

## EVALUATION OF THE PARIS DECLARATION PHASE 2

### Progress report presented to the International Reference Group at its 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, Paris, 30 November – 1 December 2009

As indicated in the table below all planned activities related to Phase 2 have been completed on schedule except formation of National Reference Groups. Several countries which participated in Phase 1 have established or reactivated National Reference Groups. New countries are in the process of doing so following the Regional Workshops.

Timeline for PD Evaluation Phase 2 as agreed at the 1<sup>st</sup> IRG

2009		Status
February 11-13	1 <sup>st</sup> Meeting of the International Reference Group (Auckland Workshop)	✓
March	Auckland Workshop report to MG and IRG	✓
	2 <sup>nd</sup> draft Approach Paper to IRG	✓
April	3 <sup>rd</sup> draft Approach Paper to MG → IRG	✓
	Prepare draft TOR for core team to MG → IRG	✓
Mid-May	IRG Approval of AP and TOR by written procedure	✓
May – August	Tendering and contracting of the Core Team.	✓
End-September	Core Team in place and operational.	✓
	Forming of national reference groups	partial
October	Draft generic TOR for country level evaluations	✓
October – November	Four 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	✓

The Thematic Study on Developmental Effectiveness of Untying of Aid which was initiated during Phase 1 has been delayed, primarily due to unavoidable delays of country case studies in Burkina Faso, Ghana, PD Laos, South Africa, Vietnam and Zambia. The draft Synthesis report is now available for comments, and the Final report should be ready mid January 2010.

The PDE Secretariat commissioned a concept note on “Evaluating the Transaction Costs of Implementing the Paris Declaration”. Unfortunately the consultant delivered his report six weeks late and it has therefore had limited utility for preparing the revised draft Terms of Reference. It has, however, revealed that the theoretical concept of “Transaction Costs” needs to be adapted for use in this evaluation.

## Country Evaluations

At present the following countries have committed to conduct a country level evaluation. Cameroun is still uncertain. The individual country evaluations will be financed through a variety of channels. Regardless of funding mechanism procurement of national evaluation teams should be by national pocedures.

	<b>PDE Phase 2 Country studies</b>	<b>confirmed</b>	<b>Funding Partner</b>
1	Afghanistan	x	Finland
2	Bangladesh	x	Japan
3	Benin	x	Switzerland
4	Bolivia	x	Spain
5	Cambodia	x	Self
6	Cameroun	(x)	
7	Colombia	x	Self/US/Spain
8	Cook Islands	x	Trust Fund
9	Ghana	x	Canada
10	Indonesia	x	Trust Fund
11	Kyrgyz Republic	x	AsDB
12	Malawi	x	Trust Fund
13	Mali	x	Trust Fund
14	Mozambique	x	Finland
15	Nepal	x	AsDB
16	Philippines	x	self
17	Samoa	x	self
18	Senegal	x	Canada
19	South Africa	x	self
20	Sri Lanka	x	self
21	Uganda	x	Austria
22	Vietnam	x	Trust Fund
23	Zambia	x	Trust Fund

At present the following Donors and IFCs have committed to conduct donor/agency HQ evaluations:

	<b>PDE Phase 2 Donor/Agency HQ studies</b>	<b>confirmed</b>	<b>funding</b>
24	African Development Bank	x	self
25	Austria	x	self
26	Japan	x	self
27	Ireland	x	self
28	Spain	x	self
29	Sweden	x	self
30	US	x	self

## Budget

As of 25 November 2009 the total budget is € 5.875.000 ( app. US\$ 8.800.000 at to-day's rate). The only changes made since the original budget of March 2009 is adjustment of cost on country and Donor/Agency HQ to reflect additional studies.

<b>PDE Phase 2 Budget</b>		
	<b>Euro</b>	<b>US \$ @ €1,50</b>
<b>Country Level Studies (23)</b>	<b>1.840.000</b>	<b>2.760.000</b>
<b>Donor/agency HQ Studies (7)</b>	<b>710.000</b>	<b>1.065.000</b>
<b>Reference Group meetings (4)</b>	<b>350.000</b>	<b>525.000</b>
<b>Management Group Meetings (8)</b>	<b>25.000</b>	<b>37.500</b>
<b>Regional workshops (8)</b>	<b>225.000</b>	<b>337.500</b>
<b>Core team</b>	<b>1.000.000</b>	<b>1.500.000</b>
<b>Special Studies</b>	<b>550.000</b>	<b>825.000</b>
<b>Dissemination</b>	<b>310.000</b>	<b>465.000</b>
<b>Secretariat DIIS</b>	<b>740.000</b>	<b>1.110.000</b>
<b>Contingencies</b>	<b>125.000</b>	<b>187.500</b>
<b>Total Estimated Cost</b>	<b>5.875.000</b>	<b>8.812.500</b>

Country and Donor/agency HQ studies are budgeted at a standard figure of € 80.000 each. This may vary as countries budget their studies over the next few months.

<b>PDE Phase 2 Contributions</b>	
	<b>Total (EURO)</b>
Austria	<b>80.000</b>
Australia*	<b>100.000</b>
Belgium	<b>70.000</b>
Cambodia	<b>80.000</b>
Canada	<b>260.000</b>
Denmark*	<b>200.000</b>
Finland*	<b>360.000</b>
France	<b>40.000</b>
Germany*	<b>490.000</b>
Ireland*	<b>160.000</b>
Japan	<b>160.000</b>
Luxemburg	<b>0</b>
Netherlands*	<b>740.000</b>
New Zealand	<b>45.000</b>
Norway	<b>60.000</b>
Philippines	<b>30.000</b>
Samoa	<b>80.000</b>
South Africa	<b>80.000</b>
Spain	<b>240.000</b>
Sri Lanka	<b>80.000</b>
Sweden*	<b>580.000</b>
Switzerland	<b>160.000</b>
UK*	<b>670.000</b>
US	<b>570.000</b>

AfDB	<b>80.000</b>
AsDB	<b>160.000</b>
EC	<b>0</b>
IDB	<b>0</b>
UNDP	<b>0</b>
World Bank	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5.575.000</b>
Budget	<b>5.875.000</b>
Shortfall	<b>300.000</b>

As can be seen, there is a shortfall of € 300.000. Depending on the number of languages in which documents and reports will be produced the budget for dissemination may be increased by app. 50% absorbing the contingency funds.

The shortfall may be covered in part by contributions from donors and agencies who have not yet pledged, in part by donors who have committed funds in 2009 but are unable to pledge further funding until next fiscal year. Ultimately there may be savings on the budget for special studies.

### **Governance**

The Approach Paper (para 106) states that

“The International Reference Group comprises 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 International Reference Group. 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 BACG (REALITY OF AID) representing “south” NGOs. The International Reference Group will be co-chaired by Sri Lanka and the Netherlands.”

Two governance issues need attention:

1. Mr. V. Sivagnanasothy, Sri Lanka, who ably co-chaired the IRG during Phase 1 has resigned due to national priorities, and Mr. Bram Van Ojik, the Netherlands has moved on to a new assignment.

The Management Group suggests that Mr. Joakim Molander, Head of Evaluation at SIDA and vice-chair of the DAC Evaluation Network replaces Mr. Van Ojik as Co-chair while Mr. Ted Kliest continues as the Netherlands representative in the Management Group

At the Asia-Pacific Regional Workshop Mr. Cao Manh Cuong, Vietnam was nominated to replace Mr. Sivagnanasothy in the Management Group. The IRG may wish to nominate a new Co-chair among the current members of the Management Group: Mr. Cuong, Vietnam, Ms. Ngwira, Malawi and Mr. Escobar, Colombia.

2. As is shown by the decision of the IRG formally only 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 International Reference Group.

Countries and organisations that do not contribute actively may participate in the International Reference Group as observers.