
Draft Feedback on Workshop Results

Core Evaluation Team

Opening

- Introductions
- Welcome by Hon. Fraser Nihorya stressing the commitment of Malawi to the process, with a detailed introduction to the workshop agenda and the process to follow. Stressed the importance of PD-type principles for the use of all public resources
- Word of appreciation to the Malawian hosts from the Evaluation Management Group representative
- Presentation of the Workshop Programme – with some adjustments and flexibility foreseen

Overview of the PD Phase 2 Evaluation – presented and discussed

Stress that Donors too are being evaluated

- Through performance on the ground
- Through Phase 1 and additional Donor/Agency HQ Evaluations
- With some linkages between country level and Donor HQ Evaluations

Trace and evaluate the roots of PD reforms before 2005. Consider the possibility that pre-2005 changes were most significant.

Workshop Objectives – presented and discussed

- First clarification re: “aid effectiveness” and “development results”
- Suggested to improve the diagram of the building blocks for Phase 2 evaluation
- Clarification of the role and use of supplementary studies

Presentation of Status Reports for Country Evaluation preparations

- Malawi, Zambia, Ghana, Uganda, Mozambique, South Africa, AfDB (for information)
- Mix of different stages of preparation and linkages to national strategic planning cycles
- Review of key deadlines and targets for completing preparation

Action: Countries to update PD2 Evaluation Secretariat with completed Status Reports in time for IRG Meeting of Nov 30th 2009

Practical guidance

Presentation by Uganda and South Africa on the experience of Phase 1 evaluations, with positive and cautionary lessons

South Africa

- Stressing the limited but still strategic place of aid in the special development challenges of South Africa

Uganda

- Stressing the pre-2005 roots of aid effectiveness work and the integration of these evaluations into normal work processes and strategic planning cycles

Presentation of Draft Generic TORs and Common Matrix: General points

- Give proper weight to external as well as internal forces
- Take account of “policy reform overload” of past 10 years and rapid change
- Be clear and focused on what context question is really after
- Clarify between aid efficiency, aid effectiveness and development results
- Recognise different weightings of different Core Questions and PD principles in various countries

Presentation of Draft Generic TORs and Common Matrix: General points (2)

- Reflect “compliers” and “non-compliers” among national stakeholders and donors, including the biggest
- Allow for prioritisation among different norms and select the most productive places to concentrate efforts
- Go as far as the evidence permits in tracing “plausible contributions”, if not “attributions”
- The general approach makes sense, is “doable” with tweaking, and the Matrix seems appropriate

Core Question 1: Context

- Simplify and sharpen the overall question, e.g.
 - “What are the factors that have shaped and limited Paris Declaration implementation and its potential effects on aid effectiveness and development results?” (Consider limiting to the 3/4/5 most important)
- a) Focus on context factors relevant to PD implementation and ensure analytical not descriptive treatment
- b) Rephrase: “What is the place of aid subject to PD principles among all sources of development finance and resources? What have been the trends from early roots to 2005 and since?”

Core Question 1: Context (2)

- c) Rephrase more directly: “Who are the key actors, in the country and among its development partners, who can take major decisions on aid and whether or not to implement the Paris Declaration and AAA commitments? What are their priorities and incentives?”
- d) Merged into c) above
- e) Unchanged
- f) State of implementation (may be covered by Core Question 2)

Core Question 2: Aid effectiveness

- Consider rephrasing 2: “Has the implementation of the PD led to an improvement in the efficiency of aid delivery and the management and use of aid?”
- Use the 11 “expected outcomes” as the main sub-questions (noting the need for greater clarity in some and the difficulty in measuring)
 - Build in, where applicable, assessments of changes in “transaction costs” (and benefits) and who carries them
 - Consider assessing changed activities, behaviour and relationships on each of the 11 outcomes

Core Question 2: Aid effectiveness (2)

- Treat capacity development outcomes mainly as development outcomes under Core Question 3
- Recognise the challenges of survey method here: finding good, balanced, adequately informed range of respondents
- Seek and/or cross-refer to relevant indicators where possible
- Unintended consequences, negative or positive: open-ended question

Core Question 3: Contribution to development results

- “Has the implementation of PD strengthened the contribution of aid to [sustainable] development results? How?”
- Note: the PD’s own expected effects
 - “Increase the impact of aid in:
 - 1.Reducing poverty
 - 2.Reducing inequality
 - 3.Increasing growth
 - 4.Building capacity
 - 5.Accelerating achievement of MDGs”
- Not expect directly attributable results but plausible contributions and informed discussion on causal linkages (seek clear impacts, numbers wherever possible)

Core Question 3: Contribution to development results (2)

Re-ordered and revised:

- a) “Were results in specific sectors enhanced through the application of the PD principles?” (Health and one other, “non-social” sector)
- b) “Did the implementation of the PD help countries to improve the prioritisation of the needs of the poorest people, including women and girls, and reduce social exclusion?” [possible supplementary study]
- c) New: “How has the mix of aid modalities (including general or sector-specific budget support) evolved and what have been the development results?”
- d) Unintended consequences, negative or positive: open-ended question
- e) Rephrase: “Has the PD enhanced ODA’s impact on achieving the goals of the national development strategy and the MDGs?”

Core Question 4: Different or alternative approaches

- Propose to eliminate separate question but integrate “counter-factuals” into Core Question 3 and the Conclusions

Proposed framework for Conclusions

1. To what extent has each of the 5 principles been observed and implemented? Why?
2. What has the Paris Declaration achieved for aid effectiveness and development results? How significant are these contributions? How sustainable?
3. What has Paris Declaration-style development cooperation added compared with the pre-PD situation and alongside other drivers of development in the country, other sources of development finance and other donors?
4. What are the key messages for a) national stakeholders, and b) donor countries and agencies?
5. What are the key implications for aid effectiveness in the future?

Feedback Points on Country Evaluation Process - Management

Core Evaluation Team

Putting Together an Effective Evaluation Team

- Composition: team size, mix of consultant experience (national/ regional/ international)
- (Indicative) allocation of days and elapsed time required to complete the Country Evaluation
- Key qualifications, skills and experience (essential and desirable) and weighting in selection
- Independence; conflicts of interest

Action: CET to develop and share (email to NEC) a Guidance Note on the above by November 23rd

National Evaluation Coordinator's role

- Expected to be Government appointed
- Key responsibilities: Ensure overall management and delivery, safeguarding the quality and integrity of the evaluation

Guidance on putting together National Reference Group

- Key considerations for determining optimal size and composition:
 - Broad and balanced representation of key players in development processes and aid management
 - Visibility and profile of the evaluation exercise – high level approval and formal launch of the Reference Group
 - Capability to advise the evaluation process and to comment on the quality, credibility and clarity of the report
 - Chairing models: (i) appointment of an independent, (ii) co-chairs (Govt & Donor/Agency), (iii) Government chair
- Idea: A separate or related working group to support the NEC on Evaluation Management

Managing Key Relationships for an Independent Country Evaluation

- National Evaluation Coordinator and National Reference Group
 - National Coordinator is the Executive Director/ or the Secretary/ likely to serve for the National Reference Group
- National Reference Group and the wider set of evaluation stakeholders
 - Responsible for ensuring an effective communication plan to the wider group of stakeholders
- Country Evaluation Team and Core Evaluation Team
 - To guard against compromising the independence of the Country Evaluation Team through getting directly involved

***Action:* CET to provide ‘organogram’ of reporting relationships**

Maintaining the Independence of the Country Evaluation

- National Evaluation Coordinator communicating and using the Quality Standards of the DAC (or National or Regional Standards if available) in managing the evaluation process
- Idea: Appointment of an Independent Chair for the National Reference Group
- Clear understanding that NRG review does not include changing findings or conclusions
- Proposal: ‘Sign off’ (not signing) by Minister level on the evaluation process and report can strengthen country ownership

Timing and Sequencing

- Distinction between ‘detailed design of the study’ and the ‘ToR’
- Generic ToR > Country specific ToR > Workplan (of which ToR form part) > Inception Report
Action: CET add “Inception Report” to Glossary
- Balancing utility and quality of the evaluation in finalising the timing and length of evaluation
- Not rushing - taking time to get the right team in place
Action: CET create a diagram to show sequencing within the evaluation process

Timing and Sequencing (2)

- Team leader (face to face) orientation once contracted – expect all TLs in place by latest March 2010
- Meetings (Feb/Mar) sub-regional or national will include TL, NEC and possibly other team members and NRG chair
- If a country wants to progress on a faster track, CET will – to extent possible – adjust support mechanisms to country requirements (e.g. Uganda)

Communication Plan: Country Evaluation

- Communicating the process of the evaluation
- Communicating the results of the evaluation; numbers, quotes and human stories which reflect/bring alive evaluation findings

Other issues arising

- Donor HQ study – partner country representation on reference groups
- Facilitating communication with Core Evaluation Team

Action: Countries to advise CET on their access to video conferencing facilities either within Government or with Donor partners