

**Evaluation of the Paris Declaration  
Phase II  
Reference Group Meeting  
11 -13 February 2009  
Auckland, New Zealand**

**WORKSHOP REPORT**

**March 2009**

## Executive summary

With the overall objective of launching the second phase of the evaluation of the Paris Declaration, an International Reference Group meeting was held in Auckland, New Zealand 11-13 February 2009 attended by more than 50 participants representing partner and donor countries, civil society, Global Environment Facility (GEF), and OECD/DAC.

During the 3-day meeting the participants discussed the overall approach, methodology and governance of the evaluation which gave rise to a series of broad agreements. The most important agreements are presented below in summarized form:

- Evaluation purpose – to analyze the results of the Paris Declaration in terms of aid effectiveness and development effectiveness and/or the preconditions or enabling conditions that will lead to development results.
- Evaluation focus – the emphasis of the evaluation will be on partner country level evaluations. Select donor studies, however, will be conducted as well to complement the donor HQ studies already carried out during phase I. Supplementary thematic studies will only be conducted where deemed essential to ensure adequate coverage of important issues
- Evaluation participation – so far 21 partner countries have expressed interest in conducting country evaluations namely: Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Cambodia, Cameroun, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Columbia, Ghana, Indonesia, Kyrgyz Republic, Laos, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Uganda, and Vietnam., Furthermore, four donor countries, not participating in the donor HQ study work of evaluation phase I, have expressed interest in conducting HQ studies during the evaluation phase II. The donor countries are Belgium, Sweden and the United States.
- Evaluation implementation – the evaluation will be implemented by two different types of evaluation teams: an international core team responsible for literature review, technical guidance of country study work, and synthesis work; and country-based teams responsible for conduct of partner country/donor HQ studies.
- Evaluation management – the evaluation will be managed through a three-tier governance structure: an International Reference Group composed of all participating countries/agencies which will meet at mile-stone moments to review key evaluation outputs; a Management Group composed of six partner/donor representatives and the evaluation secretariat to guide the overall evaluation including the drafting of TOR and oversight of the work of the core team; and in-country reference groups to oversee the individual country level evaluations.
- Evaluation funding – the evaluation will be funded by donor partners. So far approximately 70 per cent of the core funding is secured.
- Evaluation time-line – the evaluation is scheduled for finalization in May 2011 to feed into the preparation of the 4<sup>th</sup> High-Level Forum. The conduct of country-study work is scheduled for January – October 2010.

# List of Contents

- 1. Introduction ..... 4
- 2. Approach..... 4
- 3. Methodology ..... 8
- 4. Governance..... 12
- 5. Participation and funding ..... 13
- 6. Next steps..... 16

# Table of Appendices

- Annex 1 Workshop programme
- Annex 2 List of participants
- Annex 3 Assessment of evaluation propositions
- Annex 4 Workshop presentations

# 1. Introduction

With the overall objective of launching the second phase of the evaluation of the Paris Declaration (PD), an International Reference Group (IRG) meeting was held in Auckland, New Zealand 11-13 February 2009. The specific purpose of the meeting was to reach a general consensus about scope, approach and focus of the evaluation of phase II; to agree on evaluation governance structure; to review budget and funding mechanisms and to pledge support; and to solicit commitment from all partners to the evaluation (see workshop program in Annex 1).

A total of 54 participants attended the workshop representing 17 partner and 15 donor countries. Civil society representatives, a representative from GEF, and observers from OECD/DAC participated as well (see Annex 2 for list of participants).

Below follows a summary of the information-sharing, discussions, and decision-making which took place during the 3-day meeting, structured as follows:

- *Approach* (Section 2) discussing scope and focus of evaluation phase II as well as retracing results of phase I
- *Methodology* (Section 3) addressing key methodological issues such as evaluation questions and propositions for phase II
- *Governance* (Section 4) presenting the governing and managing bodies for phase II
- *Participation, Pledging* (Section 5) summarizing the commitments made
- *Next steps* (Section 6) outlining the time line of the evaluation.

Emphasis in this brief workshop report has been on the presentation of working session results (three sessions in total) and plenary discussions with the aim of summarizing points of consensus. This summary record together with the revised approach paper will form the basis for developing the TOR for the various elements of the evaluation. The workshop presentations on approach, methodological and governance issues can be found in Annex 4.

It should be noted that while all working session inputs for the sake of transparency are presented in this report; the duplicative and/or conflicting nature of some of the inputs are such, that not all inputs are to be retained when revising the approach paper.

## 2. Approach

For the benefit especially of new stakeholders to the PD evaluation, Ted Kliet presented an **overview of results of the first phase of the evaluation** outlining the main conclusions and recommendations and Helen Wedgwood reported on the **utilization of the phase I results** in the Accra High Level Forum (HLF) process (see Annex 4). In regard to the utilization of the PD evaluation for the HLF, it was found that the evaluation had informed the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) negotiation process by highlighting the need for political leadership and reform of international relationships in aid management. Furthermore, the evaluation provided evidence for the need for enhanced emphasis on accountability on the part of both donors and partner countries and adjusting PD implementation to specific country contexts.

Niels Dabelstein presented the **grand picture** outlining the overall evaluation architecture of the Paris Declaration with focus on phase II including the overall evaluation objective of assessing the influence of the PD on aid effectiveness and development effectiveness or results; the evaluation partnership modality (joint but country-led evaluations); and the evaluation oversight mechanisms (reference/management groups). See Annex 4 for details.

Based on the Approach Paper for the Phase II Evaluation of the Paris Declaration, John Eriksson gave a **presentation of the proposed approach** for phase II addressing in particular the scope and focus. The issues presented included the selection and/or merging of evaluation frameworks and models; development of evaluation propositions; and selection of critical substantive topics for particular consideration (for full presentation see Annex 4). In particular the foci of the two conceptual frameworks were addressed - implementation and results – and the derived methodological challenges were unpacked.

Elliot Stern **presented some key design issues** unpacking in particular the issue of designing evaluation questions by introducing typologies (normative/descriptive; results/ /process; and counterfactual/longitudinal). Various propositions or hypotheses found in research were presented. It would be one task for the Phase 2 evaluation to explore some of these and see how far conditions in countries and donor policies might lead to different results. See Annex 4 for full presentation.

For **WORKING SESSION I** the participants were requested to address two sets of approach issues, namely: an assessment of the propositions and the identification of evaluation questions with the view of providing input to the drafting of TOR.

The 21 **evaluation propositions** have been identified in the approach paper as ‘hypotheses’ to be tested during the phase II evaluation based on significant bodies of research. However in order to ensure that the propositions also reflect development practitioners’ experiences, the participants were requested to briefly review the propositions for relevance. And, in a general manner of speaking, the participants found that the propositions were in need of further simplification/clarification as reflected in summarized assessments below (for detailed assessments please consult Annex 3):

- the inclusion of more context issues for the country ownership and poverty reduction propositions;
- the addressing of reciprocity aspect and personal interests/capacities for the propositions about donor harmonization and alignment;
- the reconsideration of trade as a propositions about contribution to wider development goal;
- the merging of the propositions about improving governance and reducing fragility; and
- a stronger linkage between the propositions about capacity development and mutual accountability and the country ownership and poverty reduction propositions.

Finally a number of additional issues were identified, namely propositions addressing (i) the untying of aid; and (ii) the leadership at donor HQ translated into implementation and results.

The **evaluations questions** suggested by the groups were numerous and often of similar nature yet subtly different which is why all proposed questions are retained in this report, but sorted by type (results, counterfactual, process) and theme:

*Results type questions* ( what did the PD achieve?):

- *Aid effectiveness/development effectiveness (AE/DE)*: To what extent has the PD achieved aid effectiveness? Has the PD enhanced ODA’s impact on development results? Because evaluation will be in the context of different countries with different development goals: did PD implementation allow development goals to be addressed effectively? Were the achievements of development results in specific sectors enhanced through the application of the PD principles? What results did the PD achieve? To what extent are intermediate results (to the extent achieved) plausibly going to lead to longer-term/higher level results? What has the PD achieved relative to what was initially expected?

- *MDGs and poverty*: To what extent has aid reduced poverty (degree of sustainability, equity, efficiency, and capacity)? What is the contribution of the PD to the MDG and poverty reduction? Did the PD principles and commitments help development partners and partner countries to bring good results to reduce poverty?
- *Country systems and capacity building*: Did the PD lead to enhanced use of developing country systems? What are the effects of the PD for building and enhancement of capacity (individual, institutional and organizational level) at the medium/long term (focusing on all MDGs or central key sectors)? Does the PD provide a sufficient model to enhance country capacities to take development into their own hands; or are additional enabling factors more important? Has the PD had an impact on the kinds of modalities used?
- *Policy changes and leadership*: What are the effects of the implementation of PD on state building and democratization? What did PD achieve in terms of ownership and alignment (focusing on political leadership, budgetary systems, policy coherence, reduced transactions costs, and accountability/sustainable development policy)? Has mutual accountability led to more sustainable development policies?
- *Other*: To what extent will policy changes associated with PD be robust in a changing global context and evolving donor policy?

*Counterfactual type questions* (could the same results have been achieved through other non-PD approaches – or by doing nothing?):

- *General*: Was the PD the best way to achieve results? Whether PD approaches effectively brought results better than other approaches in the relevant field? How did the results (development goals) relate to previous achievement of development goals?
- *Level of alignment*: Does having ODA on budget enhance ownership by the partner country?
- *Aid dependency*: Are PD approaches necessary in countries that are not aid dependent?
- *Policy coherence/coordination*: Do countries and donors that have enhanced policy coordination and policy coherence out-perform other countries and donors as regards development trends and benefits? What are the key external factors that may have also contributed to the attained results?
- *Pre-2005 processes*: What has been the added value of the PD for those countries that have implemented PD-like processes before 2005?
- *Modalities and funding sources*: Have vertical funds (distinguishing between different kinds of funds) led to similar aid effectiveness results as the PD modalities? Were the development results in specific sectors more significant in cases where the PD principles are implemented compared to situations of vertical programs and project type approaches? What is the added value of the PD in comparison with other “strategies” to reach development results (e.g. PD modalities versus non-PD modalities; donor aid versus internal mobilization of resources; PD donor intervention versus non-PD donor intervention)? Could sustainable non-PD sources of funding have achieved the same results (e.g. domestic and non-PD related external resources and policies, economic conditions, regional factors, vertical programs with little capacity strengthening, other sources)? What would be the implications for development results in a given country if donors were to shift a majority of aid to budget support?

*Process questions* that could help explain results (what processes e.g. ways of implementing the PD, explain effects and outcomes?):

- *Transaction costs*: Have transaction costs actually diminished? Has harmonization and alignment led to reduction of transaction costs and more resources for poverty reduction and other development priorities?
- *Country leadership/capacity*: How have countries used PD partnerships to achieve results? Has the PD actually helped the alignment of donor intervention with the partner country priorities (mainstreaming of priorities)? Have parameters such as high degree of country

leadership and capacity; and effective donor coordination contributed to the implementation of the five PD principles?

- *Context*: Were significant improvements in specific sectors and specific countries linked to application of the PD principles? Does only contextualized PD implementation lead to development results? To what extent have the levels of domestic and external resources contributed to the PD effects/outcomes?
- *Aid effectiveness/development effectiveness*: To what extent has the implementation of the PD so far encouraged critical reflection on aid effectiveness practices and development effectiveness linkages? Is aid delivered more efficiently? What processes and ways of implementing PD enhanced the achievement of outcomes? Does the implementation of the PD lead to excessive emphasis on consensus-seeking at the expense of creativity and variation?
- *Civil society*: To what extent are capacity development resources enabling civil society actors to strengthen their contribution to development outcomes (extension to Parliaments etc)?

Based on the various Q&A sessions and plenary discussion the following **broad points of agreement** on approach issues were made (see Box 1).

### Box 1 Points of agreement on approach issues

1. The main goal of the evaluation is to analyze the results of the PD in terms of aid effectiveness and development effectiveness and/or the preconditions or enabling conditions that will lead to development results. However, due to the 2011 timeline, in many instances we will need to settle for intermediate and proxy indicators for outcomes, which theory and experience tell us point to development results. Addressing development results is critical for maintaining evaluation credibility.
2. The evaluation should ensure that all five key commitments of the Paris Declaration are addressed adequately in the evaluation. Especially adequate coverage of results-based management and mutual accountability aspects need to be addressed in the evaluation design of Phase II.
3. An assessment of the development results of PD-like aid modalities is important and should be a central element of the country level evaluations drawing on the extent possible on existing evaluations.<sup>1</sup>
4. The conceptual framework of the evaluation needs to strike the right balance between capturing of complexities and ease in implementation.
5. There are different stakeholder groups at partner country, donor and broader policy level all of whom have interests in this evaluation. For this reason although there will be a common core of evaluation priorities and evaluation questions, the country-based partnerships will be able to supplement their country level evaluations with evaluation questions that match their needs and interests and specific country contexts. The changing global context, including the financial crisis, should be reflected in the core questions.
6. It is unlikely that the PD phase II evaluations will be able to undertake the kinds of experiments that will support a rigorous explanatory (counterfactual) logic. However comparisons of various kinds will be possible and attribution of results to the PD should at least be attempted – for example by comparing PD approaches with strategies of emerging donors such as China and Brazil and the vertical funds.
7. There was little unambiguous consensus on the importance of the 21 indicative propositions. This is why it was agreed to retain the propositions as tentative hypotheses only to be kept in mind during the detailed design of the phase II evaluation.

## 3. Methodology

Mr. Muhammad Musharraf Hossain Bhuiyan from Bangladesh and Mr. Pius Bigirimana from Uganda presented their experiences with **organizing of country level evaluations** in phase I, highlighting lessons learnt with the forming and management of national reference groups; selection and contracting of evaluators; and conduct of country level evaluations (see Annex 4 for presentations). Some of the identified lessons learnt were: the importance of a strong country/donor partnership for study conduct and follow-up; a broad association of relevant stakeholders (CSOs, etc) as a prerequisite for evaluation credibility and country-wide ownership to results; and the need for flexibility in procurement procedures for timely evaluation implementation. Other partner countries mentioned similar experiences when organizing their country level evaluations, such as the Senegal study. See also the report with lessons from the survey of Phase I of the PD evaluation.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance, the EU has programmed a joint evaluation of poverty effects of General Budget Support. The World Bank is in the process of finalizing an evaluation of Sector Wide Approaches (SWAp). The Netherlands has conducted an evaluation of SWAp for water and sanitation programs.

<sup>2</sup> Survey report can be found at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/2/9/42070556.pdf>

Some **methodological issues** were then introduced by Elliot Stern raising the issue of evaluation standards and quality. Mention was made of various important evaluation attributes such as: overall sampling and coverage, issues of explanation/attribution, the design of study types; the tapping into local and regional resources; and the rationale for establishment of country reference groups (see Annex 4 for presentation).

For **WORKING SESSION II** the participants were requested to identify criteria for country participation; mechanisms for making optimal use of resources; and means to optimize the use and utility of national reference groups.

### **1. Criteria for (partner) country participation**

While it was recognized that participation in this evaluation process is on a voluntary basis the participants identified a number of criteria to be applied to identify the minimum group of countries which will provide the best possible evaluation coverage (see also agreement point 10 in Box 2): .

- Geographical location (incl. continental and regional diversity such as Anglo- and Francophone African countries)
- Income levels / aid dependency (leverage of power)
- Capacity levels
- Fragility levels
- Diversity of aid (types, modalities, sources, experimental models)
- Range of sector experience / case studies
- Access to relevant data
- Commitment to PD process
- Degree of participation of civil society
- Preference for Phase I participants (longitudinal continuity)
- Non-PD signatory partner countries
  - Emerging donors (India, Brazil, China, ...)

### **2. Making use of national/regional/international resources/expertise and information**

- Apply terms of reference that are sufficiently flexible to allow for adaptation of the country evaluations to different cultural contexts.
- Preference should be given to national teams or mixed (international/regional/national) teams. But flexibility to mobilize technical expertise according to country context (and a global standard) should be applied with quality as the over-arching principle.
- Prioritize use of local systems & resources/expertise including academia, universities, civil society and national reference groups. However, regional and national networks such as International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS), African Evaluation Association (AFREA), International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET), the Asian Community of Practice to be launched in Manila in March 2009, the DAC Evaluation network, and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) could play a role as well in the identification of expertise.
- Establish a list of qualified international/national consultants/companies. The management group (MG) could identify a pool of potential consultants and peer reviewers to be involved in the evaluation(s). However, national tender process should be used to select evaluation teams for the country level evaluations managed by the partner countries.
- Promote knowledge sharing at regional level and this possibly in the form of regional team leaders responsible for several country teams. For smaller countries (such as some Pacific nations) one regional team might be the most feasible option.

- Use of existing data/literature as much as possible, including university/research institution sources. Also information not yet published such as on-going evaluations should be collected. Maybe partner and donor countries could prepare lists of publications. Also in-country workshops to identify information sources could be considered.
- Apply right balance between primary and secondary information but use secondary information where possible. Also both quantitative and qualitative information should be used. However, information validation is very important.
- Launch preparatory studies on e.g. MDGs to guide country work. Such studies could be managed by the core team.
- Establish a website for knowledge sharing including on evaluation progress. Also, the conduct of a mid-stream workshop could be considered.

### **3. Improving utility and utilization of country study references groups**

- Establish clear TOR for the national reference groups addressing: scope/focus of reference group work/mandate; criteria for identification of consultants; criteria for identification and validation of data sources; approval mechanisms for TOR for the country study; quality assurance procedures; and dissemination strategy and follow-up plan. The DAC Evaluation Quality Standards could serve as guidance for this.
- Promote that the national reference groups should (ideally, depending on the country context) be inclusive involving a diverse body of representatives of local government; members of parliament (legislatures), donors and multilateral organizations including non-traditional donors such as China and the vertical funds; CSOs; and private sector. Also representatives from other countries in the region could be considered. To enhance ownership, high-level political buy-in should be ensured. Furthermore, the reference group should be linked to/be part of an established structure.
- Ensure that the reference groups hold adequate skills in terms of technical knowledge/leadership. But the evaluation should also be utilized to enhance capacity building of reference group members.
- Ensure early involvement of stakeholders and communicate evaluation results to the government, parliament and other stakeholders. Also evaluation findings should be used to leverage improvements in working with donors.

**WORKING SESSION III** assessed a number of pre-identified themes for potential **supplementary studies** as well as identified new themes for study:

- *Backward tracking.* Only one group prioritized backward tracking of success in relation to “PD-like” initiatives as a supplementary study. Another group proposed that this type of study should be integrated into the design of country level evaluations as part of a background review of the literature. Also it was suggested that backward tracking should be closely restricted to “PD-like” interventions.
- *Tracker sites.* None of the groups found tracker sites monitoring lasting beyond year 2011 of PD-attributable development results a priority. Instead one group suggested that the recommendation of such studies could possibly be an outcome of the PD phase II evaluation.
- *Donor harmonization, including division of labor among donors.* Several groups found the conduct on donor harmonization and division of labor highly relevant but stressed that the bulk of data collection and the analytical work should be contained in the country level evaluations. Some (limited) supplementary study at international/HQ levels might be required. Also it was stressed that the study of donor harmonization should be coupled with country ownership.
- *Transaction costs.* Several groups found the supplementary study of transaction costs for PD implementation for countries and donors a priority. An analytical bi-focus was proposed with (i) incidence on donors and partner countries; and (ii) changing levels/trends. However, it

was stressed that such a study should add to, and not replace the focus of country level evaluations.

- *Roles of civil society.* One group found the supplementary study on roles of civil society in PD implementation and development effectiveness relevant, while others found that this issue should be covered in the country level evaluations. Also it was stressed that not only the roles of civil society, but also the roles of private sector, local/district and national political actors should be addressed with a focus on service delivery.
- *Strategies for sustainability.* Only one group found the supplementary study of strategies for sustainability of PD implementation pertinent; while another group stressed that such issue should be addressed in the synthesis of the country level evaluations.
- *Role of global funds.* The supplementary study of role of global funds in employing PD principles to achieve development results (e.g. “GAVI” and “AIDS, TB and Malaria”) was supported by one group. Another group found the study theme an integral part of phase II and stressed therefore the importance of addressing all vertical funds in the country level evaluations (i.a. not restrict to global funds only). However, given the importance of the subject matter maybe a supplementary (companion) synthesis report addressing this issue specifically could be developed drawing on the country level evaluations.
- *Additional issues for study.* Finally new issues for supplementary and/or country level evaluations were proposed; such as: (i) PD impact on aid modalities; (ii) PD impact on aid volumes; (iii) aid for trade; and (iv) donor/HQ constraint. However, as stressed by several groups: the launching of supplementary studies should be minimized.

Based on the various Q&A sessions and plenary discussion the following **broad points of agreement** on methodological issues were made (see Box 2 below).

## Box 2 Points of agreement on methodological issues

8. The Phase II evaluation should be focused primarily at the country level (that involve donor as well as country stakeholders), with supplementary 'studies' where essential to ensure adequate coverage of important issues.
9. Continuity of Phase I countries so that they participate also in Phase II is to be encouraged. However it is not proposed to extend the work of Phase I except for a few donors that did not previously undertake a HQ case study. Emerging and non-PD donors, however, should be sought out explicitly in the country level evaluations.
10. Participation in the Phase II evaluation will be voluntary with the aim of comprising a group of countries that represents a diversity of contexts. There is agreement about a minimum set of 'criteria' concerning geographical spread, aid levels, fragility etc. If all criteria for inclusion are not met in the group of partner countries that have already indicated their participation, it may be necessary to encourage other countries to participate.
11. There will be country-based teams and an international 'core' team. The core team will offer technical support to country teams, and eventually produce a cross country synthesis report. Furthermore, the core team will provide guidance on supplementary studies to be conducted. A priority task for the core team is the conduct of an additional literature review to guide the work of the country level evaluations. Also regional workshops to guide the work of the country teams are foreseen.
12. Evaluation teams at both country-partnership and 'central' levels will be selected by open tender. The country teams should be formed using national expertise to the maximum extent possible but may also include regional and international experts.
13. Use of country systems should be prioritized to capitalize on existing data/literature including academia, universities, and civil society. However, global and regional networks could play a role as well in the identification of e.g. relevant background studies.
14. A mix of methods will be necessary e.g. synthesis of existing evidence, evaluations and research; case studies; tracking (longitudinal) studies that look forward and backwards; comparative studies across cases and themes etc.
15. There is agreement that national reference groups will have an important role to play in accessing information; exerting quality control; linking to government and civil society; and encouraging the use and usefulness of the evaluations findings. Furthermore, it was agreed that TOR should guide the work of the reference groups to ensure clear roles and responsibilities.

## 4. Governance

Ted Kliest presented the **overall governance structure** of the evaluation identifying the key principles; the entities (international reference group, management group and country reference groups); and their tasks (see Annex 4 for presentation). The evaluation governance principles are the same as those applied for phase I namely that the governance structure should

- allow for appropriate involvement, cooperation and ownership of main stakeholders;
- safeguard the independence, credibility and quality of the evaluation;
- conform with 'good practices' for joint evaluation; and
- ensure an efficient evaluation process.

In the ensuing plenary discussion it was agreed that the evaluation will be managed through a three-tier governance structure: an International Reference Group composed of all participating countries/agencies which will meet at mile-stone moments to review key evaluation outputs; a

Management Group composed of six partner/donor representatives and the evaluation secretariat to guide the overall evaluation including the drafting of TOR and oversight of the work of the core team; and in-country reference groups to oversee the individual country level evaluations.

The following **points of agreement** were retained on the issue of governance (see Box 3):

### **Box 3 Points of agreement on evaluation governance issues**

16. The International Reference Group (IRG) will be constituted only by countries/organizations contributing actively to the evaluation either in the form of study activity or in the form of funds are invited to appoint a representative to participate in the work of the IRG. However, civil society representatives will be invited to participate as observers with representatives from entities such as CONCORD (European NGO Confederation for Relief and Development) and REALITY OF AID representing “south” NGOs. The IRG will be co-chaired by the Netherlands and Sri Lanka.
17. The Management Group (MG) will be constituted by three partner country representatives, three donor country/body representatives, and the PD Evaluation Secretariat will form the international Management Group. Malawi, Sri Lanka and Bolivia or Columbia<sup>3</sup> will represent Africa, Asia and the Pacific and Latin America in the MG. The Netherlands, Sweden and the US will represent the donors. No multilateral agencies/international financing institutions were present at the workshop. The Management Group will ensure linkages with the OECD/DAC’s Working Party on Aid effectiveness - the links will be formal, but designed to ensure the independence of the evaluation. The MG will be co-chaired by the Netherlands and Sri Lanka.
18. Criteria for selection of country reference group members should be developed in order to ensure diversity.
19. The quality of the evaluation reports is the responsibility of the independent evaluation teams. However each country reference group is responsible for reviewing the relevant country study similar to the reference groups involved in donor HQ studies. The international reference group is responsible for reviewing the draft synthesis report; the draft supplementary studies; and the TORs guiding the various studies including the country level evaluations.
20. Whenever feasible national and regional evaluation quality standards should guide the country level evaluations. Where such standards do not exist and for the other products such as the synthesis report and supplementary studies, the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards should be applied.
21. Concise periodical briefings will be produced by the Evaluation Secretariat with the purpose of (i) communicating evaluation progress and intermediate results with the wider community and (ii) managing expectations with respect to this evaluation.

## **5. Participation and funding**

21 partner countries and 4 donor countries have expressed a strong interest in conducting country evaluation studies:

- *Partner countries to conduct country level evaluations:* Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Cambodia, Cameroun, Columbia, Indonesia, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Samoa, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Uganda, and Vietnam. Still to be confirmed are the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Kyrgyz Republic, Laos and South Africa.

---

<sup>3</sup> Bolivia and Columbia will agree on selection of country by early March.

- *Donor countries to conduct HQ studies: Belgium, Sweden and the US.*<sup>4</sup>

Niels Dabelstein presented the preliminary evaluation budget for phase II estimated to total an amount of EUR 4,825,000 (see details in Annex 5) while stressing that:

- only funds for the Evaluation Secretariat are secured at this point in time through the confirmed funding of EUR 740,000 by the Netherlands;
- the estimated budget for donor/HQ and country level evaluations will vary with the number of studies to be conducted – e.g. already 19 partner countries have expressed interest in conducting country level evaluations (see above) while the budget estimated a total of 15 studies,
- the unit cost per country study and the budget allocated for the core team need to be carefully reviewed to ensure that adequate funding is allowed; and
- the contingencies are designed to cover unexpected expenses.

**Table 1 Preliminary budget for phase II**

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED BUDGET	
	Euro	USD @ 1,30
Reference Group meetings (4)	350.000	455.000
Management Group Meetings (8)	25.000	32.500
Regional meetings/workshops (8)	225.000	292.500
Core team (80 months + travel)	800.000	1.040.000
Special Studies (5)	750.000	975.000
Dissemination and communication	310.000	403.000
Contingencies	125.000	162.500
<b>Total core fund</b>	<b>2.585.000</b>	<b>3.360.500</b>
Secretariat (financed by the Netherlands)	740.000	962.000
Country Level Studies (15)	1.200.000	1.560.000
Donor HQ Studies (4)	300.000	390.000
<b>Total Estimated Cost</b>	<b>4.825.000</b>	<b>6.272.500</b>

Several donors **pledged funding** either in the form of funding to the core fund (untied funding) or funding of country level evaluations. A total of EUR 1,820,000 was pledged to the core fund, not taking into account the commitments yet to be specified. Hence pledges amounted to approximately 70% of the budgeted amount. Furthermore, funding of at least 12 country level evaluations (Japan to determine number off studies they will fund) was pledged. The donor HQ studies are self-financed. See funding details in Table 2 below.

<sup>4</sup> These donor HQ studies will be carried-out to complement the donor HQ studies already undertaken during the PD evaluation phase I.

**Table 2 Pledged funding**

Countries	Core funding (Euro)	Funding for Evaluation Secretariat (Euro)	Funding of country level evaluations (# of studies)	Funding of Donor HQ studies (# of studies)	Comment
Australia	TBS		1		Australia might also contribute core funding
Belgium	100,000			1	
Canada	TBS		2		Canada will also contribute core funding
Denmark	200,000				
Finland			2		
France	TBS				France will contribute core funding
Germany	350,000		1		
Japan			TBS		Japan might fund some country level evaluations
Netherlands		740,000			
New Zealand	TBS		TBS		New Zealand will contribute with funding
Norway	TBS				If needed, Norway will contribute with core funding
Spain	TBS		2		Spain will contribute core funding
Sweden	500,000			1	SADEV <sup>5</sup> will contribute evaluation of Sweden HQ study
Switzerland			2		1-2 country level evaluations will be funded as a minimum
UK	670,000				Pledging amount: 600,000 GBP
US			2	1	The US will either fund 2 country level evaluations or 1 country study and contribution to core fund
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,820,000</b>	<b>740,000</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	The core funding total is conservative given that many donors are yet to specify amount

Note: TBS= to be specified

It was agreed that contribution to the core fund is the preferred modality in order to allow for maximum flexibility. However, donors which are pledging funds for country level evaluations should also consider providing technical support to these studies.

The Evaluation Secretariat will contact major donors/agencies not represented during the Auckland IRG meeting to solicit their engagement in the PD evaluation phase II.

<sup>5</sup> Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation

## 6. Next steps

In terms of next steps the **timeline** outlined in the approach paper was retained as presented with only two adaptations: (i) cancelling of the international reference group meeting end-April to discuss TOR for the core team (commenting/validation will be done in writing instead); and (ii) scheduling a meeting of the international reference group for late 2009 to discuss and validate the general country study TOR as well as to discuss progress of the evaluation.

In terms of immediate deadlines the revised approach paper will be circulated for (substantive) comments in March 2009. Further it was communicated that the deadline for commitments to engage in country study work is end-April 2009. See revised timeline below in Table 3.

**Table 3      Timeline for PD evaluation phase II**

DATE	ACTIVITY
<b>2009</b>	
March	Auckland report to MG and IRG
	Revised Approach Paper to MG → IRG
	1st draft TOR for core team to MG → IRG
April	Prepare 2nd draft TOR for core team to MG → IRG
Mid-May	Approval of TOR by written procedure
May – August	Tendering and contracting of the Core Team.
End-September	Core Team in place and operational.
October	Finalization of generic TOR for country level evaluations
	Forming of national reference groups
October – November	Regional workshops to discuss generic TOR and initiate development of country-specific TOR.
Early-December	IRG meeting to discuss evaluation progress, to validate generic country study TOR, and to discuss country-specific TOR
<b>2010</b>	
January – October	Conduct of evaluation country-level evaluations and possible supplementary studies
December	IRG meeting on Emerging Findings
<b>2011</b>	
January	Finalized detailed dissemination and communication plan
January – April	Preparation of draft Synthesis report
April	Reference Group Meeting to comment on draft Syntheses report
April – May	Finalize Synthesis report and feeding into preparations for 4thHLF
September/October	4th High-Level Forum
June - December	Dissemination activities (workshops, discussions, interviews, wide distribution of Synthesis Report and Summary).

ooooooooooooOoooooooooooo

**Evaluation of the Paris Declaration  
Phase II  
Reference Group meeting  
11 – 13 February 2008  
Millennium Copthorne Harbour City Hotel,  
Auckland, New Zealand**

11 February		<b>AGENDA</b>	Facilitator/Chair
08:30	09:00	<b>Registration</b>	
09:00	09:30	<b>Opening, Presentation of purpose and programme</b>	Penny Hawkins
09:30	10:00	<b>Brief overview of Phase I results and utilization</b> Ted Kliest and Helen Wedgwood will provide a brief overview of the salient findings and of the utilization of the first phase evaluation report.	Penny Hawkins
10:00	10:30	<b>Phase II - Grand Picture</b> Niels Dabelstein will present the proposed "architecture" of the overall evaluation of the PD with focus on phase II.	Penny Hawkins
10:30	11:00	<b>Coffee/tea</b>	
11:00	11:30	<b>Presentation of Approach</b> John Eriksson will present the general approach of the phase II evaluation followed by a Q & A session.	Ted Kliest
11:30	12:00	<b>Q &amp; A, discussion</b>	Ted Kliest
12:00	13:00	<b>LUNCH</b>	
13:00	13:30	<b>Key design issues for Phase 2</b> Elliot Stern will identify some key evaluation design issues including: the need to choose among many different evaluation priorities and selecting the most important evaluation questions.	Niels Dabelstein
13:30	15:00	<b>Discussion on Key issues – in groups</b> Discussion should focus on 1) the key evaluation questions and 2) propositions to be covered in the evaluation.	
15:00	15:30	<b>Coffee/tea</b>	
15:30	16:00	<b>Reporting back on ppt or flipchart</b>	Ted Kliest
16:00	17:30	<b>Plenary Discussion</b> Overall approach, key questions and country focus.	Niels Dabelstein
18:00	20:00	<b>Cocktails</b>	

<b>Evaluation of the Paris Declaration Phase II Reference Group meeting 11 – 13 February 2008</b>			
12 February		<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>Facilitator/Chair</b>
09:00	09:15	<b>Recap of day 1</b>	<b>Niels Dabelstein</b>
09:15	10:15	<b>Organizing country studies, experience from Phase I</b> In this session colleagues from Bangladesh and Uganda will present their experiences from Phase I: - The National Reference Group – who participated, did it work well, what were problematic issues (if any) - Selection of evaluators – who contracted the evaluators? strengths and weaknesses of the (tender) process. - Conduct of the country studies – strengths and weaknesses.	<b>Gamiliel Mungambe</b>
10:15	10:45	<b>Evaluation Methodology</b> Elliot Stern and John Eriksson will introduce methodological issues including: choosing suitable methods; information collection and quality of data; having a balanced sample of countries and sectors; interpreting results and why attribution matters; using evaluation findings to improve policy making; and remaining consistent with 'partnership' ways of working.	<b>Gamiliel Mungambe</b>
10:45	11:15	<b>Coffee/tea</b>	
11:15	12:30	<b>Methodology; discussion in Groups</b> Among topics to be discussed are 1) criteria for country "selection/participation, 2) making use of national, regional and international resources (expertise) and information sources; 3) how (national) 'partnership' reference groups can improve utility and utilization of the evaluation results.	
12:30	13:30	<b>LUNCH</b>	
13:30	14:30	<b>Reporting Back: Methodology discussion</b>	<b>Ted Kliest</b>
14:30	14:45	<b>Topics for Supplementary Studies</b> The Approach Paper suggests several studies and additional topics may have been identified in previous sessions. (John Eriksson)	<b>Niels Dabelstein</b>
14:45	15:30	<b>Prioritizing Thematic topics - groups at round tables</b> Each group is expected to identify and justify a maximum of 3 studies of high priority.	
15:30	16:00	<b>Coffee/tea</b>	
16:00	17:30	<b>Plenary Discussion</b> Presentation of timeline and discussion of overall approach, the balance between evaluation components: e.g. country studies, cross country studies, donor studies, thematic studies; a balanced sample of countries and donors/agencies	<b>Niels Dabelstein</b>

<b>Evaluation of the Paris Declaration Phase II Reference Group meeting 11 – 13 February 2008</b>			
13 February		<b>AGENDA</b>	Facilitator/Chair
08:30	08:45	Recap of day 2	Niels Dabelstein
08:45	10:00	<b>Overall Governance structure: International Reference Group, National Ref. Groups, Management Group: membership and mandates</b> T. Kliest will present the suggested governance structure based on the positive experiences from Phase I. This session will discuss and agree on overall governance structure for Phase II. ( <i>See Approach Paper section IV. A</i> )	Penny Hawkins
10:00	10:30	Coffee/tea	
10:30	11:00	<b>Constitution of IRG and MG</b> This session will agree on criteria for membership of the International Reference Group and appoint members of the Evaluation Management Group.	Hans Lundgren
11:00	11:30	<b>Budget, funding modalities and pledging</b> Niels Dabelstein will present the preliminary budget and different funding modalities; members of the International Reference Group are requested to pledge funding/resources for Phase II. ( <i>See Approach Paper section IV.G</i> )	Niels Dabelstein
11:30	12:00	<b>Next steps</b> Niels Dabelstein will summarize the key issues coming out of the workshop and outline the next steps	
12:00	12:30	Close of Meeting	Penny Hawkins
12:30	13:30	LUNCH	
Afternoon		Sightseeing trip (optional)	NZAID & C.I.

**Evaluation of the Paris Declaration  
4<sup>th</sup> Reference Group Meeting  
Workshop on Phase II  
11 – 13 February 2009  
Millennium Copthorne Hotel, Auckland**

<b>Australia</b>	
Mr. Peter Versegi Office of Development Effectiveness Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) GPO Box 887 ACT 2601 Canberra, Australia	<a href="mailto:peter.versegi@ausaid.gov.au">peter.versegi@ausaid.gov.au</a>
Ms. Virginia Sprague Office of Development Effectiveness Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) GPO Box 887 ACT 2601 Canberra, Australia	<a href="mailto:virginia.sprague@ausaid.gov.au">virginia.sprague@ausaid.gov.au</a>

<b>Bangladesh</b>	
Mr. Muhammad Musharraf Hossain Bhuiyan Secretary Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance, Govt. of Bangladesh Sher-e-Bangla Nagar Dhaka-1207 Bangladesh	<a href="mailto:secy_erd@bangla.net">secy_erd@bangla.net</a>  Tel+880-2-8112641 Fax.+880-2-8113088
Mr. Monowar Ahmed JCS Coordination Officer (Deputy Secretary) PRS-HAP Cell, Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance, Govt. of Bangladesh Sher-e-Bangla Nagar Dhaka-1207 Bangladesh	<a href="mailto:ahmedmonowar@hotmail.com">ahmedmonowar@hotmail.com</a>  Tel. +880-1-711522543 Fax. +880-2-8113088

<b>Belgium</b>	
Mr. Dominique Decrombrugghe Special Evaluator Special Evaluation Office - S0.4 Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Coop.n Rue des Petits Carmes, 15 B - 1000 Brussels Belgium	<a href="mailto:dominique.decrombrugghe@diplobel.fed.be">dominique.decrombrugghe@diplobel.fed.be</a>  +32 (2) 501.36.06
<b>Benin</b>	
Mme Justine Odjoubé Coordinatrice for Observatoire du Changement Social i Bénin, Ministère d'Etat Chargé de la Prospective, du Développement et de l'Evaluation de l'Action Publique Cotonou Bénin	<a href="mailto:ocsbenin@ymail.com">ocsbenin@ymail.com</a>  Tel. (Bureau): +229 21 32 78 06 / +229 21 32 79 42 Tel. (mobil): +229 90 92 62 31
<b>Bolivia</b>	
Ms. Corali Cusilayme Ramirez Manager Of The Financing Unit Vice ministry of Public Investment and External Financing Ministry of Planning and Development Mariscal Santa Cruz Avenue, Comunications palace, 11 th. Floor La Paz Bolivia	<a href="mailto:ccusilayme@vipfe.gov.bo">ccusilayme@vipfe.gov.bo</a>  <a href="mailto:cchochala@hotmail.com">cchochala@hotmail.com</a>  tel. +591 231 7424 (1134) +591 707 88 252
Ms. Ana Elizabeth Acarrunz Aarcon Muñoz Financial Analyst Vice ministry of Public Investment and External Financing Ministry of Planning and Development Mariscal Santa Cruz Avenue, Comunications palace, 11 th. Floor La Paz, Bolivia	<a href="mailto:EAscarrunz@vipfe.gov.bo">EAscarrunz@vipfe.gov.bo</a> <a href="mailto:aascarrunz2005@yahoo.com">aascarrunz2005@yahoo.com</a>  Tel. +591 231 7472 (1138) +591 706 89 387

<b>Cambodja</b>	
Mr. Chhieng Yanara Secretary General Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board (CRDB) Council for the Development of Cambodia (CDC) Palais du Gouvernement, Sisowath Quay Phnom Penh Cambodia	<a href="mailto:chhieng.yanara@crdb.gov.kh">chhieng.yanara@crdb.gov.kh</a>  + 855 12 812 301
Mr. Philip Courtnadge Senior Adviser Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board (CRDB) UNDP Council for the Development of Cambodia Government Palace Sisowath Quay Phnom Penh Cambodia	<a href="mailto:philip.courtnadge@undp.org">philip.courtnadge@undp.org</a> <a href="mailto:Philip.courtnadge@crdb.gov.kh">Philip.courtnadge@crdb.gov.kh</a>  Tel.: +855 (0)16 818 507 Fax: +855 (0)23 981 161
<b>Cameroon</b>	
Mr. Bertin Tadjieufouet Youwo Chargé d'Etudes Déclaration de Paris Secrétariat Général Ministère des Finances Yaoundé CAMEROUN	<a href="mailto:tyouwo@yahoo.fr">tyouwo@yahoo.fr</a>  + ( 237) 99 64 21 56/ 79 83 05 32
<b>Canada</b>	
Mr. Goberdhan Singh Director of Evaluation, Evaluation Division Strategic Policy and Performance Branch (SPPB) Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) 200 Promenade du Portage (Québec) K1A 0G4 Canada	<a href="mailto:goberdhan.singh@acdi-cida.gc.ca">goberdhan.singh@acdi-cida.gc.ca</a>  Tel: + (1) 819 997 1176 Fax: + (1) 819 953 9130

<b>Colombia</b>	
Mr. Juan Sebastián Estrada Escobar Asesor Dirección de Cooperación Internacional Agencia Presidencial para la Acción Social la Cooperación Internacional Colombia	<a href="mailto:jestrada@accionsocial.gov.co">jestrada@accionsocial.gov.co</a>

<b>Cook Islands</b>	
Mr. Jim Armistead Senior Research and Policy Officer, Aid Management Division, Ministry of Finance and Economic Management, PO Box 3195, Rarotonga COOK ISLANDS	<a href="mailto:jim.armistead@project-aid.gov.ck">jim.armistead@project-aid.gov.ck</a>

<b>Denmark</b>	
Mr. Niels Dabelstein Danish Institute for International Studies 56, Strandgade DK-1401 Copenhagen K Denmark	<a href="mailto:nda@diis.dk">nda@diis.dk</a>  +45 32 69 89 43 +45 25 37 56 62  Co-Chair of the Reference Group for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration

<b>France</b>	
M. Benoit Chervalier Chef, Unité Évaluation des activités de développement DGTPÉ Service des Affaires, multilaterales et development Direction Générale du Trésor et de la Politique Économique Télédoc 621 139 rue de Bercy 75572 Paris Cedex 12 France	<a href="mailto:benoit.chervalier@dgtpé.fr">benoit.chervalier@dgtpé.fr</a>  Tel.: + (33) 1 44 87 73 06 Fax: + (33) 1 44 87 71 70

<b>Germany</b>	
Dr. Frank Schwarzbeck Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development Dahlmannstr. 4 53113 Bonn Germany	<a href="mailto:Frank.Schwarzbeck@bmz.bund.de">Frank.Schwarzbeck@bmz.bund.de</a>  Tel. +49 228 99 53 53 643

<b>Indonesia</b>	
Mr. Widjanarko Soebadhi Director for Evaluation Accounting and Settlement Ministry of Finance 10710 Jakarta Indonesia	<a href="mailto:wjnk@yahoo.com">wjnk@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:widjanarko@dmo.or.id">widjanarko@dmo.or.id</a> + 62-21-3864778/62-21-3510711/62-21- 3510713/62-21-3449230 Int-5647 Fax +62-21-3843712 +62-81318027135

<b>Japan</b>	
Mr. Seizaburo Fujisawa Official Evaluation Division International Cooperation Bureau Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2-2-1 Kasumigaseki Chiyoda-ku Tokyo 10+0 - 8919 Japan	<a href="mailto:seizaburo.fujisawa@mofa.go.jp">seizaburo.fujisawa@mofa.go.jp</a>  Tel: (81) 3-3580-3311 ext. (3226)
Mr. Tatsuhiro MITAMURA Development Partnership Division Operations Strategy Department JICA Shinjuku Maynds Tower Bldg. 12F, 2-1-1 Yoyogi, Shibuya-ku Tokyo 151-8558, JAPAN	<a href="mailto:Mitamura.Tatsuhiro@jica.go.jp">Mitamura.Tatsuhiro@jica.go.jp</a>  Telephone: 81-3-5323-5115

<b>Kyrgyz Republic</b>	
Mr. Sultan Akhmatov Head of the Aid Strategy Department Ministry of Economic Development and Trade Government of the Kyrgyz Republic	<a href="mailto:Asm2010@gmail.com">Asm2010@gmail.com</a>

<b>Malawi</b>	
Ms. Naomi Ngwira Director , Debt and Aid Management Division Ministry of Finance P. O. Box 30049 Lilongwe Malawi	<a href="mailto:naomingwira@yahoo.com">naomingwira@yahoo.com</a>  +265 9 48 9494 +265 1 789 355 +265 1 789 056

<b>Mali</b>	
Mr. Modibo M. MAKALOU Coordinateur/Mission de Développement et Coopération Development and Cooperation Initiative (DACI) Présidence de la République B.P.10 Koulouba, Mali	<a href="mailto:mmakalou@mdc.pr.ml">mmakalou@mdc.pr.ml</a> <a href="mailto:mmakalou@cefib.com">mmakalou@cefib.com</a>

<b>Mozambique</b>	
Mr. Gamiliel Munguambe Director Studies, Planning and Information Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation Av 10 de Novembro no 620 Maputo Mozambique	<a href="mailto:gm.ddepi@minec.gov.mz">gm.ddepi@minec.gov.mz</a>

<b>New Zealand</b>	
<p>Ms. Penny Hawkins  Head of Evaluation  Strategy, Advisory and Evaluation Group  New Zealand Agency for International  Development  195 Lambton Quay  Private Bag 18-901  Wellington  New Zealand</p>	<p><a href="mailto:penny.hawkins@nzaid.govt.nz">penny.hawkins@nzaid.govt.nz</a></p> <p>Tel: +6444398149  Fax: +6444398513</p>
<p>Mr. Andrew Kibblewhite  Evaluation Advisor  Strategy, Advisory and Evaluation Group  New Zealand Agency for International  Development  195 Lambton Quay  Private Bag 18-901  Wellington  New Zealand</p>	<p><a href="mailto:andrew.kibblewhite@nzaid.govt.nz">andrew.kibblewhite@nzaid.govt.nz</a></p>
<p>Miranda Cahn  Evaluation Advisor  Strategy, Advisory and Evaluation Group  New Zealand Agency for International  Development  195 Lambton Quay  Private Bag 18-901  Wellington  New Zealand</p>	<p><a href="mailto:Miranda/cahn@nzaid.govt.nz">Miranda/cahn@nzaid.govt.nz</a></p>
<p>Ginny Chapman  Development Programme Officer  Pacific Group  New Zealand Agency for International  Development  195 Lambton Quay  Private Bag 18-901  Wellington  New Zealand</p>	<p><a href="mailto:Ginny.chapman@nzaid.govt.nz">Ginny.chapman@nzaid.govt.nz</a></p>

<b>Norway</b>	
<p>Mr. Hans Peter Melby  Norwegian Agency for development  Cooperation – NORAD  PO Box 8034 Dep.  NO-0030 Oslo0  Norway</p>	<p><a href="mailto:hans.melby@norad.no">hans.melby@norad.no</a></p> <p>+47 22 24 20 81</p>

<b>Papua New Guinea</b>	
Mr. Reichert Thanda PNG Assistant Secretary (UN,EU), Foreign Aid Divison, PAPUA NEW GUINEA	<a href="mailto:reichert_thanda@planning.gov.pg">reichert_thanda@planning.gov.pg</a>

<b>Samoa</b>	
Ms. Noumea Simi ACEO, Aid Coordination Unit Ministry of Finance SAMOA	<a href="mailto:noumea.simi@mof.gov.ws">noumea.simi@mof.gov.ws</a>  Ph 685 22042 Fax 685 21312

<b>Senegal</b>	
Mr. Amadou Tidiane Dia Expert chargé de l'Absorption et de la Mobilisation des ressources et du suivi de la Déclaration de Paris Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances Immeuble Peytavin 1er étage porte D, Rue Carde Dakar, Senegal	<a href="mailto:atdia@yahoo.com">atdia@yahoo.com</a>  221 33 889 21 66 221 33 822 41 95 221 77 556 01 43

<b>Spain</b>	
Mr. Carlos Rodríguez-Ariza Policy Analyst Evaluation Division Directorate General of Development Policy Planning and Evaluation Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation	<a href="mailto:colaboradores.cra@maec.es">colaboradores.cra@maec.es</a>  Tel: (34) 91.394. 87.74 Fax: (34) 91.431.17.85

<b>Sweden</b>	
Mr. Joakim Molander Director Department for Evaluation SIDA SE-105 25 Stockholm Sweden	<a href="mailto:Joakim.Molander@sida.se">Joakim.Molander@sida.se</a>  Phone: +46-8-698 5440 Fax: +46-8-698 5643
Ms. Gunilla Törnqvist Director General Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation (SADEV) Box 1902, 651 19 Karlstad SWEDEN	<a href="mailto:gunilla.tornqvist@sadev.se">gunilla.tornqvist@sadev.se</a>  +46 54 10 37 24 (phone) +46 54 10 37 01 (fax)
Ms. Viktoria Hildenwall Senior Evaluation Officer	<a href="mailto:viktoria.hildenwall@sadev.se">viktoria.hildenwall@sadev.se</a>

Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation (SADEV) Box 1902, 651 19 Karlstad SWEDEN	+46 54 10 37 28 (phone) +46 54 10 37 01 (fax)
--	--

<b>Switzerland</b>	
Mr. Gerhard Siegfried Head, Evaluation & Controlling Unit Direction du Développement et de la Coopération Département fédéral des affaires étrangères Freiburgstr. 130 CH-3003 Berne Switzerland	<a href="mailto:Gerhard.Siegfried@deza.admin.ch">Gerhard.Siegfried@deza.admin.ch</a>  Tel: + (41) 31 325 92 58 Fax: + (41) 31 323 08 49

<b>The Netherlands</b>	
Mr. Bram van Ojik, Director, Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB), P.O. Box 20061, 2500 EB The Hague, The Netherlands.	<a href="mailto:bram-van.ojik@minbuza.nl">bram-van.ojik@minbuza.nl</a>
Mr. Ted Kliet Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs P.O. Box 20061 2500 EB The Hague The Netherlands	<a href="mailto:tj.kliet@minbuza.nl">tj.kliet@minbuza.nl</a>  Phone: + 31 70 3486201 Fax: + 31 70 3486336

<b>Uganda</b>	
Mr. Pius Bigirimana Permanent Secretary Office of the Prime Minister 6th Floor, Postel Building Plots 67-75 Yusuf Lule Road P. O. Box 341, KAMPALA Uganda	<a href="mailto:piusbigman@yahoo.com">piusbigman@yahoo.com</a>
Mr. Timothy Lubanga Ag. Assistant Commissioner Monitoring and Evaluation National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (NIMES) Office of the Prime Minister P. O. Box 341, Kampala Uganda	<a href="mailto:tlubanga@opm.go.ug">tlubanga@opm.go.ug</a> <a href="mailto:tklubanga@yahoo.co.uk">tklubanga@yahoo.co.uk</a> Tel: 256 (0)312264517, (0)414233968 Mob. 256 (0) 772451852

<b>UK</b>	
Ms. Helen Wedgwood Deputy Head, Evaluation Dept Department for International Development, DFID Abercrombie House Eaglesham Road, East Kilbride Glasgow G75 8EA UK	<a href="mailto:H-Wedgwood@dfid.gov.uk">H-Wedgwood@dfid.gov.uk</a>  Tel: 00 44 (0)1355 84 3714

<b>USA</b>	
Mr. Peter B. Davis Coordinator, Planning, Performance Management, Monitoring and Evaluation Office of Director of US Foreign Assistance Department of State/USAID 2201 C Street NW, Washington DC 20520, USA	<a href="mailto:DavisPB@state.gov">DavisPB@state.gov</a>  +1 202 647 2798 (phone) +1 202 647 2813 (fax)
Mr. Steven Piers Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Chief Operating Officer, USAID, 1300 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington DC 20523, USA	<a href="mailto:spierce@usaid.gov">spierce@usaid.gov</a>  +1 202 712 1097 (phone) +1 301 646 6157 (mob)

<b>Vietnam</b>	
Mr. Cao Manh Cuong Deputy Director General Ministry of Planning and Investment 2 Hoang Van Thu St. Ba Dinh District Hanoi, Viet Nam	<a href="mailto:cmanhcuong@yahoo.com">cmanhcuong@yahoo.com</a>  tel. +84 4 37 333 000

<b>Civil society: Reality of Aid</b>	
Ms. Margarita Gomez Reality of Aid/Ibon IBON Center 114 Timog Ave Quezon City 1103 Philippines Philippines	<a href="mailto:maita_gomez100@yahoo.com">maita_gomez100@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:mgomez@ibon.org">mgomez@ibon.org</a>  tel. +632 927 7060 – 61 – 62 Fax. +632 927 6981

<b>Civil society: CONCORD/CDI</b>	
Mr. David Culverhouse Executive Director Council for International Development Te Kaunihera mo te Whakapakari Ao Whanui o Aotearoa 2nd Floor, James Smith Building, cnr Cuba & Manners St. PO Box 24 228, Wellington 6142, New Zealand	<a href="mailto:david@cid.org.nz">david@cid.org.nz</a>

<b>Global Environment Facility</b>	
Mr. Rob D. Van Den Berg Director, Evaluation Office, Global Environment Facility, Mail stop: G 7-7-4 – 1818 H Street NW – Washington DC 20433 USA	<a href="mailto:rvandenberg@thegef.org">rvandenberg@thegef.org</a>  tel. +1 202 473 6078

<b>OECD/DAC</b>	
Mr. Hans Lundgren Head of section, Evaluation Peer Review and Evaluation Division Development Co-operation Directorate , OECD, 2 rue Andre-Pascal 75775 Paris Cedex 16 France	<a href="mailto:Hans.LUNDGREN@oecd.org">Hans.LUNDGREN@oecd.org</a>  Tel: +33 1 45 24 90 59
Ms. Anna Hellstrom Administrator/ Policy Analyst Development Co-operation Directorate OECD, 2 rue Andre-Pascal 75775 Paris Cedex 16 France	<a href="mailto:Anna.HELLSTROM@oecd.org">Anna.HELLSTROM@oecd.org</a>  Tel: +33 1 45 24 96 68

<b>Consultants</b>	
Mr. John R. Eriksson Development Evaluation Consulting, LLC. 10811 Margate Rd. Silver Spring, Maryland 20901-1615 USA	<a href="mailto:johneriks@gmail.com">johneriks@gmail.com</a>  USA 1-301-681-6968,
Ms. Rikke Ingrid Jensen Senior Consultant Development Advice & Production ApS Blaagaards Plads 1 2200 Copenhagen Denmark	<a href="mailto:rij@dapro.org">rij@dapro.org</a>  Tel: +45 35 34 19 15 Cel: +45 29 36 76 44 Fax: +45 33 25 28 35
Ms. Katarina Kotoglou Economic Policy Oxford Policy Management 6 St Aldates Courtyard 38 St Aldates Oxford OX1 1BN, UK	<a href="mailto:katarina.kotoglou@opml.co.uk">katarina.kotoglou@opml.co.uk</a>  T +44 (0) 1865 207 308 F +44 (0) 1865 250 580
Dr. Elliot Stern Courtyard Flat 41 Royal York Crescent Bristol BS8 4JS UK	<a href="mailto:crofters@clara.net">crofters@clara.net</a>



## Annex 3 Assessment of evaluation propositions

### Country Ownership and Poverty Reduction

1. The Paris Declaration, by addressing inequalities of power between donors and recipients of aid, makes recipient country governments more able to exercise leadership in planning and delivering policies to reduce poverty.

2. Developing countries are more likely to respond to incentives and 'conditions' to improve policy-making and aid effectiveness if they are linked to poverty reduction goals that are nationally determined.

3. Ownership if it rests on effective political leadership, an agreed and supported national development plan, cross-government (ministry) coordination and better budgetary systems will make it more likely that aid will be directed to development-related priorities including poverty reduction.

4. Consulting and involving national development actors including Parliaments, NGOs working with the poor and marginalized groups and the private sectors, will lead to plans for poverty reduction that are relevant to country needs and more sustainable.

→ *Assessment: propositions 1, 3 and 4 were found to be relevant by all participants although proposition 1 were found to be in need of reformulation to better reflect context issues (aid dependency, etc). Also, the underlying assumption that PD balances power inequalities was questioned. Only one group found proposition 2 most important while others found that proposition 2 was lacking in clarity*

### Propositions about Donor Harmonization and Alignment

5. The extent to which donors are willing to harmonize among themselves will depend on the extent that they share development objectives which are not overshadowed by other commercial or political objectives incompatible with development needs.

6. The willingness and ability of donors to align with country systems will depend on the extent to which a) they trust these systems and b) are able to manage risk while these systems are tested and improved and c) are able to negotiate their own domestic accountability requirements to match developing country circumstances.

7. Suitable organization of aid agencies (front-line staff skills, local autonomy, and discretion to local actors) and their influence with their national governments will determine their ability to deliver Paris Declaration commitments and promote policy learning among donor governments.

8. Mutual accountability will lead to enhanced learning among donors about how better to lower barriers to development resulting from their own policies which should lead to improvements in development outcomes.

9. If harmonization leads to a sensible division of labor among donors and lower transaction costs for Partner countries then the latter will be able to spend more resources for direct poverty reduction and development purposes rather than on aid management.

→ *Assessment: proposition 6 and 9 were identified as important by all groups. Proposition 8 was found in need of clarification/reformulation by several groups; in particular the reciprocity aspect needs addressing. Proposition 5 was found to be too simplistic by one group, not taking into account personal interests/capacities of donor staff. Proposition 7 was found to be lacking the partner country side.*

### **Propositions about Contribution to Wider development Goals**

10. Managing for development results will create a focused and clearer analysis of development needs and how to pursue them in a particular country context.

11. If ownership translates into improved capacity in budgeting and planning this will spill-over into other development related government decision-making with positive effects quite apart from reductions in transaction costs.

12. The Paris Declaration should also increase capacities of policy coordination and policy coherence which will then also spill-over to the benefit of broader development goals.

13. Aid that directly supports trade preparedness, facilitates the redeployment of resources, the acquisition of relevant technologies etc will make a direct contribution to growth and indirectly to development outcomes in broad terms (including, basic services, human development, equal rights etc.)

14. Institutional developments that support innovation and economic growth through the private sector will be more likely if the extremes of social inequality are reduced

→ *Assessment: the propositions of this section were found to be generally weaker. Nonetheless two groups found proposition 10 important although the proposition was in need of clarification to define development needs and to focus on where aid could make a difference. Proposition 12 was also found relevant by several groups but again reformulation was suggested in the form of merging proposition 11 with proposition 12 (while highlighting donor capacity to reform/change). Also proposition 12 should address 'enhanced' and not 'increased' capacities. For proposition 13 the issue of trade was found to be beyond the remit of this evaluation.*

### **Propositions about Improving Governance and Reducing Fragility**

15. Increases in public services that address the needs of the poor will increase the legitimacy of governments thus reducing fragility of States.

16. Improvements in the effectiveness of governments (e.g. through budgeting, policy making, planning, stakeholder consultation, policy coordination and policy coherence) will gradually strengthen governance more generally thus reducing aspects of State fragility.

17. Greater social inclusion, government effectiveness and State legitimacy will make it more likely that a virtuous cycle of poverty reduction and improvements in governance will occur.

→ *Assessment: the propositions in this group were found to be generally less important. Furthermore, one group proposed to merge the three propositions into one including also other dimensions such as environmental issues.*

### **Propositions about Capacity Development and Mutual Accountability**

18. Capacity development will follow from practical experience of implementing the Declaration principles and commitments (learning by doing) if supported by an effective partnership relationship with committed donors.

19. Mutual accountability in its broader sense that includes accountability to stakeholders, parliaments and civil society – and when combined with transparency/information flows – will provide positive feedback, reinforcement and increase the likelihood that development policies will be sustainable.

20. International mutual accountability (e.g. between donors and the recipients of aid) will be strengthened by more inclusive in-country accountabilities which requires capacity development for other development actors.

21. Partnership arrangements promoted by the Paris Declaration – including policy-dialogue, open exchange of information, joint reviews and assessment mechanisms, as well as joint problem solving – will lead to greater trust and confidence in governments to innovate.

→ *Assessment: proposition 19 was found to be the most important proposition by several groups. One group found proposition 18 irrelevant/wrong. Furthermore, it was found that the linkages between proposition groups 1 (ownership) and 5 (capacity development and mutual accountability) should be strengthened. Also, further attention should be given to endogenous factors.*

## **Annex 4 Workshop presentations**

The PPT presentations can be downloaded from:

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork>