morning's session and this afternoon's session.

These two days have been extremely important and significant to develop a mutual understanding on evaluation among the participants. The point is now how to go ahead. We have to find a way to give at least a couple of answers. The first one is **how to play evaluation in the broader context of development policies ?** Evaluation has a cost, and we cannot forget that we are operating in an environment where resources are declining rather than increasing. But when we go to prioritise evaluation, how can we place it in the broader context of the broader development aid ?

The second question is, **to which extent evaluation is a mask, or is it a wish ?** The reality seems to me that in many cases evaluation is assumed as an added value, a wished added value to the overall development policy. But it is not, somehow, something that is assumed as compulsory in all the development projects. So how can this mechanism be regulated, in order to gain the consent among the receiving countries, the beneficiaries, the donors, and other organisations?

Laura Hawken (WHO)

Fundamental change in focus, involvement and participation, discussion, ownership and power, risk, different forms of monitoring and evaluation, variety of message, triangulation, learning, internalisation, innovation, networking, negotiation and facilitation, effective change…

To what extent can we start **putting some of these principles into practice**, by examining the functioning of this meeting, and how we might actually run future meetings differently in the future. Are we prepared to take the risk to learn ?

Question de la salle

Perhaps just a note of caution, when it comes to cooperation, let's go for **cooperation-collaboration, but not cooption**. To NGOs, researchers, universities and networks of any kind, in the North and the South, let's be careful and retain our own values and origins.

Chen Zhaoying

I really appreciate your concern for my speech, but honestly, I just mention it to you as a Chinese evaluator. I have had the contact with the International Evaluation Society only for the recent three or four years, so maybe some of my personal opinions are my personal feeling, my personal experiences.

Jean-Charles Rouge

Je vais commencer par la question de Mohamed Manai. Il est vrai que la question de la durabilité des réseaux nationaux est l’une des questions essentielles à l'heure actuelle. Les réseaux qui ont démarré grâce à l'appui des structures des Nations Unies ont développé un système de budget zéro, c'est-à-dire que c’est sur la base du volontariat que ces réseaux sont animés, et c’est sur la base d'alliances stratégiques avec les partenaires que nous pouvons développer des initiatives à caractère national, de développement professionnel, de formation, d'accueil des réunions. Je pense que cet esprit de volontariat est très important à préserver et qu'il est une des clés de la réussite actuelle de ces réseaux. Je ne suis pas vraiment pour instaurer des systèmes de cotisations qui pourraient avoir un effet contraire à ce que l'on souhaiterait. Il s’agit d’ailleurs de savoir en fait ce que l'on veut vraiment faire de ces réseaux. Est-ce qu’il n’est pas essentiellement question ici d'assurer, via ces réseaux, l’existence d’une plate-forme de discussion, qui dans certains de ces pays sont totalement absentes, et qui permettraient à ces évaluateurs de s'exprimer librement sur une diversité de sujets, parfois politiques ou sensibles ?

Pour ce qui est de l'intervention de la Banque Mondiale, effectivement dans le cas du réseau nigérien, l'université est très impliquée dans nos activités. Il y a un représentant pour les institutions d'apprentissage au sein du comité de coordination. Nous avons beaucoup travaillé avec eux pour élaborer un projet de séminaire de suivi-formation et un comité scientifique a été constitué avec bon nombre de ces représentants. Par ailleurs, bon nombre de chercheurs des différentes facultés - agronomie, sciences sociales ou sociologie – sont membres du ReNSE et participent aux réunions. Le monde académique est une part intégrante de la dynamique du réseau.

Par rapport à l’existence de **l’expertise professionnelle dans les institutions**, celle-ci est parfois étonnante et novatrice : si je prends l'exemple du Niger, nous avons des exemples de pratiques, de développement de systèmes de bases de données renseignant sur les performances à plusieurs niveaux des projets sur le terrain, très intéressants. Cette expertise existe donc. Il est vrai que les capacités des différentes directions des évaluations de programmes des ministères sont relativement faibles, étant donnés le manque de moyens et le manque de ressources financières. Cependant, ces structures participent aux activités du réseau et ont, par ce biais, la possibilité de présenter bon nombre de leurs travaux et d’en débattre avec d’autres experts, ce qui concourent au renforcement de leurs capacités.
Pour ce qui est du **suivi, plutôt que de l'évaluation**, au Sud la performance des mécanismes de suivi est aussi importante que les mécanismes qui permettent d'évaluer les projets. Du fait de la faiblesse des systèmes statistiques de ces pays, il est primordial d’avoir non seulement des systèmes d'évaluation efficaces, mais également des mécanismes de suivi qui vont permettre de se perfectionner et d’appuyer les processus d’évaluation.

Nathalie Schnuriger

How do you enter, or **how do you work with the institutional level** ? We go by « learning by doing », which means we just sit together and work together. From that perspective, we are building up that culture of evaluation. We do not decide it from one side or the other, we do it together. Which means that we do what ? We co-finance, together, the evaluation. Which means that the NGO asks for an evaluation and is the owner of the evaluation and its results, but through the « Comité de pilotage », the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the F3E, the NGO, etc., chair the aims and the methodology of the evaluation, which is conducted by an independant expert..

The second thing was **the willingness to change**. Is there conflict in that area ? I guess our philosophy will be « solve the conflict first, evaluate after ». These are two different jobs, and if we mix the two different exercises, then we screw up both exercises. We tend to say that we will go for advisory situations, counselling practices, we will solve the conflict first. Just by sitting together for the terms of references, you may solve a lot of things. That would be our philosophy.

The question about the **sharing**. Do the effectiveness survey, the capitalisation on common criteria, according to the mission of each of the NGOs. I would say both. This is the work we are having at the moment. As French, we don't like one way thinking. NGOs are very diverse, we got to cope with that, so we are doing that work on effectiveness at the moment, and things are not definite.

The last question on **joint evaluation**. According to us, we cannot talk about joint evaluation before we sit together for terms of references. It is like a so-called joint, or shared, or partners, or whatsoever evaluation, it is not, according to us again, a properly joint evaluation.

Synthèse

Mr. Graham Walter, Director Evaluation Division, Asian Development Bank

We had four presentations, including two on networks, one from a developed country in the North, and one from a region within Africa as well as the perspective from a recipient country in the OECD, and finally a perspective from France.

Turi Hammer from Norway presented their model of a network which is bringing together NGOs, learning from each other, exchanging experience and building capacity. She noted, however, that interest in extra network activities was small, and also that they had limited success in involving southern partners. She also noted that the key challenge for them was maintaining the relevance and the usefulness of their work and she concluded by saying that the key point is that « the network is the members ». Because of that, the institutional and financial stability is ensured, despite the fact that they have some funds from the Ministry.

Jean-Charles Rouge made the point that networking has been mostly in Anglophone Africa, and perhaps we can ask why is the interest in Africa, and not in Asia ? The key point that he has made is that the establishment was assisted by UNICEF and by a framework from UNDP. Thus the neutrality of this UN approach allowed the participants to come together and it provided this conceptual framework. It allowed communities to come out of their isolation and discuss among themselves, providing also the interface between donors and the local community. He made the point that there is a high demand for training in that region. He finally concluded that the Africa experience shows that the true evaluation culture can be developed, both within State organisations, and within NGOs and consultant groupings.

Professor Chen Zhaoying noted that most of the ECD papers have a donor perspective and not a recipient perspective. She posed two specific questions : is ECD a hot topic in recipient countries, and if not, why ? And why have there been so few joint evaluations ? What are the barriers ? One of the questioners made the assumption that donors assume that filling in the gaps with knowledge transfer will help develop evaluation capacity. She noted that, despite a number of in-depth evaluations within China, the ECD in China has not really been enhanced as a result. Because they have not truly been joint evaluations, they have not been involved in evaluation design, in developing the terms of reference, they have really been a facilitator, an assistant, rather than a true, joint evaluation person. She noted at the end that we could take local institutions as the local partner, rather than individuals, and this might help in fact develop capacity. Oswaldo Feinstein raised that we should look more to universities and institutions for this. I myself have worked in China, and we've used Tienjing University for part of our capacity building.

Finally, Nathalie Schnuriger presented the French experience of the F3E, an association fund. She made the point that the mutual pooling of resources, of mutual interest, and the sharing and dissemination of results, distinguishes the F3E from a network. She mentioned the review committee bringing together government officials and non-government people, which creates a culture that is neither government nor non-government. It involves all protagonists and they are interested in real change and effective change. They are not dogmatic about evaluation and the key thing she ended up with was the need to be innovative in things such as this.

VALORISER LA COLLABORATION ET LE TRAVAIL EN COMMUN

Président : M. Jean-Michel Severino, Directeur général de l'Agence Française de Développement.

Rapporteur : M. Jim Rugh, Coordinateur, Care International.

Contributions :

- « Enseignements tirés des données d'expérience de la Banque mondiale en matière d'évaluation conjointe », Osvaldo Feinstein, Manager, Operations Evaluation Department Banque Mondiale.
- « L'établissement, le renforcement et le développement de la coopération pour l'évaluation entre les agences gouvernementales et non gouvernementales allemandes », Brunhilde Vest, Ministère fédéral de la Coopération économique et du développement (BMZ), Allemagne.
- « Collaboration for development evaluation: Ideas shaping a New Global Effort », Sulley Gariba, Président, International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS).

ENHANCING COLLABORATION AND JOINT WORK

Chair: Mr Jean-Michel Severino, Chief Executive Officer, Agence Française de Développement

Rapporteur: Mr Jim Rugh, Coordinator, CARE International

- "Lessons Learned from Experiences in Joint Evaluation" Oswaldo Feinstein, Director, Operations Evaluation Department, World Bank.
- "The establishment, strengthening and development of co-operation for evaluation between governmental and non-governmental German agencies", Brunhilde Vest, Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation (BMZ), Germany.
- "Collaboration for development evaluation: Ideas shaping a New Global Effort", Sulley Gariba, Chair, International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS).

Introduction

M. Jean-Michel Severino, Directeur général de l'Agence Française de Développement

Cette dernière session sera consacrée au travail en commun, à l'appropriation et aux échanges, puisque l'évaluation n'est pas simplement une technique mais est aussi une pratique sociale et que, à l'intérieur de cette pratique sociale, l'apprentissage fait partie des enrichissements les plus évidents que l'on peut imaginer et tirer de cette activité.

Cette session ciblera la valorisation de la collaboration entre tous les acteurs de l'évaluation qui devrait, en théorie, nous permettre de mieux apprendre les uns des autres, de mieux connaître ce qui est attendu des évaluations par les différents partenaires du développement. Elle cherchera aussi à souligner combien ce travail en commun favorise la transparence et l'échange d'expérience.

Il y a également un intérêt à long terme, au-delà de cet échange d'expérience, à travailler en commun entre institutions de développement et pays partenaires, et la convergence des méthodes est une source d'efficacité, d'efficience supplémentaire pour toutes les maisons de développement et les partenaires du développement en général.

Contributions

« Lessons learned from Experiences in Joint Evaluation »

Mr. Osvaldo Feinstein,

Director Operations Evaluation Department, World Bank

I will focus on joint evaluation experiences that the World Bank's Operations Evaluation Department had basically since 1999.

The reason is that in that year we started an evaluation of aid coordination which made it very clear to us that there is a serious problem in terms of aid fragmentation. One of our responses to the complaint that has been voiced frequently in developing countries concerning "evaluation bombardment" has been precisely to carry out joint evaluations.

In the context of this presentation, I am referring basically to evaluations done by the World Bank jointly with other donors. This is important to mention upfront, given that there have been several statements made before in this conference about joint evaluations and different types of joint evaluations. The Working Party on Aid Evaluation published a very useful report on joint evaluations, on multi-donor evaluations, that includes a typology of different evaluations. Here we are focussing on joint donor evaluation which we have been carrying out since 1999. In previous years, we also had some experiences in joint evaluations.

Collaboration in evaluation: a challenge

It is interesting to link these experiences with the first challenge that was mentioned by Rob Van Den Berg, i.e., collaboration in evaluation. This is a challenge we have been trying to address through joint evaluations, and there are some lessons that we have drawn from our experience.

First of all, let me mention that - in addition to the point made before about the fragmentation of aid - a complaint has been voiced by developing countries about the great number of evaluations that they had to suffer, given their limited absorptive capacity.–It is also worthwhile to take into account that there is a new modality of intervention, joint programmes, that started precisely in these years, and to which some reference was made in this conference. These programmes, which are jointly implemented, have in turn led to the need for joint evaluations.

Thus, there is a more enabling environment for joint evaluations. At the same time, despite this strong motivation for joint evaluation, our progress has been limited in advancing in joint evaluations. This is important to acknowledge, given the several exhortations that have been made since yesterday about joint evaluations. It may be worthwhile to reflect on what may be the lessons from this somewhat limited progress achieved so far. Hopefully we can identify some ways in which we can improve what we are doing jointly. In a way, what we need to do is a sort of self-evaluation of our joint evaluations, a formative evaluation.

At project level there are good opportunities for joint evaluations, particularly for co-financed interventions, and we already had some experiences.

The one we had in Jordan with the current Japanese Bank International Cooperation (JBIC) was interesting. We had missions in the country, and at the same time there was a division of labour focussing on areas that the two institutions had been supporting.. We ended up with individual reports, but we prepared a joint summary of the evaluation, incorporating findings from both organisations.

We have also been doing work on joint evaluations at the country level. We have already made approximately 60 country assistance evaluations, and we had a first experience of joint evaluation at the country level with the African Development Bank (ADB). This is an interesting case in which we issued a joint report. One part of the report is common, on the country context, one part corresponds to the experience of the African Development Bank, one to the World Bank, and then there is a joint section on recommendations and conclusions. One of the values that we see in these evaluations is that joint conclusions and recommendations may carry more weight..

One thing that we haven't done, but it is useful to reflect upon, is quantifying the costs and the benefits of joint evaluation. We have some indications about the issues that are critical and we are starting to monitor the cost, but it is also important to try to quantify the benefit side. One of the benefits of joint evaluations is that it provides opportunities to advance in attribution, when we have the possibility of taking what others are doing not just as exogenous factors, but as part of the work that is being evaluated.

Finally, we have identified a set of lessons, one being that we are emphasising joint processes, rather than joint pro ducts. It is very important as it can be seen like a sort of second best approach. It has proven very difficult to do joint evaluations, but some processes or stages in the evaluation can be done jointly (such as surveys, bibliographical reviews, etc.) These can lead to a whole new set of possibilities, not only for multilateral development banks but also in the case of NGOs, and open opportunities to collaborate in different phases of the evaluation work.

« The establishment, strengthening and development of cooperation for evaluation between governmental and non-governmental German Agencies»

Ms. Brunhilde Vest,

Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation (BMZ), Germany

Besides our efforts to work together on an international level, we are a member of the DAC working group on evaluation and, with our partners in the developing countries, we are convinced that cooperation, especially with NGOs, has to start at home. It is a challenging, sometimes exhausting, but so far successful process of cooperation that has taken place during the last six years in Germany.

Why did we decide to foster the cooperation between governmental and non-governmental organisations in the field of quality assurance in Germany?

In the mid-nineties there was a great demand to improve standards of quality assurance. The parliament and the critical public in particular were asking for reliable information on the effectiveness and results of our development aid. It seems that this demand is of topical relevance, and is still topical, as the French Minister of the Economy and Finance raised the same question yesterday in the opening session.

In 1997, the Federal Ministry for Cooperation and Development (BMZ) came up with a new strategy for quality assurance. Key elements of this new strategy were the delegation of tasks to the implementing organisations, such as the task of conducting project evaluations. This went hand in hand with the concentration on strategic evaluation which provided us with relevant information for policy decision-making processes, and of course fostering the internal learning process within the ministry. Since then, our disclosure policy has changed completely. Now all evaluation reports are open to the public. One should not underestimate the effects of this change on the transparency and also on the credibility of our evaluation work. One of the important merits of this new strategy was the realisation that there is a great need to improve evaluation, not only in the inner circle of bilateral aid, but within the whole development aid system. Therefore there was a great need for a systemic approach that could benefit from the complementarity and the comparative advantages of the partners involved.

The results of a comprehensive assessment of the quality assurance system

As a result we decided to improve the efficiency of quality assurance in the development corporation system, but the question was, of course, how to go about it. It rapidly emerged that, apart from some diffuse and anecdotal evidence, not enough was known about what the individual players were doing in the field of quality assurance. We commissioned the Hamburg Institute for International Economics, to conduct a comprehensive and systematic review of the current situation. The BMZ, the implementing agencies and the major NGOs in Germany were assessed by the Institute. Strengths and weaknesses were found, and the Institute recommended that the institution as a whole should be brought more into compliance with the principles, that the organisational basis for an independent and effective system should be created, and that the development of appropriate methods for assessing sustainability and effectiveness should be promoted. Finally there was a recognised need to establish an institutional framework for quality assurance.

The cooperation system

Cooperation systems and networks consist of complex webs of inter-relationships. They usually do not follow a sequential process, but instead many activities and networks take place simultaneously or overlap. The initiatives taken by the parties involved must be integrated. Thus all partners play an important part in shaping the process and the system of cooperation. It is not only the Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation alone that is responsible for the success of such a process of establishing this cooperation system, but all partners involved.

To simplify the complex web of relationships, I would like to distinguish between the main groups of players. There are civil society organisations, the academic community, and the governmental implementing organisations.

What kind of actions did we take to advance this system?

First we started with regular meetings and exchanges of experience within the community, in order to foster the common understanding of evaluation issues, to facilitate, for example, learning, to benefit from comparative advantages from all partners involved, and we tried to keep each other up to date internationally. The aim of all this was to promote a favourable climate for evaluation.

Secondly, we conducted joint evaluations with different partners. For example, with the help of the academic community, we developed methodologies for ex-post evaluations; with church-related institutions, we practiced participatory evaluation methods. This was of great help to us.

Thirdly, task forces on special topics were established within the German Evaluation Society. These task forces consisted of members of governmental and non-governmental agencies, of the academic community and the evaluators themselves. Their major tasks were to come up with guidelines and to develop common procedures. We developed guidelines and tasks, and we also support the establishment of training opportunities.

Besides the aforementioned joint efforts to strengthen cooperation in the field of quality assurance, most development institutions themselves have made a number of changes to their own quality assurance systems in terms of content, strategy, policy and organisation.

The progress made so far and the lessons learned

We did another review which showed that the DAC principles are now widely recognised, new quality assurance systems have been introduced, the quality of evaluation has improved and modern internet-based information systems have been established. Horizontal learning has taken place, and the evaluation climate has improved considerably.

The political will to improve the quality assurance system was crucial at the very beginning. The public pressure to justify the development cooperation implemented by us but also by the NGOs was also an important factor pushing all of us. There were also common needs to start with, like the question of which methodology can be used to assess impact or sustainability, and of course all of us brought with us the willingness to enter into this lengthy process and to contribute experiences openly. We managed the process by means of dialogue and shared responsibility and, finally, we created a space for new ideas.

Future prospects

It is clear for us that the fundamental changes in development aid require more joint evaluations, but simplified procedures are needed as well. More cooperation with non-governmental organisations, more ownership on the part of our partners, and of course greater evaluation capacity are needed in our partner countries. That leads me to the conclusion and to the message that I would like to convey, that none of us can afford to try to conquer the world of evaluation single-handedly.

« Collaboration for development evaluation : Ideas shaping a New Global Effort »

Mr. Sulley Gariba

Chair, International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS)

Challenges that confront us as we move towards the future of development evaluation

We have all witnessed this rather rich discussion in the last couple of days about what we are to account for, and if evaluation is really about accounting for development. We have also gone through quite convincing renditions of the fact that aid effectiveness and the whole development assistance enterprise is actually just a tiny bit in the enterprise of development generally.

When we are confronted with what to account for in the discourse between aid effectiveness and sustainable development, our votes, as we speak about the new ideas for the future, rest more in the area of accounting for sustainable development, especially when confronted with the reality of today in which development is coalescing around sector-wide approaches, poverty reduction strategy papers. Donors themselves are aggregating their development assistance into common baskets, multi-donor supports, on the one side of the equation, but on the other side, we are also confronted by much larger pools of resources that are being leveraged within developing countries themselves.

So, in effect, the sum total of the development enterprise is no longer that determined by the particular development assistance that previous evaluation enterprises are focused on.

Who is participating ?

We had interesting discussions about the past of evaluation being donors and recipients haggling over results and development effectiveness. In the transition towards the future, we are looking at stakeholders in the larger process of sustainable development. Some of the speakers before me raised the issue of parliament and the critical public. These are the kind of stakeholders that one should be looking at.

Demand and supply

We have witnessed an error in the past in evaluation, and even in the present, in which evaluation is very much supply driven. There is increasing call and we are challenged to stimulate demand, especially demand for evaluation and accountability from developing countries, and we are also challenged to involve civil society.

What principles would need to inspire us, as we travel on this path towards the future of development evaluation ?

Many of the speakers have eloquently reflected on the issue of partnership in defining scope of development objectives. This is a very critical beginning and an important principle. We have heard about joint evaluations as exercises that are probably in transition, but what is central in the venue where partnerships need to be developed in defining the scope of the very development objectives that we are engaging in.

Collaboration on what is to be measured or what is to be evaluated

It can be achieved by broadening the perspective to include not just development assistance, as we have heard Robert Picciotto's presentation, but also on the broader policy issues pertaining to trade, migration and other issues.

A significant principle is seeking cooperation on methods and in particular the theoretical and conceptual underpinnings of these methods. What we have witnessed this far, and hence the marginalisation of developing countries especially, in the evaluation discourses, is the focus on particular methods and particular tools that are for good purposes developed and refined in developed countries. In an area of cooperation and methods, we begin to juxtapose some more rigorous quantitative methods with qualitative participatory, bottom tree approaches, as we describe them in Africa.

Utilisation of evaluation and the outcomes of these evaluation exercises for social and political actions on policy change and practices

Mutual evaluation capacity development

The notion of evaluation capacity development - which presupposes there are skill sectors somewhere and they only need to be transferred elsewhere - in effect, paints the whole world with yet another unlineal brush. The notion of mobilisation of evaluation capacity that addresses both the demand and the supply, and also includes the skills and competences in developing countries.

I'm not going spend too much time on the need but rather to underscore the importance of seing that many of what we are beginning to do is already emerging towards addressing some of the needs. Many of the colleagues have introduced the whole notion of national associations already coalescing and federating, seeking to build larger pools of capacities, so that they can share expertise. Most importantly, we are in this area in which there is a need, for those of us in this room, and those who are not, to begin to build a larger constituency of practice, born out of the collection convictions that we have all shared in these last two days, and before.

That is what takes us to this destination of an international association, that seeks to connect the global perspective to national realities and national capacities.

The International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS)

IDEAS is ready to work with others to build capacities for development evaluation by expanding and sharing evaluation knowledge, creating a larger space of discourse, promoting professional excellence and supporting emerging networks on the basis and on the principle of subsidiarity. Many of the things that were talked about in terms of collaboration are really resonating in the front line of IDEAS.

In order to address the obvious demographic situation, IDEAS were launched in Beijing in September 2002, so we are only a few months old, but it Is an idea that has been nurtured for two to three years, with many institutions and individuals having worked strenuously to stimulate the impetus towards the establishment of ideas.

The focus of IDEAS as we delve into our programme realm is to deepen development evaluation itself as a discipline that begins to transcend the notion of evaluation for aid effectiveness, encompassing development in its totality. It is also promoting responsive and accountable governance of development, particularly by focusing increasing attention of policy coherence, public sector management and for those countries in the developing world, and transition economies that have parliaments, stressing on building capacities for parliamentary oversight, and accountability to civil society. This is the angle at which the demand side is to be addressed. Focusing on the poverty environment nexus, by engaging new constituencies of actors to look at evaluating PRSPs and MDGs in particular, involved in civil society.

We have quite a broad-based Board of ten people from ten different countries, covering a broad spectrum, if not the entire globe. It’s a monumental task to be achieved. As you can see from our logo, already a vignette has been presented. The one idea that you might bring is that drop water which then ripples into IDEAS.

Synthèse

Mr. Jim Rugh, Coordinator, Care International

The first session this afternoon was on capacity building and the second one was on collaboration. We heard a lot about collaboration in the capacity building session and you have heard a lot about capacity building in the collaboration session, so the two overlap a bit, which is fine.

Oswaldo Feinstein talked about joint evaluations with the World Bank. I guess in the past it was perceived as coming heavy-handedly from the outside, doing projects, evaluating projects and the countries, as we refer to in the evaluation terminology, the « evalued ». There are experiments in more joint evaluations, and hopefully more joint concepts and development of the programmes themselves. Why should we do this ? Well, it reduces costs, hopefully it is more effective, hopefully there is more buy-in and there is capacity building, if the people being evaluated feel like they are part of the evaluation rather than just subjects of the evaluation.

Brunhilde Vest talked about the German experience of doing more collaboration within Germany, of the government, civil society and universities. We had examples of how they had begun to do joint work. A couple of times she reflected on how helpful the DAC principles had been, and evidently they had helped to guide organisations and countries, and they actually are leading towards better quality of evaluation. That is a good evaluation of the DAC principles themselves.

Sulley Gariba, talking about IDEAS, was really more pointing the need for capacity building. Evaluation in the past was pretty much focused on the success, or lack thereof, of projects in third world countries, and just as a side effect, some people might have got some capacity out of that, but that was not a focus itself of why we did those evaluations. Some of the challenges are about where we need to go in the future, to stimulate the demand for more evaluation, of accountability, and for lessons learned by the people being evaluated. His vision is that we actually have mutual evaluation capacity, that even when we do things jointly, it is not people from the North coming and teaching people from the South how to do evaluations. We have things to learn from our partners, our neighbours in the South, from their perspective, from their cultures. How can we do things that are meaningful to them and help advance development ? He then ended with strengthening the capacity of existing networks, hopefully forming new networks and we have heard about the one from Niger.

I would like to add that in addition to IDEAS, there is the International Organisation for Cooperation and Evaluation which is kind of an umbrella group over these thirty or more national and regional evaluation associations. We need to have a discussion about collaboration among these various initiatives. In any case, there are these existing networks and societies within the countries - IDEAS, resources and training – and hopefully they can work together.

To pick up on the analogy of the chicken, maybe we are now talking of chickens getting together ; and maybe we are helping to strengthen the capacity of those chicken, to analyse the safety of whether or not it is the right time to cross the road ; and maybe by working together they can cross the road. That is not the end in itself. Maybe those that represent the North, the rich countries, need to think about all these development vehicles rushing down the road and it being dangerous for those chickens. How can we put a stop-light or somehow control that traffic, so there is less danger for the poor chickens out there ?

Débats

Jean Quesnel

J'aimerais revenir à l'idée des **cinq constellations**. Je vois énormément d'énergie, beaucoup de volonté pour améliorer l'évaluation, mais c'est comme si l'on était pris chacun dans notre constellation.

La première constellation est celle du sujet de développement. Ce sont des **pays** qui se plongent dans un modèle de développement. Il s'agit de penser à la bonne gouvernance, à la reddition des comptes, valeur pour l'argent d'investissement, et en quelque sorte, si l'on se rappelle les années soixante, on avait déjà ce mécanisme. Il y avait le plan national de développement, des ministères de planification très bien articulés, mais il y a ensuite eu démembrement de tout cela. Comment peut-on donc reconstituer et remettre au centre la fonction d'évaluation comme étant endogène à la gestion publique dans les pays en voie de développement ?

La deuxième constellation, c'est celle de la **société civile**, qui apparaît un peu comme les derniers venus, alors que les autres constellations semblaient exister auparavant. Le mandat premier de la société civile est de créer un espace qui autorise le dialogue, un dialogue démocratique, qui autorise aussi l'accès aux leçons et aux rapports d'évaluation, et un débat public. C'est aussi dans la société civile qu'il faut implanter la formation des évaluateurs, où se situent les association d'évaluation et les universités qu'il faut promouvoir. Il y en a très peu à travers le monde, comme par exemple l'université du Costa Rica qui comporte une maîtrise en évaluation, l'université des West Indies avec la gestion de projet et l'évaluation. Mais surtout comment peut-on faciliter un dialogue horizontal entre les différentes circonscriptions des univers des ONG, des coopératives, etc. Les associations d'évaluation ont un forum merveilleux qui autorise ce débat horizontal.

La troisième constellation est celle des **Nations Unies**. En 1973, ECOSA (le Comité Economique et Social des Nations Unies) donnait le mandat explicite aux différents entités des Nations Unies de promouvoir la fonction d'évaluation dans les pays. La réforme du Secrétaire général qui vient d'être promulguée il y a quelques mois remet au centre la fonction d'évaluation « strengthening evaluation function », mais surtout à partir des pays.

L'autre constellation est celle des **banques**. Il y a eu un phénomène de concertation dans le cadre de séminaires régionaux par continent, en Afrique, en Egypte, en Amérique latine. Quand de grands prêts touchent la question de la réforme publique, il faudrait penser à ce que l'évaluation se fasse à partir des pays. Dans certaines des banques, il faudrait peut-être plus de transparence et permettre que les rapports donnent lieu à des discussions publiques au lieu de garder la confidentialité.

Les **bilatéraux** demandent beaucoup d'appui de capacités institutionnelles dans les pays, on pourrait peut-être réfléchir en priorité à une instance pour la mise en place d'une unité d'évaluation.

Voilà une synthèse qui réunirait en quelque sorte **un plan global où l'on pourrait voir les cinq constellations travailler ensemble**.

Iqbal Ahmed (International Labor Office)

I have few questions for Oswaldo Feinstein. When you went for joint evaluations, **how equal were your joint evaluation partners in terms of contributions and in terms of capacity to evaluate ?**

The second question I have is about one case you mentioned where the two evaluation groups looked at different areas. If that is going to be the case, then I do not think there is any saving on the recipient countries because it very well could be two separate evaluations, and what is required is this **cross-fertilisation of working together**.

The third point is, evaluating is a learning process and we have to involve the nationals, otherwise it is a joint donor evaluation of a national programme. When you involve nationals, these nationals might not be evaluators. It might be useful to **involve national evaluators** because evaluators have a different way of looking at things. If this is going to be a learning process, the joint evaluation team, along with national evaluators, might provide you more information.

Question de la salle

My question is for all the panel, or those that might like to address perhaps the downside of joint evaluations, and I raise this to be somewhat provocative. Could we not end up with a situation where we basically have **the lowest common denominator situation**, where you have a negotiated lowest common denominator ? Because the evaluation process is about the power to make judgements. When you have got parties that do not necessarily hold the same level of power, how do you deal with the challenge to, in fact, carry it through, so that you do not end up with a negotiated lowest common denominator ?

Question de la salle

Every field or profession develops **ethics** and builds mechanisms to ensure that these ethics are adhered to. I want to know if there are ethics being developed for the evaluation and for the community, because this is a matter of critical concern to developing countries. The idea is that evaluation societies of different countries have codes of conduct for evaluators. Are there mechanisms or sanctions for those who evaluate ? Who evaluate such ethics ? This is a very critical issue.

The second question is for the **World Bank**. You know you are not our friends generally in the South. I must say up front, we always view the World Bank and the IMF with scepticism. They talk about joint evaluation and there is a critical question that always is not answered. I have read a lot of World Bank evaluations and documents, country evaluations and country reports from evaluation departments, but they never look at **the social impact of their policies**. For instance they quote Ghana and Uganda as a success, but if you go to the trade unions in Ghana, they will tell you that the IMF and the World Bank have done a mess. The evaluators of the IMF and the World Bank never have social indicators and look at the baseline : what was there before the IMF and the World Bank and their policies came ? What was the social impact of their policies ? That is why those in the labour movement have begun to challenge the World Bank and the IMF on the social dimension of their policies.

The question of **power relations** is also a critical issue. They are talking about joint evaluation with other partners. A judgement has been passed by the people of developing countries on the World Bank and the IMF already, on how the general public view them. We, in the labour movement, have got a very serious concern. In Africa and developing countries, what is the

World Bank evaluator's independence from political control by shareholders ? They have financed Mobutu despite that he was continuing to steal and the evaluators never said anything.

Oladeji Ojo (BAD)

Oswaldo Feinstein made a reference to the joint evaluation with the World Bank on Lesotho. I venture to intervene in regard to reports on the side of the African Development Bank. I would like to underscore one particular issue and this is that it has been a very useful experience for us. It has represented a medium knowledge transfer. The World Bank has been in this field for a long time. They developed the methodology and everything. For us it was a new experience and collaborating with them has been some **knowledge transfer**. I have been talking about capacity building and this has, in fact, considerably enhanced our capacity to do such evaluations. Beyond that we have carried out one on Botswana, and now we are doing another one with the World Bank on Rwanda.

Somebody raised the point as to whether we were equal partners or unequal partners. I can say that we regarded ourselves as **equal partners**, but we do differ in terms of the size of our portfolio which is relatively small in relation to that of the World Bank.

Today, as a result of this particular assignment, I have a good relationship with the task manager at the World Bank. It is not a question of one being equal and one being unequal, but we consider ourselves as equal partners, even though our portfolios may differ in size. The other point concerns the social impact of the programmes, but as far as we are concerned in the Bank, we make efforts to delineate the social impact of our interventions and I am sure that the World Bank does this.

Veronica Ayikwei-Kofie (Trades Union Congress, Ghana)

We have had discussions on our processes, methodologies, all to make evaluation better, for people to learn from it, to make development benefit everybody. The question that I want to ask at this point is : is it possible that international evaluators would also, at this point in time, take up the responsibility of **evaluating the IMF/World Bank policies on developing countries** ? We need to do this because we have been talking about the negative impact on our people, the negative impact on our economies, and the social dislocation that we are going through, but nobody seems to be listening to us. We have come to a point when the need has arisen for an evaluation to be conducted on the IMF/World Bank policies on developing countries.

Osvaldo Feinstein

It is very good that we had this type of questions because it provides an opportunity to address issues that are sometimes in the mind of the people but that they do not have a chance to address them to people representing these institutions.

About **joint evaluations and equal partners** in these types of situation, apart from the case mentioned with the African Development Bank, we had an experience with the Islamic Development Bank with an explicit capacity building function. We think that sometimes it is a fact that there are differences in experience . It is not just a matter of how many people are in missions, but also the type of experience that the people have. In the case of the Islamic Development Bank, they didn't had a single experience in country assistance evaluation. My colleague from the African Development Bank did not mentioned that now in Rwanda our two evaluation departments are carrying out a joint evaluation and the African Development Bank's evaluation department is taking the lead in that evaluation.

In terms of the **different focus**, we can take the example of Jordan. Although it is one example, it is interesting because you can have the institutions addressing different issues, and you can have a common diagnostic and a common set of recommendations. From the perspective of the recipient country, there will be a single mission rather than having to be exposed to two different missions looking at the diagnostic, but this has to do with the point that I was making in terms of decomposing the evaluation activity in a series of stages, like a value chain.

Concerning the **involvement of nationals**, the type of support that we have been providing to national associations and to international associations of evaluation - evaluation capacity development for which our evaluation department has a programme - has precisely the purpose of trying to contribute to mobilise capacities so that, among other possibilities, these people will may work in evaluations where we are going to be involved.

In terms of the possibility of going towards **the lowest common denominator**, the issue that is very important is harmonisation. Our experience with joint evaluations have also facilitated the harmonisation process. It is a sort of virtuous circle:when you enter into this type of joint evaluations, this is an opportunity to know each other better and to harmonise. And as the harmonisation advances, joint evaluations become more feasible.

Now, let me address the more controversial issues. What you mentioned about the lack of **social indicators** on the part of the World Bank and the lack of analysis of the social dimension shows that the dissemination of our work has been imperfect. We can share with you evaluations where we are addressing this type of issues, including several country assistance evaluations.. In the case of corruption that you were mentioning, the Bank during the last seven years had an anti-corruption initiative. In fact, we have also been evaluating this type of initiative. One of the very interesting aspects of the World Bank is that it is a **learning organisation**. It is not that there is any pretension of infallibility. It has mechanisms to learn from experience and evaluation is one of the important mechanisms. In the case of the IMF, an independent evaluation office has been established in September 2001, so that they are now also trying to address all these issues and consulting also with civil society on different issues. Concerning the independence of the evaluation function, we have produced recently a note on independence. An assessment has been made of our independence and we appear as an **independent** outfit from management. In fact, we have been facing sometimes situations where we have been considered too critical, but indeed this is an important aspect of our work. Thank you again for your comments.

Brunhilde Vest

I would like to mention that it is a good idea to do **joint evaluation** with all of your NGOs at home because by doing so you will learn a little bit more how participation is functioning and that would be a first step if you would like to do more participation also with partner countries. It is a learning process and I think it is a first step to start with before you take the big one.

Sulley Gariba

I just wanted to address the simpler issue that was raised about **evaluating the International Financial Institutions**. My take on it is the following : if we accept that globalisation has foisted on us new and profound policies and conditionality that shape positively sometimes, but also negatively most times, the development scenario, we must also admit that it has also created possibilities, a global labour movement, for instance, with larger constituencies that can mobilise citizens and demand accountability. For that matter, in the transition that we were just talking about, demand accountability for development investments both from the donor community but also in the domestic arena. That then suggest to me that the emergence of the constituency needs to be accelerated so that evaluation is not left only to the supply side, as we have been arguing, but that there is an inherent citizen movement that inserts itself in the process of demanding accountability, and for that matter, evaluation. Certainly, in IDEAS, we would be thrilled to have many of our colleagues in the labour movement participate, help shape the ethics.

The formulation of ethics needs to be a participatory one. It cannot simply be a code of conduct by some professional association. By participating in a forum and in the professional associations that strengthen the demand side, especially from the World Bank countries and transition economies, we can constitute the agenda that might in fact propose to engage in evaluation of the practices of International Financial Institutions and it would be perfectly legitimate demand.

Jean-Michel Severino

Les interventions de la salle ont bien montré que **l'évaluation n'est pas un processus technocratique** mais qu'il s'agit bien d'un **processus social** et qu'il y a une ingénierie sociale de ce processus qui visiblement est à parfaire. Nous avons des progrès collectifs à réaliser et sans doute plus sur ce terrain là que sur la perfection des indicateurs et les aspects plus techniques ou plus scientifiques au sens étroit de l'évaluation. Nous avons collectivement progresser si nous voulons que l'évaluation soit un élément non seulement d'apprentissage, mais aussi de création de consensus et de progrès dans les pays comme dans les organisations d'aide, et bien sûr, chez tous les acteurs du développement.

Jim Rugh

I would like to take this opportunity to have a personal survey. This is referring to evaluation as a profession. We are all here representing the organisations that we work with. How many of us as individuals are members of national or regional evaluation professional societies or associations ? Less than half. Let me suggest that this conversation can continue, it can be spreading through other colleagues that work with us.

I would recommend that, for example, you think about the international evaluation conference that will take place in Toronto in October 2004 (eval.org). Let me also mention, in terms of technical resources, MandE News (mandenews.org) as a very good resource for lots of evaluation materials and other links.

Let's continue the spread and strengthen the evaluation profession.

Jean-Michel Severino

L'invitation de Jim Rugh à **adhérer à des associations professionnelles** pour ceux qui ne l'ont pas fait est effectivement importante, quelle que soit la qualité de nos débats, ils sont insuffisants pour épuiser l'ensemble des sujets.

Beaucoup des thèmes qui ont été abordés ont été extrêmement inspirants. Je suppose que beaucoup d'entre nous, au niveau des organisations bilatérales ou multilatérales, de la société civile, parmi les universitaires qui sont présents ici, retireront des leçons opérationnelles de ces deux journées.

CONCLUSION

M. Daniel Kamelgarn

Rapporteur général de l'atelier,

Ministère français de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie

Nous venons de consacrer deux journées à parler d'évaluation, de nos pratiques, de nos expériences. Je crois que c'est la première fois que nous étions si nombreux à en parler.

J'aimerais maintenant que vous imaginiez avec moi que l'un d'entre vous soit chargé, à son tour, de nous évaluer. Pas d'évaluer ces deux journées, non, d'évaluer ce que nous avons effectué au cours des vingt dernières années en matière d'évaluation, nous les évaluateurs de l'aide publique, qui est l'une des communautés présente ici et à laquelle j'appartiens. Ce pourrait être un évaluateur de l'un des pays partenaire ou bénéficiaire de l'aide, ou ce pourrait être un évaluateur qui appartient à la société civile, ainsi que l'on a pu le suggérer à plusieurs reprises.

En premier lieu il se poserait une question, la première question que se pose un évaluateurs : quels sont les objectifs de l'évaluation ? Quels sont les objectifs de l'action que je vais évaluer ?

Suite à ces deux journées de discussion, je crois que l'objectif apparaît clairement à tous. L'évaluation de l'aide au développement est un outil qui a un double objectif. D'une part, elle rend compte de la bonne utilisation des fonds, ce que nous appelons la redevabilité, l'« accountability » en anglais, le « redimere » en latin, et d'autre part elle doit ainsi participer à un meilleur usage des fonds, à l'amélioration de l'efficacité de l'aide, en contribuant à l'effet d'apprentissage ou « learning ».

Un double objectif pour l'évaluation, apprendre et rendre compte, comme le suggère le sous-titre de cet atelier. Pour quelle finalité ? Pour que l'aide soit plus efficace et plus volumineuse, ainsi que l'a rappelé Monsieur Francis Mer en introduction. La première priorité en matière de développement est d'augmenter les volumes de l'aide.

Que constaterait notre évaluateur s'il appréciait notre travail ? A travers ces résultats, il constaterait, ainsi que l'a rappelé Robert Picciotto, qu'au cours de la période passée, l'aide n'a pas augmenté, qu'elle a même diminué, passant de 0,75 % en 1967 à 0,33 % dans les années 1985/1986 et à 0,22 % en 2001. Il serait amené à conclure, soit que nous avons réussi à montrer que l'aide au développement était de peu d'utilité et décernerait une bonne note à notre action, tout en remarquant toutefois que nous ne sommes pas parvenus à permettre aux décideurs d'en tirer tous les enseignements en les aidant à réformer les modalités de l'aide, soit que nous avons totalement échoué à montrer que l'aide au développement est utile. Il nous décernerait alors une très mauvaise note. Dans les deux cas, le résultat de l'évaluation ne nous serait pas très favorable.

Je pencherais toutefois plutôt pour la deuxième hypothèse. Je crois que l'évaluation n'a pas atteint son objectif, qu'elle a échoué à démontrer qu'il fallait augmenter l'aide au développement afin de la rendre plus efficace. Certains d'entre vous trouveront ce sens de l'autocritique, ou de la critique, typiquement français… ils auront peut être raison.

Je veux toutefois rappeler quelques chiffres. En mars 2002, la communauté internationale des bailleurs de fonds réunie à Monterrey estimait que, pour atteindre les objectifs internationaux de développement et pour réduire la pauvreté dans le monde, il fallait augmenter l'aide publique au développement de 100 milliards de dollars afin d'atteindre ces fameux 0,7 % du PNB qui correspondent à l'objectif que l'on a fixé, alors qu'actuellement nous dépensons, nous les 22 pays membre du CAD, seulement 52 milliards de dollars.

Ce chiffre de 100 milliards paraît chaque jour un peu plus inaccessible, il nous paraît énorme. L'actualité récente nous a fourni un critère pour évaluer ces 100 milliards de dollars : c'est l'estimation la plus basse de ce que coûte la guerre en Irak, c'est-à-dire le montant qu'un seul pays est capable de débloquer s'il considère que c'est utile pour sa sécurité.

Voilà pourquoi j'estime que nous, évaluateurs de l'aide publique au développement, nous avons échoué dans notre fonction. Depuis plus de 20 ans nous faisons de l'évaluation, et nous n'avons pas réussi à faire la démonstration de l'utilité de l'argent investi dans le développement pour convaincre nos administrations, nos gouvernements, et nos opinions publiques surtout. Nous n'avons pas réussi à démontrer que c'était de l'argent bien investi et qu'il fallait effectivement consacrer 100 milliards de dollars supplémentaires chaque année à cet objectif, que cet argent était utile pour la sécurité de la planète.

L'autre possibilité serait que les 52 milliards de dollars que nous dépensons actuellement soient mal-utilisés, inutiles, inefficaces. C'est peut être en partie vrai, mais j'ai du mal à croire que ce soit le cas pour la totalité.

Dans les deux cas nous avons échoué et il était temps que nous en tirions les conséquences. Cet atelier est, je crois, une merveilleuse opportunité pour le faire, car il nous permet d'ouvrir largement nos réflexions, de les partager avec un plus grand nombre et de les rendre plus efficaces par rapport à notre objectif commun qui est de favoriser le développement des pays qui en ont besoin.

Cela signifie aussi que cet atelier doit être un commencement et non une fin, parce que les évaluateurs ou les bailleurs de fonds ont besoin des autres évaluateurs qui sont ici présents, de ceux qui travaillent dans la société civile, de ceux qui travaillent dans les pays que nous nous efforçons d'aider à se développer.

J'aimerais donc esquisser quelques pistes de ce qui pourrait être notre agenda, afin de dessiner la suite qui pourra être donnée à cet atelier, à partir de ce qui s'est dit au cours de ces deux journées et avant que cet atelier ne soit conclu par Monsieur Saint-Geours et Madame Pallez.

J'aimerais surtout lancer quelques bouteilles, qui j'espère trouveront des ports, car l'objectif qui se dégage est bien de trouver les moyens de développer une collaboration qui fait aujourd'hui défaut et dont nous ressentons tous ici le besoin, afin de changer la manière d'évaluer qui était la nôtre jusqu'à présent. Je n'ai donc pas essayé de résumer ces deux journées. Plus tard, les actes du colloque rendront compte de manière plus fidèle et plus exhaustive que je ne saurais le faire aujourd'hui. Je vais directement proposer les quelques idées qui ont été émises au cours de ces deux jours. J'en oublierai certainement, mais cela nous permettra peut être d'en faire germer d'autres dans le futur.

La première idée est de développer la collaboration entre la communauté des bailleurs de fonds et toutes les autres parties prenantes du développement : la société civile, les ONG, les syndicats - je suis très content qu'ils aient pu se joindre à nous car ils sont des acteurs importants, non seulement de l'évaluation, mais aussi de l'aide et du développement -, le secteur privé, qui je l'espère pourra aussi se mobiliser plus largement aux côtés de notre communauté, et bien sûr les pays bénéficiaires de l'aide dans toutes leurs composantes. Cette collaboration devra se décliner suivant deux principes : **le partenariat et la réciprocité**. Je crois que ce que nous avons entendu nous montre l'importance de ces deux termes. Il nous faut sur cette base lancer, chacun dans nos structures respectives, chacun dans nos pays, chacun à notre niveau d'initiative, des initiatives de collaboration qui associent d'avantage aux bailleurs de fonds, les pays partenaires et la société civile. Il faut le faire connaître pour que cela serve d'exemple et pour que se diffusent mieux les résultats des travaux de l'évaluation.

Il faut bien entendu multiplier les évaluations conjointes, mais je crois qu'il ne faut pas penser, et nous l'avons tous compris au cours de cette dernière session, qu'il s'agit d'une panacée. La méthode doit être améliorée pour en faire des exercices véritablement partenariaux. Il y a aussi d'autres formes de collaboration à trouver.

Il nous faut travailler sur les méthodes, il nous faut peut être travailler ensemble sur les évaluations des stratégies publiques. Il nous faut mieux communiquer sur les travaux, sur les résultats de ce que nous trouvons, pour mieux diffuser ces résultats.

Afin que l'échange entamé au cours de ces journées continue, il nous faut trouver non seulement des moyens et des outils, mais surtout des mécanismes qui restent à définir. Il ne s'agit pas de créer une nouvelle association, il y en a suffisamment je crois. Il faut qu'elles continent à fructifier et que l'on trouve des mécanismes pour connecter ces différentes associations.

A très court terme, Internet va nous servir. Nous avons la possibilité d'avoir des sites, de créer des connexions par courrier électronique, et donc nous allons pouvoir continuer la discussion commencée, afin de prolonger cette collaboration.

Ce sera une première étape. Dans ce cadre et après ce colloque, en plus des actes que vous recevrez tous, nous allons préparer un questionnaire que nous enverrons à tous les participants afin que chacun puisse nous faire part de ses idées en matière de collaboration et de partenariat, des idées pour le futur, pour l'après colloque, pour l'après atelier.

Cette réunion n'est donc qu'un début. Jean Quesnel et Robert Picciotto, ces routiers, ces avocats de l'évaluation de longue date, ont qualifié ce moment d'historique dans l'histoire de l'évaluation parce qu'ils pensent qu'elle va marquer un tournant dans le mode de faire. Je l'espère de tout cœur avec eux. J'espère que ce début nous a permis de mieux nous connaître, qu'il nous permettra d'œuvrer ensemble à rendre l'aide au développement plus efficace et plus importante aux yeux de tous.

Il a pu sembler difficile, voire dérisoire, par moments, de parler d'évaluation en des moments aussi graves que ceux que nous vivons aujourd'hui. Comme l'indiquait Monsieur Francis Mer hier, la gageure d'une aide efficace et de résultats tangibles et mesurables doit nous permettre d'engager un monde vivable et durable.

A travers nos discussions, nous avons, à notre modeste échelle, tenté de contribuer à la construction d'une société internationale que nous souhaitons tous ici plus juste, plus harmonieuse, plus respectueuse des uns et des autres. J'espère que cette réunion y aura œuvré, car construire et développer est une tâche qui ne doit pas être interrompue.

M. Yves Saint-Geours

Directeur général adjoint de la Coopération internationale et du développement, Ministère français des Affaires Etrangères

Merci de ces quelques paroles qui étaient à la fois optimistes et graves. Je comprends qu'elles soient graves, parce qu'effectivement les questions liées à l'aide au développement aujourd'hui s'inscrivent dans un contexte particulièrement difficile et les défis qui sont lancés aux acteurs publics sont très grands.

Vous indiquiez au début de votre intervention qu'au fond la communauté des évaluateurs, mais sans doute aussi celle des acteurs publics, n'avait pas bien travaillé pendant de longues années pour justifier une augmentation massive des volumes de l'aide. Nous nous retrouvons aujourd'hui dans une situation qui, au fond, de nouveau pose ces mêmes défis. Nous avons à relever le défi d'une augmentation des volumes de l'aide. C'est une perspective enthousiasmante et à la fois c'est une perspective extrêmement exigeante.

Je crois que depuis quelques années nous songeons sans arrêt, nous tournons dans notre tête les mots efficacité, les mots rendre compte, les mots évaluation, à chaque fois que nous posons la question de la structure, des contenus et des volumes de l'aide au développement. Pour ceux qui en France, au Ministère de l'économie, des finances et de l'industrie et au Ministère des affaires étrangères, sont en charge d'animer à la fois la réflexion et l'action pour l'aide publique au développement, ces responsabilités restent en quelque sorte comme une question lancinante que nous nous posons conjointement.

Nous nous la posons conjointement parce que depuis quelques années déjà nous avons mis au point des dispositifs institutionnels qui nous permettent de nous poser sans cesse cette question, d'où l'invitation, dont je remercie très sincèrement le Ministère de l'économie, des finances et de l'industrie, qui nous a été lancée au Ministère des affaires étrangères de venir participer avec vous à cette réunion et de conclure les travaux.

L'atelier avait trois thèmes principaux qui ont été soulignés par Monsieur Mer au début de ces deux journées : le souci de rendre compte, l'efficacité de l'aide et bien sûr la nécessité du dialogue avec la société civile. Le compte rendu que vient de faire Monsieur Kamelgarn montre non seulement la richesse des débats mais aussi la richesse des idées, des initiatives et de propositions pour les mois qui viennent.

Pour le Ministère des affaires étrangères, j'aurais trois propositions essentielles, en direction précisément des acteurs non-gouvernementaux, en direction de leur action. Comme l'a indiqué Jean-Michel Severino, c'est certain, l'évaluation est un processus social et nous sommes convaincus que cette première réunion est fondamentale pour l'avenir, mais il faut qu'elle ait des suites.

La première proposition est de continuer à appuyer les efforts consentis par les acteurs non-gouvernementaux pour évaluer leurs actions et la professionnaliser. C'est le cas avec le dispositif du F3E et je crois que nous allons continuer à travailler en ce sens.

La deuxième est de renforcer le partenariat autour de l'évaluation, et nous devons pour cela trouver des modalités appropriées.

La troisième proposition est très concrète. Il s'agit de se retrouver chaque année avec les partenaires gouvernementaux pour échanger sur les pratiques d'évaluation de l'aide au développement, et je crois que, de ce point de vue là, il faut que nous nous donnions les moyens, car sans cela bien des velléités pourraient s'évanouir.

Pour préparer l'atelier qui vient de se tenir, les administrations françaises gestionnaires et animatrices de l'aide au développement, les deux ministères, avaient proposé au F3E d'organiser une rencontre sur les thèmes de l'atelier à Paris en visant plus spécifiquement les ONG françaises qui travaillent à l'international. Ce séminaire a eu lieu en décembre 2002 et il a montré le besoin de se livrer plus fréquemment à des échanges de vues sur les pratiques et sur les problématique d'évaluation. Je pense donc que seul un dialogue nourri, constant et renouvelé permettra d'aboutir à un travail commun approfondi. Bien des thèmes qui ont été abordés hier et aujourd'hui pourraient nous servir de point de départ pour une nouvelle journée de réflexion à la fin de l'année 2003. Je crois qu'il faut que nous nous donnions cet objectif.

Il nous reste aussi à trouver la façon dont l'atelier d'aujourd'hui pourrait se prolonger. Vous l'avez évoqué, est-ce que ce sont des rencontres régulières, est-ce que l'Internet nous permettre de faire ce travail ? La question reste ouverte. Toutes les initiatives et toutes les suggestions sont bonnes.

Voilà ce que je souhaitais dire pour vraiment remercier tous les participants de toutes ces réflexions parce qu'elles nous aident énormément. Encore une fois, face aux défis que j'évoquais au départ, je vous remercie au nom du Ministère des affaires étrangères. Je remercie également le Ministère de l'économie, des finances et de l'industrie.

Mme Stéphane Pallez

Chef du Service des Affaires européennes et internationales, Ministère français de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie

Vous voilà arrivés au terme des deux journées de travail de cet atelier. Avant que vous ne partiez rejoindre vos organisations respectives, il me revient de conclure.

Compte tenu de la richesse des discussions et du foisonnement d'idées, il est impossible de résumer ce qui s'est dit et il est encore trop tôt pour en tirer toutes les leçons et des propositions directement opérationnelles.

Yves Saint Geours a indiqué le soutien que son Ministère était prêt à apporter pour soutenir les efforts en matière d'évaluation de l'aide et d'association de la société civile au niveau français. Je me joins à ces intentions.

Je voudrais aussi dire le soutien que la France et mon Ministère sont prêts à apporter pour soutenir toutes les initiatives internationales qui permettront de :

- Améliorer l'efficacité de l'aide,
- Rendre l'évaluation plus performante, plus efficace et plus utile,
- Associer plus largement l'ensemble des parties prenantes, pas simplement de l'aide, mais aussi du développement, aux travaux et réflexions.

Ces deux journées ont déclenché une dynamique qu'il ne faut pas laisser retomber. Pour la première fois, 280 évaluateurs ou responsables de l'évaluation venant de 45 pays et près de 200 organisations se sont réunis.

La richesse des débats et l'importance de cette participation montre que :

- Les évaluateurs qui appartiennent aux différentes communautés ont manifestement des choses à échanger (des méthodes, des expériences, des idées) et des travaux à faire ensemble,
- Ces échanges sont utiles pour rendre plus efficace l'aide au développement,
- Il y a lieu d'associer à l'évaluation de l'aide l'ensemble des parties prenantes du développement : non seulement la communauté des bailleurs de fonds, mais aussi les organisations de la société civile et les pays partenaires,
- Ceci est vrai aussi d'ailleurs pour la définition des stratégies de développement dans leur ensemble.

Je voudrais donc vous faire une première proposition, au nom du Ministère, pour répondre au besoin qui s'est ainsi fait jour :

- Laisser ouvert, pendant quelques mois, le site Web qui a été créé pour l'atelier afin de faciliter et continuer le dialogue qui a commencé,
- Ensuite, le Ministère restera à l'écoute des attentes qui auront pu ainsi s'exprimer, les étudiera avec attention et, le cas échéant, y apportera son soutien.

Je voudrais remercier tous ceux qui ont contribué à la préparation de ces deux journées :

- L'unité d'évaluation (Marie Hélène Bouvard et Daniel Kamelgarn) qui a veillé à l'organisation de l'atelier et à la coordination des services du Ministère, et notamment de la Direction en charge du centre de conférence, dont nous avons pu nous rendre compte de l’efficacité,
- Hans Lundgren et Monique Bergeron du Secrétariat du CAD qui ont été constamment présents et ont apporté leur connaissance et leur savoir faire en matière d’organisation de réunion et d’évaluation,
- M. François Grünewald et ses étudiants de l'université de Paris 12 qui nous ont aidé à vous accueillir,
- Les membres du Comité Directeur de l’atelier qui ont apporté leurs utiles conseils et ont créé le mouvement dans leur pays :
    - Elisabeth Barsacq du MAE français,
    - Mary Thomson et Colin Kirk du DFID,
    - Eirik Jansen et Jan Dybfest du Ministère des affaires étrangères norvégiens (qui a notamment organisé à Oslo une réunion très utile avec des ONG locales norvégiennes),
    - Tove Degnbol et Niels Dabelstein de DANIDA,
    - Horst Breier et Brunhilde Vest du BMZ,
    - Guglielmo Riva du Ministère des affaires étrangères italien,
    - Ted Kliest du Ministère des affaires étrangères des Pays Bas.
- Les organisations qui ont permis à certains de nos partenaires du Sud d'être présents aujourd'hui : je pense en particulier aux coopérations de la Norvège et du Danemark et à l'Agence intergouvernementale de la Francophonie.

Je vous remercie de votre attention et je vous souhaite un bon retour.

ANNEXES

Annexe 1 : sigles et acronymes

ACFOA	Australian Council For Overseas Aid
ADB	African Development Bank
AFD	Agence Française de Développement
ALNAP	Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance
ASI	Associations de Solidarité Internationale
BID	Banque Interaméricaine de Développement
BMZ	Federal Ministry for Cooperation and Development
BOAG	British Overseas Aid Group
CAD	Comité d'Aide au Développement
CDF	Comprehensive Development Framework
CSLP	Cadre Stratégique de Lutte contre la Pauvreté
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DFID	Department for International Development
ECD	Evaluation Capacity Development
ECG	Evaluation Co-operation Group (Groupe de Coopération sur l'Evaluation)
ECOSA	Comité Economique et Social des Nations Unies
EIB	European Investment Bank
FMI	Fonds Monétaire International
F3E	Fonds pour la promotion des Etudes préalables, Etudes transversales et Evaluations
GT-EV	Groupe de Travail sur l'Evaluation de l'Aide
HAP	Humanitarian Accountability Project (Projet Redevabilité Humanitaire)
HCR	Haut Commissariat pour les Réfugiés
IAWG	United Nations Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation (Groupe de Travail Inter-Institutionnel sur l'Evaluation des Nations Unies)

ICFO	International Committee on Fundraising Organizations
IDB	Inter-Development Bank
IDEAS	International Development Evaluation Association (Association Internationale pour l'Evaluation du Développement)
IFI	Institution Financière Internationale
ILO	International Labour Office
IMF	International Monetary Fund
JBIC	Japanese Bank International Cooperation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NEPAD	Nouveau Partenariat pour le Développement de l'Afrique
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OCDE	Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Economique
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
ONG	Organisation Non Gouvernementale
ONUSIDA	Session Spéciale de l'Assemblée Générale des Nations Unies sur le SIDA
OSI	Organisation de Solidarité Internationale
PCB	Programme Coordinating Body of UN-Aids
PNUD	Programme des Nations Unies pour le Développement
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
QUAP	Quality Assurance Process
UN	United Nations
UNGASS	United National General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS
WP-EV	Working Party on Aid Evaluation

Annexe 2 : programme de l'atelier

Mardi 25 mars

8h45 - 9h30 : **Accueil**

9h30 - 10h : **Introduction**

> Discours de bienvenue de M. Francis Mer, Ministre français de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie.
> Introduction par M. Rob D. van den Berg, Président du Groupe de Travail sur l'Evaluation de l'aide (GT-EV).

10:00 - 13:00 : **Session 1 Les pratiques de l'évaluation**

Les bailleurs de fonds et les organisations de la société civile présenteront leurs approches et leurs pratiques en matière d'évaluation. Les principales questions abordées seront "Les objectifs et les méthodes sont-ils semblables? Quelles sont les contraintes auxquelles est confrontée chaque communauté ? Que pouvons nous apprendre les uns des autres ?"

Président : M. Henri Rouillé d'Orfeuil, Président, Coordination Sud.
Rapporteur: M. Hans Lundgren, Conseiller, Direction de la Coopération au développement, OCDE.

Bailleurs de fonds

> "*Groupe de travail du Comité d'Aide au Développement (CAD) sur l'évaluation de l'aide*", Rob D. van den Berg.
> "*United Nations Inter Agency Working Group on Evaluation (IAWG) : Partenaires en évaluation*", Khalid Malik, Président de l'IAWG et Directeur, Bureau de l'évaluation, Programme des Nations Unies pour le Développement (PNUD).
> "*Note sur l'Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) des banques multilatérales de développement* ", Gregory K. Ingram**,** Président entrant d'ECG et Directeur Général, Operations Evaluation Department, Banque Mondiale.

Organisations de la société civile

> "*Vers l'évaluation des performances organisationnelles : expériences en matière de renforcement de l'apprentissage, de la redevabilité et d'une meilleure compréhension du changement social"*, Margaret Niewens, British Overseas Aid Group (BOAG).
> "*Les défis de l'évaluation vues par les organisations non gouvernementales norvégiennes et leurs partenaires*", Pia Reierson, Directeur de l'appui aux programmes, Aasa Sildnes, spécialiste en développement et Susie Tapia, Directeur régional, Fondation Stromme.
> "*L'évaluation et les ONG françaises, un outil pour deux ambitions majeures: rendre compte et tirer des enseignements pour améliorer ses pratiques*", François Doligez, IRAM.

Débats

13h00 - 14h30 : **Déjeuner**

14h30 - 18h00 : **Session 2 Nouveaux défis du développement et évaluation**

Cette session abordera les défis de l'évaluation au regard des nouvelles dynamiques du développement et visera à identifier les meilleures pratiques de chaque communauté. L'atelier sera divisé en quatre sous-groupes pour permettre une meilleure participation.

Sous-groupe I : **Evaluation participative** Président : Mme Ros David, Action Aid Rapporteur : M. Goberdhan Singh, Directeur de l'évaluation, Agence Canadienne du Développement international >"*Où en sommes nous ? L'évaluation participative dans la pratique de Handicap international*", Nick Heeren, Directeur des programmes de Handicap International. >"*Une évaluation par des partenaires du Sud des programmes norvégiens d'éducation au développement*", Stiann van der Merwe, Afrique du Sud. >"*L'évaluation du changement de deux projets d'éducation namibiens*", Ursula Van Harmelen, Université de Rhodes, Afrique du Sud. >"*De l'évaluation participative aux fonds d'expertise en évaluation des pays partenaires*", Caroline Guillot-Marchi, consultante, Fondation de France. **Débats**	Sous-groupe II : **Etudes de cas sur l'impact social et nouvelles approches de l'évaluation de l'impact** Président : Mme Karen Odhiambo, Présidente, Kenya Evaluation Association Rapporteur : M. Michael Hippler, Chef du département de l'évaluation, MISEREOR Partie 1: Etudes de cas sur l'impact social >"*Les approches de la mesure de l'impact et du reporting. Le travail de deux ONG norvégiennes en Ethiopie et au Sri Lanka*", Marit Haug, Norwegian Institute for Urban & Regional Research (NIBR). >"*Renforcer les structures d'évaluation des ONG de femmes travaillant dans la santé en vue d'améliorer le suivi et l'évaluation des engagements internationaux en Asie*", Jashodhara Dasgupta, SAHAYOG, India. >"*Une perspective syndicale en matière d'évaluation*", Bandula Kothaloawala, Trades Union Congress (TUC), Grande-Bretagne. Partie 2 : Nouvelles approches de l'évaluation de l'impact >*"Comment sélectionner les indicateurs pour évaluer l'impact ?"*, Nurul Alam, PNUD. **Débats**
Sous-groupe III **Internalisation des résultats d'évaluation** Président : M. Jean Quesnel, Directeur, Bureau d'évaluation, UNICEF Rapporteur : M. Paolo Basurto, ICU >"*L'appropriation des résultats de l'évaluation grâce aux leçons apprises : perspectives complémentaires, dilemmes et quelques enseignements*", Paul G.H. Engel, Directeur, Centre européen pour la gestion de la politique de développement (ECPDM). >"*Apprendre et croître à travers un projet de développement: l'expérience d'un syndicat aux Philippines*", Patricia Rizon Quiaoit, PSLink, Philippines. >"*Quelles conditions pour une appropriation optimale des évaluations ?"* Patrick Durish, Fondation Terre des Hommes, Suisse. >"*Le suivi et l'évaluation du Civil Society Challenge Fund*", Mike Battcock, Department For International Development (DFID), Grande-Bretagne. >"*L'évaluation, un enjeu pour l'avenir de la coopération*", Sergio Marelli, Président, Association des ONG italiennes. **Débats**	Sous-groupe IV **Evaluation de l'aide humanitaire et de l'assistance en situation de conflit** Président : M. Colin Kirk, Chef du Département de l'évaluation, DFID Rapporteur : M. Ted Kliest, Evaluateur, Ministère des Affaires étrangères des Pays Bas >"*Evaluation de l'impact des programmes de coopération politique en contexte de crise*", Ulrich Storck, Friederich Ebert Stiftung (FES). >"*La pratique rend elle parfait? L'évaluation par ALNAP de la qualité de 165 évaluations d'action humanitaire, 2000-2002*", John Mitchell, Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP). >"*De l'évaluation à la formation à travers la recherche opérationnelle et la capitalisation d'expérience*", François Grünewald, Président, Groupe Urgence Réhabilitation Développement (URD). **Débats**

18h30 - 20h00 : **Cocktail offert par M. J-P. Jouyet, Directeur du Trésor**

Mercredi 26 mars

9h00 - 12h00 : **Session 3**

L'évaluation comme moyen de rendre compte (redevabilité)

Cette session est l'occasion d'explorer les différences et similarités de l'exigence de rendre compte et des différentes approches développées; elle permettra également d'explorer comment les agences multilatérales et bilatérales peuvent évaluer l'action des ONG qu'elles soutiennent.

9h00 - 10h30 : **Les moyens de rendre compte**

Président : M. Niels Dabelstein, Chef de département, Secrétariat de l'évaluation de Danida
Rapporteur : M. Mahesh Patel, Conseiller régional, Suivi et évaluation, UNICEF

> *"Le suivi des organisations caritatives : critères et méthodes d'évaluation*", Burkhard Wilke, Secrétaire général, International Committee on Fundraising Organizations (ICFO).

> "*L'évaluation, un instrument de la redevabilité*", Noria Mezlev, Humanitarian Accountability Project (HAP).

> "*Développement d'un cadre de suivi-évaluation pour la mise en œuvre de la Déclaration d'engagement sur le SIDA: Session spéciale de l'Assemblée générale des Nations unies sur le SIDA (UNGASS)",* Michel Caraël, Responsable de l'évaluation ONUSIDA.

> "*Les moyens de rendre compte*", Communication de François Senemaud, Chef de Service, Ministère français des Affaires Etrangères.

> "*La dimension manquante du développement : l'impact des politiques des pays riches sur les pauvres*" Robert Picciotto, Directeur, Global Policy Project.

Débats

10h45 -11h45 : **L'évaluation des ONG - Suivi et rétroaction**

Président : Mme Nancy Mac Pherson, Responsable de l'Initiative suivi-évaluation, IUCN
Rapporteur : Mme Elisabeth Barsacq, Chef du bureau de l'évaluation, ministère des Affaires Etrangères

> "*Les ONG australiennes et AusAID – des partenariats pour l'assurance qualité et l'amélioration de l'efficacité*",
Partie I: Peter Ellis, Directeur, Program Evaluation Section, AusAID
Partie II: Linda Kelly and Rhonda Chapman, Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA).

> "*Les agences néerlandaises de cofinancement et leur pratiques communes en matière d'évaluation*", Yvonne Es, Gemeenschappelijk Overleg Medefinanciering (GOM).

Débats

12h00 - 13h00

Rapports des travaux des sous-groupes de la session 2

Président : M. Hans Lundgren, Conseiller, Direction de la Coopération au développement, OCDE.

Les rapporteurs de chaque sous-groupe de la session 2 résument les interventions et débats de la veille.

13h00 - 14h30 : **Déjeuner**

14h30 - 18h30 : **Session 4**

Collaboration et travail en commun entre les différentes communautés de l'évaluation

Les participants examineront comment les capacités en évaluation peuvent être améliorées. Une discussion sera consacrée aux avantages et rôles comparatifs des différentes communautés, les possibilités de travailler ensemble et les sujets en perspective.

14h30 - 16h15 : **Renforcer les capacités en évaluation**

Président : M. Hans-Rimbert Hemmer, Responsable du département de l'évaluation, Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KFW)

Rapporteur : M. Graham Walter, Directeur de la Direction de l'évaluation, Banque asiatique de développement.

> "*Améliorer les capacités en évaluation, l' exemple du réseau norvégien*" Turi Hammer, conseillère technique, Norwegian Development Network.

> "*Faciliter le renforcement durable des capacités en suivi évaluation*" Jean-Charles Rouge, PNUD Niger.

> "*L'aide des bailleurs pour le renforcement des capacités en évaluation: le point de vue d'un pays bénéficiaire*", Chen Zhaoying, Directeur général, National Center For Science and Technology Evaluation (NCSTE), Chine.

> "*Du renforcement des compétences en évaluation des Organisations de solidarité internationale à la construction d'une culture de l'évaluation, l'expérience du F3E en France*", Nathalie Schnuriger, Président F3E et France Pays du Mékong.

Débats

16h30 - 18h00 : **Valoriser la collaboration et le travail en commun**

Président : M. Jean-Michel Severino, Directeur général de l'Agence Française de Développement

Rapporteur : M. Jim Rugh, Coordinateur, Care International

> "*Enseignements tirés des données d'expérience de la Banque mondiale en matière d'évaluation conjointe*", Oswaldo Feinstein, Directeur, Operations Evaluation Department Banque Mondiale.

> "*L'établissement, le renforcement et le développement de la coopération pour l'évaluation entre les agences gouvernementales et non gouvernementales allemandes*", Brunhilde Vest, Ministère fédéral de la Coopération économique et du développement (BMZ), Allemagne.

> "*Collaboration for development evaluation: Ideas shaping a New Global Effort",* , Sulley Gariba, Président, International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS).

Débats

18h00 - 18h30 : **Conclusion**

> M. Daniel Kamelgarn, Rapporteur général de l'atelier, résumé et principales conclusions.

> M. Yves Saint-Geours, Directeur général adjoint de la Coopération internationale et du développement, ministère français des Affaires Etrangères.

> Mme Stéphane Pallez, Chef du Service des Affaires européennes et internationales, ministère français de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie.

Annexe 2 : Workshop programme

Tuesday, 25th March

8h45– 9h30: **Registration**

9h30 – 10h00**: Introduction**

> Welcome by Mr Francis Mer, French Minister of Economy, Finance and Industry
> Introduction by Mr Rob D. van den Berg, Working Party on Aid Evaluation (WP-EV) Chair

10h00 – 13h00**: Session 1** Evaluation Practices

Donors and civil society organisations will present their evaluation approaches and practices. Key issues such as "Are objectives and methods similar? What are the constraints faced by each evaluation community ? What can we learn from each other ?" will be addressed.

Chair: Mr Henri Rouillé d'Orfeuil, Chair, Coordination Sud
Rapporteur: Mr Hans Lundgren, Advisor, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD.

Donors

> "*Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Working Party on Aid Evaluation*", Mr Rob D. van den Berg, WP-EV Chair.

> "*United Nations Inter Agency Working Group on Evaluation (IAWG) : Partners in evaluation*", Khalid Malik, IAWG Chair and Director, Evaluation Office, United Nations Development Program (UNDP).

> "*Note on the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) of the Multilateral Development Banks Evaluation Co-operation Group*", Gregory K. Ingram, ECG incoming Chair, Director-General Operations Evaluation Department World Bank.

Civil Society Organisations

> "*Towards organisational performance assessment: experiences of strengthening learning, accountability and understanding social change*", Margaret Niewens, British Overseas Aid Group (BOAG).

> "*Evaluation challenges as seen by Norwegian non-governmental organisations and partners*", Pia Reierson, Director Programme Support, Aasa Sildnes, Development Specialist and Susie Tapia, Regional Director, Stromme Foundation.

> "*Evaluation and French NGOs, a tool for two major ambitions: accountability and learning for the improvement of practices*", François Doligez, IRAM.

Discussion

13h00 – 14h30: **Lunch**

14h30 - 18h00: **Session 2** New development challenges and evaluation

This session, divided in four parallel subgroups, will aim at addressing challenges for evaluation emerging from current trends of development and identifying best practices coming from each community. Short presentations and roundtable discussion will highlight the methods used.

Sub-group 1: **Participatory evaluation** Chair: Ms Roz David, Action Aid Rapporteur: Mr Goberdhan Singh, Director of Evaluation, Canadian International Development Agency >"*How are we doing? Participation evaluation in the practice of Handicap international*", Nick Heeren, Director of Programmes at Handicap International. >"*An evaluation conducted from the South of Development Education in the North*", Stiann van der Merwe, South Africa. >"*Evaluating change in educational development, a case study of two Namibian education projects*", Ursula Van Harmelen, Senior lecturer, Rhodes University, South Africa. >"*From participatory evaluation to specified Funds for evaluation in partner countries*", Caroline Guillot-Marchi, consultant, Fondation de France. **Discussion**	Sub-group 2: **Case studies on social impact and new approaches on impact evaluation** Chair: Ms Karen Odhiambo, Chair, Kenya Evaluation Association Rapporteur: Mr Michael Hippler, Head of Evaluation and Quality Management Department, MISEREOR Part I: Case studies on social impact >"*Approaches to measuring and reporting on impact. The work of two Norwegian NGOs in Ethiopia and Sri Lanka*", Marit Haug, Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research (NIBR). >"*Building Capacities of Women and Health NGOs to monitor and evaluate international development commitments in Asia*", Jashodhara Dasgupta SAHAYOG, India. >"*Evaluation: a trade union perspective*", Bandula Kothaloawala, Trades Union Congress (TUC), United Kingdom. Part II: New approaches on impact evaluation >"*Selecting indicators for impact evaluation*", Nurul Alam, UNDP. **Discussion**
Sub-group 3: **Internalisation of evaluation results** Chair: Mr Jean Quesnel, Director, Office of Evaluation, UNICEF .Rapporteur: Mr Paolo Basurto, ICU. >"*Internalising evaluation results through learning: complementary perspectives, dilemmas and some lessons learned*", Paul G.H. Engel, Director, European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM). >"*Learning and growing through development project: a Trade Union Experience in the Philippines*", Patricia Rizon Quiaoit, PSLink, Philippines. >"*What conditions for an optimal internalisation of evaluation?"*, Patrick Durish, Fondation Terre des Hommes, Switzerland. >"*Assessing the performance of the Civil Society Challenge Fund*", Mike Battcock Department for International Development (DFID), United Kingdom. >"*Evaluation, a key point for future cooperation*", Sergio Marelli, Chairman, Italian NGO Association. **Discussion**	Sub-Group 4: **Evaluation of humanitarian or conflict-related assistance** Chair: Mr Colin Kirk, Head of Evaluation Department, DFID Rapporteur: Mr Ted Kliest, Evaluator, Ministry of Foreign affairs in Netherlands >"*Assessment of the impact of political cooperation programmes on the development of conflicts*", Ulrich Storck, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES). >"*Practice makes perfect? ALNAP's assessment of the quality of 165 evaluations of humanitarian action, 2000-2002*", John Mitchell, Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP). >"*From evaluation to training through operational research and capitalisation of experience*", François Grünewald, Chairman, Groupe Urgence Réhabilitation Developpement (URD). **Discussion**

18h30 - 20h00: **Cocktail offered by Mr Jouyet, Treasury Director**

Wednesday, March 26th

9h00 – 12h00: **Session 3 Evaluation as a means to accountability of partners in development**

This session will aim at exploring differences and similarities of demands and approaches of the accountability concept and will also address how bilateral and multilateral agencies can evaluate the NGOs they support.

9h00 – 10h30: **Presentation of various approaches to accountability**

Chair: Mr Niels Dabelstein, Head of Department, Danida's Evaluation Secretariat.
Rapporteur: Mr Mahesh Patel, Regional advisor, Monitoring and Evaluation, UNICEF.

> "*Monitoring charitable organizations: criteria and assessment methods*", Burkhard Wilke, Secretary General, International Committee on Fundraising Organizations (ICFO).

> "*Evaluation a tool for accountability*", Noria Mezlev, Humanitarian Accountability Project (HAP).

> "*Development of a monitoring and evaluation framework for the implementation of the Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS: United Nations General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS (UNGASS)"*, Michel Caraël, Chief Evaluation UNAIDS.

> "*Means to accountability*", Communication by François Sénémaud, Head of Service, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

> "*The missing dimension of development: impact of rich countries' policies on the poor*" Robert Picciotto, Director, Global Policy Project.

Discussion

10h45 – 11h45: **Evaluation of NGOs - Feedback and monitoring**

Chair: Ms Nancy Mac Pherson, Head, Monitoring & Evaluation Initiative, IUCN
Rapporteur: Ms Elisabeth Barsacq, Head of Office of Evaluation, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs

> "*Australian NGOs and AusAID – partnerships for quality assurance and improving effectiveness*", Part I: Peter Ellis, Director, Program Evaluation Section, AusAID
Part II: Linda Kelly and Rhonda Chapman, Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA).

> "*Dutch co-financing agencies and their common evaluation practices*", Yvonne Es, Gemeenschappelijk Overleg Medefinanciering (GOM), Netherlands.

Discussion

12h00 – 13h00

Reporting back on work conducted in subgroups of the Session 2

Chair: Mr Hans Lundgren, Advisor, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD

The rapporteurs of each sub-group will report back.

13h00 – 14h30: **Lunch**

14h30 – 18h30: **Session 4** Collaboration and joint work between the various evaluation communities

Participants will look at how evaluation capacities can be further enhanced. A discussion will be devoted to the comparative advantages and roles of the various evaluation constituencies, the possibilities to work together, and issues for the future.

14h30 –16h15: **Enhancing evaluation capacity**

Chair: Mr Hans-Rimbert Hemmer, Head of Evaluation Department, Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau
Rapporteur: Mr Graham Walter, Director Evaluation Division, Asian Development Bank.

> "*Enhancing Evaluation Capacity, the example of a Norwegian Evaluation Network*", Turi Hammer, Technical Advisor, the Evaluation Network of the Norwegian Development Network.
> "*Facilitating Sustainable Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity Development*",Jean-Charles Rouge, PNUD Niger.
> "*Donor support for Evaluation Capacity Development: from the perspective of a recipient country*", Chen Zhaoying, Executive Director, National Center for Science and Technology Evaluation (NCSTE), China.
> "*From enhancing evaluation capacities of NGOs to building an evaluation culture, the F3E French experience*", Nathalie Schnuriger, President F3E and France Pays du Mékong.

Discussion

16h30 – 18h00: **Enhancing Collaboration and joint work**

Chair: Mr Jean-Michel Severino, Chief Executive Officer, Agence Française de Développement
Rapporteur: Mr Jim Rugh, Coordinator, CARE International

> "*Lessons Learned from Experiences in Joint Evaluation*" Oswaldo Feinstein, Director, Operations Evaluation Department, World Bank.
> "*The establishment, strengthening and development of co-operation for evaluation between governmental and non-governmental German agencies*", Brunhilde Vest, Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation (BMZ), Germany.
> "*Collaboration for development evaluation: Ideas shaping a New Global Effort",* Sulley Gariba, Chair, International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS).

Discussion

18h00 – 18h30: **Conclusion**

> Mr Daniel Kamelgarn, Rapporteur general for the Workshop, sum up and concluding remarks.
> Mr Yves Saint-Geours, Deputy Director for International Co-operation and Development, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
> Ms Stéphane Pallez, Head of European and International Affairs Service, French Ministry of Economy, Finance and Industry**.**

Annexe 3 : liste des intervenants, présidents, rapporteurs et orateurs

Nurul Alam, Directeur adjoint, PNUD.
Elisabeth Barsacq, Chef du bureau de l'évaluation, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, France.
Paolo Basurto, Expert, ICU.
Mike Battcock, Chef de section, Department For International Development (DFID), Grande-Bretagne.
Michel Caraël, Responsable de l'évaluation ONUSIDA.
Niels Dabelstein, Chef de département, Secrétariat de l'évaluation, Danida.
Ros David, ActionAid, UK.
Francois Doligez, Chargé de programme, F3E (IRAM).
Patrick Durish, Fondation Terre des Hommes, Suisse.
Peter Ellis, Directeur, Program Evaluation Section, AusAID.
Paul G.H. Engel, Directeur, Centre européen pour la gestion de la politique de développement (ECPDM).
Yvonne Es, Département contrôle qualité (GOM).
Osvaldo Feinstein, Manager, Operations Evaluation Department, Banque Mondiale.
Sulley Gariba, Président, International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS).
François Grünewald, Président, Groupe Urgence Réhabilitation Développement (URD).
Caroline Guillot-Marchi, Consultante, Fondation de France.
Turi Hammer, Conseillère technique, Norwegian Development Network.
Marit Haug, Norwegian Institute for Urban & Regional Research (NIBR).
Nicholas Heeren, Directeur des programmes, Handicap International.
Hans-Rimbert Hemmer, Responsable du département de l'évaluation, Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KFW).
Michael Hippler, Chef du département de l'évaluation, MISEREOR.
Gregory K. Ingram, Président d'ECG et Directeur Général, Operations Evaluation, Banque Mondiale.
Dasgupta Jashodhara, SAHAYOG, India.
Daniel Kamelgarn, chargé de mission, Ministère de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie, France
Linda Kelly, Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA).
Colin Kirk, Chef du Département de l'évaluation, DFID.
Ted Kliest, Evaluateur, Ministère des Affaires étrangères des Pays Bas.
Bandula Kothaloawala, Trades Union Congress (TUC), Grande-Bretagne.
Hans Lundgren, Conseiller, Direction de la Coopération au développement, OCDE.
Nancy Mac Pherson, Responsable de l'Initiative suivi-évaluation, IUCN.
Khalid Malik, Président de l'IAWG et Directeur, Bureau de l'évaluation, PNUD.
Sergio Marelli, Président, Association des ONG italiennes.
Francis Mer, Ministre de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie, France.
Noria Mezlev, Manager, Humanitarian Accountability Project (HAP).
John Mitchell, Coordinateur, Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP).
Margaret Niewens, Conseiller, British Overseas Aid Group (BOAG).
Karen Odhiambo, Présidente, Kenya Evaluation Association.
Stéphane Pallez, Chef de Service, Ministère de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie, France.

Mahesh Patel, Conseiller régional, Suivi et évaluation, UNICEF.
Robert Picciotto, Directeur, Global Policy Project.
Jean Quesnel, Directeur, Bureau de l'évaluation, UNICEF.
Pia Reierson, Directeur de l'appui aux programmes, Fondation Stomme.
Chapman Rhonda, Directeur, Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA).
Patricia Rizon Quiaoit, Chef de projet, PSLink, Philippines.
Jean-Charles Rougé, Programme des Nations Unies pour le développement, Niger.
Henri Rouillé d'Orfeuil, Président, Coordination Sud.
Jim Rugh, Coordinateur, Care International.
Yves Saint-Geours, Directeur général adjoint, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, France.
Nathalie Schnuriger, Président F3E et France-Pays du Mékong.
François Senemaud, Chef de Service, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, France.
Jean-Michel Severino, Directeur général, Agence Française de Développement.
Aasa Sildnes, Spécialiste en développement, Fondation Stromme, Norvège
Goberdhan Singh, Directeur de l'évaluation, Agence Canadienne du Développement International.
Ulrich Storck, Coordinateur régional, Friederich Ebert Stiftung (FES).
Susie Tapia, Directeur régional à Lima (Pérou), Fondation Stromme.
Rob.D. Van den Berg, Président du Groupe de Travail sur l'Evaluation de l'aide (GT-EV), CAD.
Stiann Van den Merwe, VDM consultancy, Afrique du Sud.
Ursula Van Harmelen, Université de Rhodes, Afrique du Sud.
Brunehilde Vest, Ministère fédéral de la Coopération économique et du développement (BMZ), Allemagne.
Graham Walter, Directeur de l'évaluation, Banque asiatique de développement.
Burkhard Wilke, Secrétaire général, International Committee on Fundraising Organizations (ICFO).
Chen Zhaoying, Directeur général, National Center For Science and Technology Evaluation (NCSTE), Chine.

Annexe 4 : liste des organisations représentées

Afrique du Sud / RSA
Confederation of South African Workers'Unions - CONSAWU
National Council of Trade Unions (NACTU)
Rhodes University
Rural Development Support Programme RDSP
VDM Consultancy
Algérie / Algeria
Union Générale du Travail d'Algérie - UGTA
Allemagne / Germany
DEG
Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources (BGR)
Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ)
Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation
GTZ - German Technical Cooperation
Heinrich Böll Foundation
Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau
MISEREOR
Australie / Australia
Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)
Praxis Consultants Pty Ltd
Standards & Development Practice
Autriche/Austria
Austrian Foundation for Development Research
Austrian Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Belgique/ Belgium
Development Researchers Network
Burkina Faso
Union mondiale pour la nature IUCN
Cameroun
Confédération Syndicale des Travailleurs du Cameroun
Canada
Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
Federation of Canadian Municipalities
Commission Européenne / European Commission
Commission Européenne
Chine / China
National Center for Science and Technology Evaluation (NTSCE)
Côte d'Ivoire / Ivory Coast
Union Générale des travailleurs de Côte d'Ivoire (UGTCI)

Danemark / Denmark

DanChurchAID
Danida (Ministry of Foreign Affairs)
Danish Confederation of Professional Associations - AC
Danish Trade Union Council for International Development Cooperation (LO/FTF Council)
IBIS - Danish Solidarity and Development Organisation
The Project Councelling Service

Espagne / Spain

Ministerio de asuntos exteriores
OPE, Universitad San-Pablo-CEU
PriceWaterhouseCoopers
Universidad politechnica de Madrid

Etats Unis / United States of America

CARE International
Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANTA) Project/USAID

France

ADETEF
Agence française de développement (AFD)
Aide et Action
Association des professionnels en sociologie de l'entreprise (APSE)
CGM Analyses et Méthodes
Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement (CIRAD)
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS)
Comité catholique contre la Faim et pour le Développement (CCFD)
Comité Français pour la Solidarité Internationale (CFSI)
Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail (CFDT)
Confédération générale du travail (CGT)
Conseil et Développement
Conseil Général des Mines
Coordination Sud
EHESS/CEMI
EUREVAL-C3E
Evalua
F3E
Fondation des Villes
Force Ouvrière - CGT-FO
France Pays du Mekong
GRET
Haut Conseil de la Coopération Internationale (HCCI)
Ingénieurs Conseil et Economiste Associé (ICEA)
Institut Bioforce Développement
Institut de recherche pour le développement (IRD)
Institut de recherches & d'applications des méthodes de développement (IRAM)
Mazars et Guérard
Ministère de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères
Maîtrise des Techniques du Bâtiment et de leur Financement (MTBF)
NATEXIS - Banques Populaires
Société IFIS
Université de Rennes 1
Groupe Urgence Réhabilitation Développement (URD)

Ghana
Trades Union Congress - GTUC
Hongrie / Hungaria
Société à responsabilité Limitée de Coopération Internationale et de Conseil (TESCO)
Inde / India
Healthwatch UP Bihar
Irlande / Ireland
Christian Aid Ireland
Concern Worldwide
GOAL
Ireland Aid
Self Help Development International
Trocaire
Italie / Italy
Association des ong italiennes
ICU - Instituto per la Cooperazione Universitaria
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères
NGO CISP
NGO CISV
NGO ICU
Università di Roma "La Sapienza"
Kenya
CARE International
Central Organisation of Trade Unions
International Confederation of Free Trade
University of Nairobi and Kenya Evaluation Association
Kirkhizstan
Luxembourg
Cercle des ONG
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères
Malawi
Centre for Social Research/Malawi Network of Evaluators
UNICEF Malawi
Mali
Confédération Syndicale des Travailleurs du Mali
Maroc / Morocco
Union Générale des travailleurs du Maroc (UGTM)
Mauritanie
OKT – Consult
Niger
Ministère des Finances et de l'Economie
Plan Niger
Réseau nigérien de suivi évaluation African Evaluation Association
Norvège / Norway
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Stromme Foundation
The Norwegian Development Network

Nouvelle Zélande / New Zealand
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères
Pays Bas / Netherlands
Consultative body of cofinancing agencies (GOM)
MAE
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
PLAN NEDERLAND
SNV/Netherlands Development Organisation
Pérou / Peru
Stromme Foundation
Philippines
MASAI (management advancement systems association inc.)
PSLINK (Public Services Labor Independant Confederation)
Pologne / Poland
Polish Humanitarian Organisation
Portugal
Institut Portugues de Apoio ao Desenvolvimento
République slovaque / Slovak Republic
Organization National Platform of NGDOs of the Slovak Republic
République tchèque / Czech Republic
FORS - Czech Forum for dévelopment Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Royaume Uni / United Kingdom
Actionaid UK
CAFOD (Catholic Agency for Overseas Development)
Christian Aid
Department For International Development (DFID)
EUIRD TUC Trade Union Congress
OXFAM GB
Save the Children UK
Sénégal
Confédération Nationale des Travailleurs du Sénégal - CNTS
Slovénie / Slovenia
Seecran South East European Children Rights Network
Suède / Sweden
Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)
Suisse / Switzerland
Direction du Developpement et de la Coopération - Département fédéral des affaires étrangères
Fondation Terre des Hommes
Secrétariat CAD/DAC Secretariat
Commission syndicale consultative auprès de l'OCDE (TUAC)
Development Co-operation Directorate, OCDE
Togo
Confédération syndicale des travailleurs du Togo (CSTT)
Agences des Nations Unies / United Nations Agencies
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Bureau International du Travail / International Labour Office
United Nations /Department of Economic and Social Affaires (UN-DESA)
United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF)

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services (UN OIOS)
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)
United Nations Volunteers (UNV)
World Food Program (WFP)
World Health Organization (WHO)
World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

Institutions Financières International/International Financial Institutions

African Development Bank (ADB)
Asian Development Bank (AsDB)
International Moneteray Fund (IMF)
International Finance Corporation (IFC)
Banque Mondiale (World Bank)

Autres Institutions Internationales/Other International Institutions

ACILS - American Center for International Labour Solidarity AFL - CIO
AFL-CIO European Office
Agence Intergouvernementale de la Francophonie
The Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Assistance (ALNAP)
CIET Group
Club du Sahel
Commonwealth Secretariat
ECDPM (European Centre for Development Policy Management)
European Training Foundation
Fédération Internationale Terre des Hommes
Global Policy Project
Handicap International
Humanitarian Accountability Project (HAP)
International Committee on Fundraising Organizations (ICFO)
International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)
International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS)
International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)
The World Conservation Union (IUCN)
PLAN
The One World Trust
World Confederation of Labour (WCL)

Annexe 5 : Index des mots clefs