

December 11, 2009

Joint Evaluation of the Paris Declaration, Phase 2
Evaluation Framework and Work-plan

Contents

1. Overview	3
2. Evaluation Profile	4
Reasons for the Evaluation	4
Objectives	4
Audiences and Stakeholders	4
Approach	5
3. Approaches to Evaluation Methodology	7
Basis of the evaluation methodology	7
Principles to be adopted	8
The Evaluation Framework and core questions	8
Core components of the methodology	10
Anticipated methods	11
Ensuring comparability	12
Ensuring validity and reliability	12
4. Accountabilities and Responsibilities	13
International Reference Group	13
National Evaluation Coordinator	13
National Reference/Advisory Group	14
Country Evaluation Team	14
Donor/Agency Headquarters Evaluation Team	15
Core Evaluation Team	15
Evaluation Management Group and Secretariat	15
5. Work-plan and Schedule	17
Appendices	
Appendix A. The Overarching Evaluation Matrix for Phase 2	18
Appendix B. Generic ToR for Country Evaluations	(separate)
Appendix C. Generic ToR for Donor/Agency HQ Studies	(separate)
Appendix D. Illustrative Outline for Evaluation Synthesis Report	27
Appendix E. Two framework diagrams from preparatory studies	29

1. Overview

1. The Paris Declaration expresses a broad international consensus developed in the 15 years that preceded 2005. It stipulates that new partnership relationships and ways of working between developed countries and partner countries are essential if development results are to be assured, aid well spent and aid volumes maintained.

2. The Declaration¹ was endorsed at the 2nd High Level Forum held in Paris in 2005 by 52 donor and partner countries and 30 other actors in the development cooperation field (United Nations and other multilateral agencies and non-governmental organizations). It aims to strengthen “partnerships” between donor countries and countries receiving aid in order to make aid more effective and to maximize development results. The Declaration consists of 56 “Partnership Commitments” grouped under five overarching ‘principles’: *Ownership* by aid-receiving developing countries of their own development strategies and plans; *Alignment* of donors by using country systems and procedures in support of country plans; *Harmonization* of donor actions to minimize administrative burdens and transaction costs on partner countries; *Managing for Development Results* by partner countries and donors becoming focused on results and using results oriented information to improve decision-making; *Mutual Accountability*, such that both donors and partner countries take on a joint commitment to account both to their own constituents and publics and to each other for achieving development results.

3. In response to the Paris Declaration’s own explicit commitment to carry out an independent cross-country evaluation, as well as monitoring, it was decided to conduct a two-phase evaluation, commissioned and overseen by an International Reference Group. The Group comprises representatives of donors and multilateral agencies (chiefly members of the DAC Evaluation Network), partner countries and representatives of civil society. Day-to-day management of the evaluation is entrusted to a small Evaluation Management Group supported by an Evaluation Secretariat.

4. The evaluation complements the monitoring of the implementation of the Paris Declaration, undertaken through the Cluster D of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Working Party on Aid Effectiveness “Assessing Progress on Implementing the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action”.

5. The first phase of the evaluation² ran from March 2007 to September 2008 and aimed at providing information on the “HOWs and WHYs” of the implementation process of the Paris Declaration. It was designed to deliver practical lessons and help take stock of implementation performance at the 3rd High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness held in Accra, Ghana in September 2008. The emphasis of this phase was at the **input and output levels**, through a series of partner country, development partner³ headquarters, and thematic evaluations. These evaluations were of a formative nature, capturing the incremental and incidental behaviour changes associated with the Paris Declaration.

¹ The full Declaration can be found at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf>

² Wood, B; D. Kabell; F. Sagasti; N. Muwanga; Synthesis Report on the First Phase of the Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration, Copenhagen, July 2008. The report can be found at: http://www.diiis.dk/graphics/Subweb/paris_evaluation_web/index.htm.

³ By Development Partners is meant donors, multilateral agencies, International Finance Institutions and other organisations engaged in development assistance.

2. Evaluation Profile

Reasons for the Evaluation

6. The second phase of the evaluation will run from the 3rd High Level Forum in 2008 up to the 4th High Level Forum in Korea in 2011. This second phase will emphasize **outcomes and results** and offer answers to the critical policy question of whether the intended long-term effects of the Paris Declaration are being achieved. The evaluation's primary focus will be at the level of country evaluations that assess changes in the effectiveness of donors/agencies in the country as well as the country stakeholders, and of the partnerships between them. A number of headquarters-level donor/agency studies to complement the twelve conducted in Phase 1, and a small number of supplementary "studies" will also be carried out where essential to ensure adequate coverage of important issues. Together, these elements are intended to ensure adequate depth and breadth of the evaluation.

Objectives

7. The overall aim of the Phase 2 evaluation is to document, analyze and assess the relevance and effectiveness of the Paris Declaration and its contribution to aid effectiveness and ultimately to development results, including poverty reduction.

8. The evaluation is expected to analyze outcomes and results in context, taking into account preconditions or enabling conditions that may lead to or inhibit more effective aid and positive development results supported by aid.

9. Specific objectives include:

- To document the effects of implementing the Paris Declaration.
- To enable country-based "partnerships", partner countries and donors/agencies to clarify, improve and strengthen policies and practice consistent with the Paris Declaration in pursuit of aid effectiveness and development results.
- To highlight barriers and difficulties that may limit the efficacy of the Paris Declaration and its effects and impacts – and how these barriers and difficulties may be overcome.
- To strengthen the knowledge-base as to the ways in which development partnerships can most effectively and efficiently help maximize development results through aid in different development contexts – including various degrees of "fragility" in different countries and situations.
- To enable sharing and exchange of experience among stakeholders, countries and partnerships and support reflection, lesson-learning and policy improvement.

10. The Accra Agenda for Action further specified some of the Paris Declaration's commitments with the aim in particular of strengthening country ownership, building more inclusive partnerships, and sharpening the focus on development results. The Phase 2 evaluation will therefore pay particular attention to assessing implementation of these commitments, which address the concerns of many stakeholders.

Audiences and Stakeholders

11. The Phase 1 Evaluation focused on the practical lessons learned about implementation and contributed to ongoing aid effectiveness policy debates in the 3rd High Level Forum (HLF 3) on Aid Effectiveness in Ghana in September 2008 and in other fora. The focus of Phase 2 will be on a more results oriented evaluation, with the synthesis and component evaluation reports to be presented to the HLF 4 in 2011. Equally, it is intended and expected that the

evaluation process and results will spur interest and improvement efforts in the participating countries and agencies.

12. Primary constituencies include the endorsers of the Paris Declaration: the governments of the partner countries and governing authorities and senior managements of development agencies. Also key are those tasked with implementing the Paris Declaration: government, donor, civil society and private sector stakeholders in the partner countries as well as donor agencies. The findings should also be of interest to the parliaments and citizens of both partner countries and donor countries.

13. The goal of ensuring wide dissemination and use of the evaluation by its intended audiences should influence the process and products at every stage of the evaluation, by:

- a. Keeping the central questions and key audiences constantly in sight;
- b. Using straightforward language: minimizing acronyms, jargon and unnecessary technical language in all products;
- c. Open internal communications – as in the planned knowledge-sharing system within and among teams;
- d. Trilingual operation: specific work to ensure timely translation of key documents and balanced literature sources in 3 languages (English, French and Spanish);
- e. Building in the time needed for peer exchanges, edits, strong summaries;
- f. Critically, meeting deadlines for progress steps and draft and final reports and dissemination summaries.

Approach

14. An overall evaluation approach has been developed that recognizes the distinctive methodological challenges of evaluating the Paris Declaration. The evaluation is expected to provide answers to evaluation questions that are important to stakeholders and constituencies who can then use them to strengthen strategies and policies that will improve the effectiveness of aid and the achievement of development results.


15. The evaluation approach is a fully joint one, where participating countries and agencies are closely involved in all stages of the process, from developing the common and tailored elements of the Terms of Reference for the evaluations, all the way through to dissemination and use of the final evaluation reports. Given the primary reliance on the country evaluations in Phase 2, the coordinators, reference groups and teams involved in those evaluations will have a central role in the whole process. The evaluation will be a collaborative and constructive exercise which values peer review and exchanges between the participating countries, agencies and teams, the International Reference and Management Groups and the Core Evaluation Team.

16. The *main elements of the evaluation approach* include:

- Evaluating a) to what extent the Paris Declaration has been implemented, and b) insofar as it has been implemented, what the results have been in terms of aid effectiveness and contribution to development results.
- A focus on the workings of country-donor partnerships and their development outcomes at country level, thus including consideration of the effects of donor policies as well as country-level actors on country development prospects. This is examined in particular through up to 24 country evaluations.
- Seven donor/agency headquarters-level studies to supplement those undertaken in Phase 1.

- Continuous knowledge-sharing, support, peer review and quality assurance, backed by systematic, targeted literature review and an interactive project Extranet instrument.
- Addressing all the five main principles of the Paris Declaration: mutual accountability and managing for development results as well as ownership, alignment and harmonization.
- Attempting to explain and trace outcomes and development results to the Paris Declaration, while acknowledging the methodological difficulties, factors which underline the importance of comparative elements in the proposed design.
- Synthesizing the results of all the component evaluations of Phase 2, together with Phase 1 and supplementary materials, in a major policy-oriented synthesis report in time to feed into the Seoul High Level Forum.

Building blocks of the Paris Declaration Evaluation Synthesis



17. As part of the evaluation, comparisons between experiences will be important. The purposes of these comparisons are also clear - to test attribution and contribution claims for the Paris Declaration. The Phase 2 evaluation will focus on effects at the level of partner countries and their partnerships, i.e. the joint arrangements between donors and the recipients of aid that have been put in place to support the implementation of the Declaration.

18. There will be country evaluation teams in each participating partner country responsible for undertaking independent evaluations of aid effectiveness and development results. These teams will address both:

- Implementation or “process” – a continuation and extension of the issues explored in Phase 1 investigations. The “Core Questions” should be relatively few and precise concerning changes of behaviour of countries and donors while allowing countries to include elements in these evaluations to meet their particular interests; and
- Results or outcomes in terms of aid effectiveness and development results. In order to allow meaningful aggregation and synthesis the “Generic ToR” including the “Core Questions” needs to be rather precise, leaving limited room for variations in scope and methodologies. This will not in any way limit the ability of country evaluations to supplement the common evaluation “template” with questions of special relevance or interest to their particular situations.

19. Whilst most evaluative activity will be undertaken by country teams, there may also be a small number of “supplementary studies” where it appears that insufficient evidence will be available from the country evaluations to allow for firm conclusions to be drawn.

3. Approaches to Evaluation Methodology

20. The first four regional workshops of the Evaluation concluded on 20 November, 2009. Together with additional comments on the draft evaluation design and methodology the workshop results are being integrated into the Generic ToR and more detailed guidance. Given this iterative process, the full methodology for the Phase 2 evaluation will be finalized in the Inception Report of April 2010.

Basis of the evaluation methodology

21. The Phase 2 evaluation is a multi-partner comparative evaluation to assess the outcomes and results of implementation of the Paris Declaration in terms of aid effectiveness and contributions to development results. This evaluation will therefore be summative *and* formative – allowing judgments to be made about what has been achieved whilst at the same time also supporting forward-looking policy development and improvement across different constituencies and stakeholders.

22. Its analysis will be focused primarily at the country level in over 20 countries volunteering to participate. Together these countries have been assessed as providing reasonable diversity around their contexts, geographical spread, aid levels, and other variables. A small number of donor/agency headquarters studies of the implementation of the Declaration will be added to the twelve conducted in Phase 1. Together with the other results of that phase as well as supplementary studies on key topics, they will be integrated into the synthesis assessment of Phase 2.

Principles to be adopted

23. In keeping with a “country-owned” approach adopted for the evaluation – which is consistent with the principles of the Paris Declaration itself – the participating countries have had a major hand in the initial design of the methodology and core questions and continue to do so in its finalization, particularly through two series of regional and sub-regional workshops, the results of which are now reflected here and in the Generic Terms of Reference for the Country Evaluations and the Headquarters (HQ) Studies. **The workshops have further underlined the imperative requirement for a common approach, language and methodology for the country evaluations that is as clear, simple and straightforward as possible, given the intrinsic complexity of this Evaluation. This will be essential for credible and feasible evaluations in this wide group of countries and to yield timely, consistent and comparable results, in three languages.**

24. Other relevant principles and good practices to be internalized in this evaluation process include taking care to apply existing data sources where possible rather than risk duplicative and unnecessary demands. It has been explicitly recognized that each participating country, while contributing fully to the common comparative framework, may also wish to supplement this coverage with particular evaluation issues or questions of special interest or relevance to its own situation. Country reference groups and teams, once engaged, are being encouraged to do so to the extent that they can, given the available resources.

The Evaluation Framework and core questions

25. The Evaluation Framework that has been developed and refined has drawn as much as possible on a good deal of early preparatory work.⁴ Two early schematic depictions of the many complex factors and relationships at work in the implementation of the Paris Declaration (Appendix E) help to ensure that these are kept in view.

26. Given all these complexities, and the multiple *pros* and *cons* that have been explored taking account of all the possible different lenses through which the Evaluation could be approached, the Evaluation Framework has been centred on a manageable set of core questions and sub-questions. This is the most feasible approach for:

- **Keeping the focus on the most important, results-oriented questions facing the evaluation and of most interest to its key stakeholders, in countries and internationally;**
- **Providing a clear and straightforward common approach for the key country evaluations, that can be followed and implemented in many different country settings, while yielding robust comparative and aggregate findings; and**
- **Allowing for the integration of Donor/Agency HQ studies; key cross-cutting assessments, such as the adherence to the five Paris Declaration principles and the Accra Agenda for Action priorities; and the results of supplementary studies that are used to fill information gaps.**


27. The central parts of the Evaluation Framework are summarized in matrix form in Appendix A. Three core evaluation questions and the framework for conclusions (see boxes below) serve as the spine of the comparative common structure for all individual country

⁴ Summarized in the Approach Paper for the Phase 2 Evaluation (May 2009) a Major Workshop of the International Reference Group in February 2009 and a commissioned study on The Paris Declaration, Aid Effectiveness and Development Effectiveness in November, 2008 (the “Linkages Study.”), and a 2006 study: Booth, David and Alison Evans, DAC Evaluation Network: Follow-up to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: an Options Paper, Revised Draft, OECD/DAC, Paris, 2006. <https://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/8/3/38255452.pdf>

evaluations and for the final synthesis report. It will integrate the results of Donor HQ studies, Phase 1 evaluations, and other inputs as shown.

28. The logic of the core questions (illustrated in the diagram below) aims to place that part of official development assistance (ODA) which is subject to Paris Declaration (PD) commitments in its proper context relative to other sources of development finance and drivers of development in countries. On this basis, its possible contributions to development results can be realistically assessed.

The logic of the core questions



The Core Questions

1. “What are the important factors that have affected the relevance and implementation of the Paris Declaration and its potential effects on aid effectiveness and development results?” (The Paris Declaration in context)
2. “To what extent and how has the implementation of the Paris Declaration led to an improvement in the efficiency of aid delivery, the management and use of aid and better partnerships?” (Process and intermediate outcomes)
3. “Has the implementation of Paris Declaration strengthened the contribution of aid to sustainable development results? How?” (Development outcomes)

The Framework for Conclusions

- i. What has been the relevance of the Paris Declaration and the ways it has been implemented to the challenges of aid effectiveness?
- ii. To what extent has each of the five principles of the Paris Declaration been observed and implemented, and the Accra Agenda priorities reflected? Why? Have there been conflicts or trade-offs between them?
- iii. What has the Paris Declaration achieved for aid effectiveness and development results? How significant are these contributions? How sustainable? Is there evidence of better ways to make aid more effective and contribute more to development results?
- iv. What effects has the implementation of the Declaration had on the respective burdens of aid management falling on partner countries and donors, relative to the changing volume and quality of aid and of the aid relationship itself? Are these effects likely to be transitional or long term?
- v. What has been the added value of Paris Declaration-style development cooperation compared with the pre-Paris Declaration situation, and seen alongside other drivers of development in the country, other sources of development finance and development cooperation partners beyond those so far endorsing the Declaration?
- vi. What are the key messages for a) national stakeholders, and b) donor countries and agencies?
- vii. What are the key implications for aid effectiveness in the future taking account of new challenges and opportunities (e.g. climate change) and new actors and relationships?

Core components of the methodology

29. In addressing these core evaluation questions it is clear that the challenges of attributing results to a set of commitments like the Paris Declaration are especially complex in this evaluation.⁵ **One vital starting point is to recognize that the 2005 Declaration itself brought together a variety of reform efforts and initiatives that had been underway in different settings for some years before. Thus the Evaluation should explicitly include assessment of these “upstream” or precursor steps as an integral part of its scope.**

30. Clear-cut or one-dimensional models of causality cannot be relied upon as in simpler evaluations, given the importance and range of variables (political, institutional, capacity etc) that affect how partnerships operate in any given context, and how the Paris Declaration is implemented and change generated. The two framework diagrams from the preparatory studies (attached in Appendix E) help to illustrate both the broad “impact chains” that are supposed to operate under the (largely implicit) “programme logic” of the Paris Declaration, and the complexity of the linkages and factors at work. It should be noted that the order and content of the three main evaluation questions, and the framework for conclusions, successively emphasize the accepted guiding evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

⁵ See Approach Paper, p.42 for a listing of some of the most prominent special challenges.

31. Even seeking to establish the possible contributions of the Declaration to particular changes in the effectiveness of aid or development results will need to be rigorously tested. Paris Declaration implementation is a multidimensional, multi-level process, affected by many factors, which can change its direction, emphasis, and pace at different times and in response to different influences.⁶

32. To make these factors more explicit and prominent throughout the Evaluation, special emphasis is to be placed - through the first core question - on an unusually searching analysis of the context for the implementation of the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda in each country where an evaluation is undertaken.

33. The core evaluation questions will be operationalized through a set of sub-questions including descriptive, analytical, normative and evaluative questions. In the Generic Terms of Reference for Country Evaluations, these will be supported wherever possible by common specifications and suggestions of:

- i. the types of evidence and, where applicable, indicators to be used;
- ii. the anticipated availability and (probable) reliability of data sources; and
- iii. proposed sources, methods and techniques for data collection, analysis, triangulation and validation.

Anticipated methods

34. Overall, a mix of suitable methods for this evaluation - some specifically responding to the special difficulties of attribution, causality and contribution - has been identified so far,⁷ including:

- Syntheses and meta-analyses (in individual evaluations and the overall synthesis) of existing evidence (e.g. secondary sources), evaluations and research; using common specified parameters for their identification, inclusion and structured assessment;
- The normal arsenal of evaluation tools and techniques, including literature and documentation review of multiple sources at country, regional and international level, review of existing statistical data, structured surveys and questionnaires for stakeholder groups, semi-structured key informant interviews and focus groups (including civil society and the private sector), and any other relevant additional analyses. It is proposed to adapt and apply relevant elements from approaches such as outcome mapping;
- Given the methodological limitations around robustly exploring counterfactual logic (through e.g. experimental / randomized-type methods), comparative studies will be employed, for example between Paris Declaration and non-Paris Declaration type policies (e.g. different aid modalities, global funds etc.). This will be especially relevant for core evaluation question 3. Other approaches may include: backward tracking to past Paris Declaration-like initiatives and their results so as to test effects over longer periods; (where data is available) retrospective case-studies; the analysis of time-series data, and synthesis studies of existing research;
- Comparative case studies that address common sectors and possibly themes; these will enable the evaluation to generate more in-depth insights into the role and effects of the Paris Declaration;

⁶ For example, it was clear from Phase 1 that political change in countries (“North” or “South”) influenced the implementation of the Paris Declaration, and the financial crisis that began in 2008 might be expected to have had significant effects since.

⁷ Many of these are built on the sources identified in footnote 4.

- ‘Theory based’ (longitudinal) studies that are forward looking (i.e. anticipate development results that are in formation but have not become fully evident) by mapping out the plausible links in the causal chain from aid to development results and measure as far as possible “direction of travel” and “distance travelled”. This is especially important for some of the longer term effects of the Paris Declaration that will not be evident by 2011;
- Given the intentions of this evaluation to support improvements in policy and practice as well as document/measure achievements and failures, there will need to be a focus on mechanisms of change.⁸ This means identifying the nature and role of those causal factors that help *explain* results in context so as to be able to make credible recommendations.

Ensuring comparability

35. In order to ensure consistency in data gathering and fieldwork at country level for the common (shared) elements of country evaluations and make certain that results will be comparable and that synthesis across country evaluations will be possible, a shared Matrix⁹ for the common elements of country evaluations will be applied. This will be part of the Generic Terms of Reference¹⁰ for Country Evaluations. A set of Generic Terms of Reference is also being provided for the Donor/Agency HQ studies maintaining continuity with similar evaluations carried out in Phase 1. These were drafted by the Core Evaluation Team and agreed upon by the Evaluation Management Group as a basis for discussion. The Country ToR were then substantially developed and refined through a series of regional workshops with participating countries and donor/agency field representatives in October-November 2009, to be agreed upon by the International Reference Group in December 2009.¹¹

Ensuring validity and reliability

36. The robustness of the approach and methodology for the evaluation and its results will be further ensured by:

- A consistent stance in the evaluation that does not assume attribution of results to the Paris Declaration, but rather takes a critical approach, seeking to both identify areas of attribution - and contribution - while continually exploring and testing the assumptions implicit in the linkages claimed, including examining alternative explanations;
- Verification of evidence emerging through ongoing triangulation between the multiple data sources and methods employed;
- Step-by-step validation of evaluation results by national core teams (with peer review among them encouraged) by the core team, country reference groups, the Evaluation Secretariat and Management Group, possibly high level external reviewers, and the International Reference Group;

⁸ Of the kind identified in paragraph 54 of the Approach Paper.

⁹ This will track with the general matrix set out in this framework, but with much greater detail to guide the individual evaluations.

¹⁰ Together these will clarify the core evaluation questions, methods, types of evidence, quality and communication standards and quality assurance systems that should be applied in a guide for individual evaluations and, as appropriate, supplementary studies.

¹¹ Additionally, a glossary of agreed working definitions for key terms [and an agreed style guide for reports] is in progress – this has proved to be a key requirement in similar work for avoiding confusion and inconsistent treatment which impairs the comparative value of the exercise.

- Quality assurance processes that are built in to each component evaluation and the preparation of the final synthesis report – all should meet the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards or the comparable national or regional standards where these have been adopted;
- Selection of evaluation teams at both country-partnership and ‘central’ levels by established procedures, with protection for the professional integrity of their work;
- Forming country teams using national expertise to the maximum extent possible but also including regional and international experts where appropriate, assuring that all are free of potential conflicts of interest;
- Prioritizing the use of country systems to capitalize on existing data/literature including academic and civil society sources, at the same time, drawing on relevant global and regional sources of literature; and
- Wherever possible, seeking the engagement and coverage of providers of development resources not yet formally endorsing the Paris Declaration in the capacity of donors.

4. Accountabilities and Responsibilities

International Reference Group

37. Overseeing the Phase 2 evaluation will be a diverse International Reference Group made up of both participating partner countries, donors and multilateral institutions together with international civil society observers. Operational management will be the responsibility of a smaller Evaluation Management Group, also made up of donor and partner country representatives. The Management Group reports to the International Reference Group. It is explicitly responsible for ensuring the quality and independence of the evaluation, including, among other things, selection of the Core Team. There will also be a National Reference Group for each country evaluation to guide country evaluation teams, the country evaluation design, and country-specific evaluation questions; monitor progress, review report drafts and ensure that country evaluations are relevant and well integrated. Similar Reference Groups will be established for the donor/agency headquarters studies.

National Evaluation Coordinator

38. Each evaluation should be managed in-country, led by a National Evaluation Coordinator appointed by the government. The National Coordinator may wish to “team up” with a development partner’s Evaluation Department to facilitate the evaluation and secure funding. Whether such an arrangement is made or not, the National Evaluation Coordinator should be supported by a *Reference/ Advisory Group* including relevant national stakeholders and development partners.

39. The National Evaluation Coordinator will be responsible for initiating, facilitating, contracting and managing the country evaluation as well as for providing feedback to overall management and reference group. He/she will:

- 1) Act as in-country focal point for contact to the Evaluation’s overall Management and Reference groups for the evaluation.
- 2) Establish the in-country Reference/ Advisory Group comprising national stakeholders (including civil society) and development partners.
- 3) Develop specific ToR for the country evaluations (in consultation with in-country reference group, the Core Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Secretariat).
- 4) Select and contract consultants for the country evaluations (following established procedures and in consultation with in-country reference group and other stakeholders).

- 5) Sign off on the country evaluation report (i.e. approve for submission, but not amend, after consultation with in-country Reference/ Advisory Group).
- 6) Submit the country evaluation report to the Core Evaluation team for use in preparing synthesis report and publishing.
- 7) Assure that the evaluation is of acceptable quality. He/she may draw on the Core Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Secretariat in this respect.

National Reference/ Advisory Group

40. The Reference/ Advisory Group should include major stakeholders from government, donors, civil society and possibly academia. The purpose of this group is to ensure stakeholders' participation and buy-in to the evaluation process and results and to assure the independence of the evaluation. In some cases, an independent chair may reinforce the role of independent members in ensuring the independence of the evaluation itself. Ideally, the Reference/ Advisory Group should provide some standing capacity to follow up on the evaluation after completion.

41. It has been agreed that ToR should guide the work of the reference groups to ensure clear roles and responsibilities. The functions of the National Reference/ Advisory Groups include:

- 1) Approving the design of the pertinent evaluation that comprises a common set of evaluation questions applicable to all country evaluations and a module with country-specific evaluation questions;
- 2) Deciding on selection criteria for the country teams;
- 3) Selecting the members of country evaluation teams, consistent with the selection criteria and national competitive procurement or tender rules;
- 4) Serving as a resource and to provide advice and feedback to teams;
- 5) Reviewing and commenting on (but not approving) the draft products of the evaluation.

42. National Reference/ Advisory Groups will have an important role to play in accessing information; exerting quality control; linking to government and engaging civil society; facilitating the necessary wider consultation; and encouraging the use and usefulness of the evaluations findings.

Country Evaluation Team

43. The success of an evaluation depends on the composition of the evaluation team and the competence and personal abilities of the team members. This applies in particular to the team leader who should be the one concerned with the overall perspective, able to organize and co-ordinate the work of the team members, assess the quality and relevance of their contributions, assure the timely delivery of reports, and the handling of comments and act as a spokesperson for the team.

44. Members of the evaluation team should represent relevant professional areas, include gender expertise and have a gender mix, and include country and regional/international professional expertise.

45. To safeguard impartiality, firms or team members retained for the evaluation team should not have been directly involved in the design or implementation of activities to be evaluated. Given the breadth of the Paris Declaration, total non-involvement may be a difficult

requirement to meet, so that a transparent assessment and a measure of judgment on impartiality will be required.

Donor/Agency Headquarters Evaluation Team

46. Generally similar considerations and criteria apply to the Donor Headquarters evaluation teams as to the country evaluation teams as outlined in the section above.

Core Evaluation Team

47. The Core Evaluation Team, with six international consultants as core team members and a number of associated team members for specific tasks, has been selected on the basis of several criteria: to be based in an established institution or consulting enterprise with a demonstrated track record in evaluative research on international development cooperation; to consist of a small group of evaluation professionals with experience of international development cooperation, led by a recognized and experienced expert; to be composed of both sexes; reflect regional diversity and include members from developing countries; and have advanced knowledge of both French and Spanish, as well as English.

48. The Core Team will be expected to contribute to the Phase 2 evaluation at all stages: at planning and set-up; on an ongoing basis to ensure consistency and solve problems that may arise; and in the final stages when it will be expected to bring together all evaluation findings in a free-standing Synthesis Report. In order to fulfil these responsibilities the Core Team has been in place and working several months before country teams are contracted. The Core Team reports and is responsible to the Evaluation Management Group through the Evaluation Secretariat.

49. The Core Team will:

- 1) Review and collate relevant existing research and evaluations.
- 2) Provide professional advice on the selection of country and donor HQ-Level teams.
- 3) Design for the approval of the Evaluation Management Group and the International Reference Group of the "Generic Terms of Reference" for country and HQ case-study work, data gathering and fieldwork that will be comparable and able to be synthesized.
- 4) Provide ongoing advice and support to Country Teams and HQ Study teams to ensure the coherence of the evaluation and the comparability of its different elements.
- 5) Propose and contribute to the design and/or delivery of any required supplementary studies for the approval of the Evaluation Management Group.
- 6) Synthesize evaluation results generated at country and HQ levels as well as any supplementary studies and prepare the overall Evaluation Synthesis Report

Evaluation Management Group and Secretariat

50. The Evaluation Management Group comprises six members representing partner countries and donors¹² and the Evaluation Secretariat. The Management Group reports to the Reference Group but is separately charged with the responsibility to safeguard the quality and independence of the evaluation. The Evaluation Management Group will meet more frequently (by videoconference or in person) than the International Reference Group. Specific responsibilities include:

¹² Colombia, Malawi, the Netherlands, Vietnam, Sweden and the USA.

- 1) Develop Terms of Reference for the Core Team (to be approved by International Reference Group).
- 2) Select the Core Team through international competitive tender.
- 3) Develop, with the Core Team, Generic ToR for Country and Donor/Agency HQ Evaluations including “mandatory core questions” to be approved by the International Reference Group.
- 4) Oversee, and maintain regular interaction with, the Core Team, including being responsive to requests from the Team during the course of the Evaluation.
- 5) Commission required supplementary studies and other consultancies as necessary (e.g. select and appoint consultants and peer reviewers).
- 6) Recommend to the International Reference Group at its December 2010 Meeting whether an ongoing “tracker sites” study should be pursued.
- 7) Develop and implement a dissemination strategy. The communications plan should be directly linked to key points in the national and international dialogue on aid effectiveness and Millennium Development Goal (MDG) trends over the coming two years to build policy engagement with the study and ensure its timely contribution to the debates.
- 8) Be responsible for the communication to immediate stakeholders and the wider development community through concise periodic briefings with the purpose of (i) communicating evaluation progress and intermediate results with the wider community and (ii) managing expectations with respect to this evaluation.
- 9) Oversee budget, spending and accounting.
- 10) Prepare the agendas for and approve documents submitted to the International Reference Group meetings.

51. The Evaluation Management Group will be supported by a small secretariat located at the Danish Institute for International Studies. The Head of the Secretariat is an ex officio member of the Evaluation Management Group.

5. Work-plan and Schedule

Period/Date	In country	International
Nov 2009	Establish National Reference Groups	Consolidation of comments from four Regional Workshops (Core Evaluation Team) by 20 th Nov
1 Dec 2009	International Reference Group approves Generic Terms of Reference	
Dec 2009/ Jan 2010	Establish National Reference Groups and approve Terms of Reference for Country Evaluation (Country Coordinator)	Core Evaluation Team support to National Evaluation Coordinators as required
Dec 2009/ Feb 2010 Latest 31 March	Select and contract Evaluation Teams	
Feb/Mar/Apr 2010	Sub-regional/national workshops for Team Leaders and National Coordinators with Core Team/EMG	
By 30 th April 2010	Country and Donor/Agency HQ Teams submit inception reports	Core Evaluation Team submits Inception Report, with detailed guidance on methodology and methods, to International Reference Group and Management Group for comment
By 15 th May 2010	Coordinators/reference groups approve inception reports	Management Group approves Inception Report
April-Sep 2010	Conducting Country and Donor/Agency headquarters evaluations and studies	Core Evaluation Team support to National Evaluation Coordinators as required
15 th Sep 2010	Submission of first draft report including summary of findings by each Country team and Donor/Agency HQ team to Evaluation Management Group and Core Evaluation Team	
Sep-Dec 2010	Consultation, validation and finalization of report in country	Core Evaluation Team prepares consolidated emerging findings by 15 October
1 st -4 th Nov 2010	Meeting/workshop of Country Evaluation and Donor/Agency HQ study team leaders, Core Team and International Reference Group to discuss emerging findings and the plan for the synthesis	
Nov-Dec 2010	Production/submission of Country and Donor/Agency reports (deadline 31 st Dec 2010)	
Jan-Apr 2011	Dissemination of evaluation results in countries	Drafting Synthesis Report
Apr 2011	Meeting of the International Reference Group to comment on the draft Synthesis Report	
Apr-May 2011	Dissemination of evaluation results in countries	Finalization of Synthesis Report
May-Sep 2011	Dissemination activities/inputs to preparations for High Level Forum	
Sep-Oct 2011	4 th High Level Forum in Seoul	

Appendix A

The Overarching Evaluation Matrix for Phase 2

Note: The table below focuses on specifying the core evaluation questions and sub-questions to be pursued, and the main elements that will contribute to the overall Evaluation results. It should be read in conjunction with the appended Generic ToR, especially for the Country evaluations, which will be the most important set of building blocks for the entire Evaluation. The evaluation matrix in this Generic ToR will apply these same common core questions and sub-questions, while also adding columns for:

- Suggested types of evidence and where possible, indicators;
- Likely data sources;
- Suggested common methods and techniques for data collection, analysis and validation;
- Section/s in a draft Outline for Reports where each question should be treated, to ensure relevance and clear comparative focus.

Given its central importance to the entire Evaluation and the major innovations beyond the Approach Paper, the line of attack for answering Core question 2 is elaborated in some detail here.

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Overview of sources of evidence for answering the Evaluation questions (elaborated in Generic ToR)
<p>1. (The PD in context): “What are the factors that have shaped and limited Paris Declaration implementation and its potential effects on aid effectiveness and development results?”</p>	<p>Phase 2 Country Evaluations; Phase 2 Donor HQ Studies; Supplementary Studies commissioned; Phase 1 HQ, Country Evaluations, Synthesis and special studies; Other relevant evaluations and monitoring results; Targeted and tested inputs from research and literature reviews.</p>
<p>a) What are the key characteristics [of the country] that have been most relevant to the implementation of the PD? (Focusing on context factors relevant to PD implementation and ensuring analytical, not descriptive, treatment)</p>	<p>Mainly Phase 2 Country Evaluations; other elements as relevant. See Country ToR for detail. Take account of special situations of small countries, and varying relevance of PD to different regions and sectors within countries. The rule of law, respect of human rights and a functioning legislature are likely to be key conditions.</p>
<p>b) 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?”</p>	<p>Mainly Phase 2 Country Evaluations; other elements as relevant, esp. targeted and tested inputs from research and literature reviews. Possible supplementary study. Include appropriate coverage of South-South and triangular cooperation, and sources of development cooperation not covered by the PD.</p>

<p>Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions</p>	<p>Overview of sources of evidence for answering the Evaluation questions (elaborated in Generic ToR)</p>
<p>c) 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?</p>	<p>Mainly Phase 2 Country Evaluations; other elements as relevant, esp. targeted and tested inputs from research and literature reviews. Phase 2 Donor HQ Studies; Phase 1 HQ, Country Evaluations, Synthesis and special studies. Possible supplementary study</p> <p>National actors to be examined should include executive and legislative branches of national government, regional and local governments, civil society, the private sector and the media. The respective scope for decision-making and coherence between donor/agency HQs and field representatives should be assessed.</p>
<p>d) What are the most important and emerging issues that directly affect the aid arena and what has been the range of influence of the PD on those key issues?</p>	<p>Mainly Phase 2 Country Evaluations; other elements as relevant, esp. targeted and tested inputs from research and literature reviews. Phase 2 Donor HQ Studies; Phase 1 HQ, Country Evaluations, Synthesis and special studies.</p> <p>Possible supplementary study</p>
<p>e) To what extent and where have the PD commitments been implemented? Why and how?</p>	<p>Mainly Phase 2 Country Evaluations (including survey and interview results under Question 2 below); Monitoring survey results. Phase 2 Donor HQ Studies; Phase 1 HQ, and Country Evaluations, Synthesis and special studies. Other relevant evaluations and monitoring results; Targeted and tested inputs from research and literature reviews.</p>
<p>2. (Process and intermediate outcomes) “Has the implementation of the Paris Declaration led to an improvement in the efficiency of aid delivery, the management and use of aid and better partnerships? How?”</p> <p>(Note: It is proposed that the interest in assessing progress related to inefficiencies in aid processes, the weight of the resulting burdens, and who bears them, will mainly be treated under the respective intended outcomes below (e.g., numbers ii., iv., v.,</p>	<p>Mainly Phase 2 Country Evaluations; other elements as relevant, esp. targeted and tested inputs from research and literature reviews. Phase 2 Donor HQ Studies; Phase 1 HQ, Country Evaluations, Synthesis and special studies. Other relevant evaluations and monitoring results; Supplementary Studies commissioned; Targeted and tested inputs from research and literature reviews.</p>

<p>Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions</p>	<p>Overview of sources of evidence for answering the Evaluation questions (elaborated in Generic ToR)</p>
<p>and viii.) as well as in a summative question (see “Framework for Conclusions”.</p>	
<p>Sub-questions: The main means to provide answers to Core question 2 will be to assess the progress achieved in realizing each of the 11 following intended outcomes that were <u>directly specified</u> in the opening Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Declaration itself, but reflecting as well the further political emphases and priorities brought out in the Accra Agenda for Action.</p> <p>Note 1: While there are serious challenges in assessing and measuring achievement in some of these areas, this list, if taken as a whole, has an incontestable standing as the principal base for evaluation the effects of the Declaration.</p> <p>Note 2: The 11 intended outcomes are clustered below under the main action headings of the AAA, and the Accra emphases can be drawn out further in pursuing individual questions.</p>	<p>Assessments against each of these intended outcomes could be focused on changed activities, behaviour, and relationships, particularly highlighting characteristics of better partnerships.</p> <p>All the main elements listed in the cell above will be drawn upon in providing answers to these sub-questions, but the only feasible across-the-board source is likely to be a standard survey of informed respondents as a key element in each country evaluation. (Finding a good, balanced, and adequately informed range of respondents will be a challenge in most cases.)</p> <p>Since in Phase 2 the country evaluations are designed to provide the most important means of assessing donor implementation of the PD commitments, it will be important to get beyond aggregate assessments of implementation by “the donors” as an undifferentiated group. Responses may also be quite different on different commitments by the same donor/agency. Thus it will be important to design ways of assessing at least the range of different donor records of implementation and examples of greater and lesser advances, if not actual ratings or rankings.</p> <p>It is very likely that some issues will be found more applicable than others, depending on different country situations. If so, this too will be a finding.</p> <p>Survey responses would then be elaborated though structured and semi-structured interviews, analyses of context under Question 1, and findings triangulated against the available Monitoring Survey results and trends where relevant (see individual points below), and other monitoring, evaluative and research findings (e.g. the EU Code of Conduct on Division of Labour and Complementarity or the Monterrey Consensus.)</p>

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Overview of sources of evidence for answering the Evaluation questions (elaborated in Generic ToR)
A. Country ownership over development	In addition to assessing progress against the sub-questions below, with their specific and sometimes technical aspects, a broader assessment of progress is needed against this central principle, highlighted again at Accra, with its critical political and behavioural dimensions. The proposed survey instruments and related methods should seek specific assessments of progress against this overarching objective - specifically focused on changed activities, behaviour, and relationships. The Accra commitments may point to some further sub-questions. All this will contribute to the aggregate assessment against the principles in the Conclusions.
i. <u>Stronger</u> national strategies and frameworks?	e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 1 provide a partial source and cross-check. Phase 1 reports relevant
ii. <u>Increased</u> alignment of aid with partner countries' priorities, systems and procedures, help to strengthen capacities?	e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 3, 5a, 5b and 6 provide a partial source and cross-check. Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant. Note: Need to test against AAA priority on increased and appropriate support for capacity development.
iii. <u>Defined</u> measures and standards of performance and accountability of partner country systems in public financial management, procurement, fiduciary standards and environmental assessments, in line with broadly accepted good practices and their quick and widespread application?	e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 2 provide a partial source and cross-check. Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant
B. Building more inclusive and effective partnerships for development	In addition to assessing progress against the sub-questions below, with their specific and sometimes technical aspects, a broader assessment of progress is needed against this central political objective, highlighted again at Accra. The proposed survey instruments and related methods should seek assessments on this - specifically focused on changed activities, behaviour, and relationships. The Accra commitments may point to some further sub-questions.

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Overview of sources of evidence for answering the Evaluation questions (elaborated in Generic ToR)
iv. <u>Less</u> duplication of efforts and rationalized, more cost-effective donor activities	e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicators 4, 9, and 10 provide a partial source and cross-check. Phase 1 report relevant. Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant
v. <u>Reformed</u> and <u>simplified</u> donor policies and procedures, more collaborative behaviour	Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant
vi. <u>More</u> predictable and multi-year commitments on aid flows to committed partner countries. [Has the nature of conditionalities been changed to support ownership in line with the AAA commitment (para. 25)]	e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 7 provide a partial source and cross-check. Progress on untying, an Accra Agenda priority, could be treated here, with reference to Monitoring Survey Indicator 8. Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant
vii. <u>Sufficient</u> delegation of authority to donors' field staff, and adequate attention to incentives for effective partnerships between donors and partner countries	Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant
viii. <u>Sufficient</u> integration of global programmes and initiatives into partner countries' broader development agendas	e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicators 3, 6, and 9 provide a partial source and cross-check. Possible supplementary study.
C. Delivering and accounting for development results	In addition to assessing progress against the sub-questions below, with their specific and sometimes technical aspects, a broader assessment of progress is needed against this central principle, highlighted again at Accra in its political context. The proposed survey instruments and related methods should seek assessments on this - specifically focused on changed activities, behaviour, and relationships – and contribute to the aggregate assessments under question 3 and in the Conclusions. The Accra commitments may point to some further sub-questions.
ix. <u>Stronger</u> partner countries' capacities to develop and implement results-driven national strategies	e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 11 provide a partial source and cross-check. Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant

<p>Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions</p>	<p>Overview of sources of evidence for answering the Evaluation questions (elaborated in Generic ToR)</p>
<p>x. <u>Enhanced</u> respective accountability of countries and donors to citizens and parliaments</p>	<p>Phase 1 suggested that achieving this original expected outcome of the Declaration appeared to be the most important concrete way of advancing the central principle of mutual accountability, highlighted again at Accra. The proposed survey instruments and related methods should seek assessments on this - specifically focused on changed activities, behaviour, and relationships. e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 12 provide a (very) partial additional source and cross-check. Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports will be relevant. The Accra commitment on access to the requisite information is key.</p>
<p>x. (Supplement) Implementation of the general commitment in para. 50 of the Declaration and the specific mutual commitments in the Accra Agenda for Action (Para. 24) on transparency and accountability for development results, including its detailed points on transparency, mutual assessment reviews, strengthening international accountability mechanisms, and measures to fight corruption on both sides.</p>	<p>Many of these AAA commitments are specific and time-bound enough to be directly assessed in individual country evaluations, and thus contribute to the Synthesis, alongside the general results on Monitoring Survey Indicator 12.</p>
<p>xi. <u>Less</u> corruption and more transparency, strengthening public support and supporting effective resource mobilization and allocation.</p>	<p>e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 2 provide a (very) partial source and cross-check against informed respondent surveys. Other sources in this area, while often contested, may together shed light, especially at the aggregate level.</p>
<p>D. Have there been unintended consequences of the Paris Declaration for aid effectiveness? Is there evidence of better ways to make aid more effective?</p>	<p>Important, open-ended questions</p>

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Overview of sources of evidence for answering the Evaluation questions (elaborated in Generic ToR)
<p>3. (Development outcomes) “Has the implementation of the Paris Declaration strengthened the contribution of aid to sustainable development results? How?”</p> <p>[Note: the Declaration’s own statement of intended effects, to: “Increase the impact of aid in: 1. Reducing poverty 2. Reducing inequality 3. Increasing growth 4. Building capacity 5. Accelerating achievement of MDGs” (Paragraph 2)]</p>	
<p>a) Were results in specific sectors enhanced through the application of the PD principles?”</p> <p>(Health to be used as a “tracer sector” across all country evaluations, and one other, “non-social” sector (possibly infrastructure) to be selected by each country) (Note: One or two countries were noted where the health sector has little aid involvement. Briefly documenting this can contribute to overall findings.)</p>	<p>Mainly Phase 2 Country Evaluations; with guidance to be worked out on feasible and useful level and type of sectoral treatment or “case-studies” to be carried out. Other relevant evaluations and monitoring results; Health Task Force reports, other elements as relevant, esp. targeted and tested inputs from research and literature reviews. Phase 2 Donor HQ Studies; Phase 1 HQ, Country Evaluations, Synthesis and special studies.</p>
<p>b) Did the implementation of the PD help countries to improve the prioritization of the needs of the poorest people, including women and girls, and reduce social exclusion?”</p>	<p>Mainly Phase 2 Country Evaluations; Other relevant evaluations and monitoring results; other elements as relevant, esp. targeted and tested inputs from research and literature reviews. Phase 2 Donor HQ Studies; Phase 1 HQ, Country Evaluations, Synthesis and special studies. [Note: possible supplementary study required]</p>
<p>c) How and why has the mix of aid modalities (including general or sector-specific budget support) evolved, what effect has the Paris Declaration had on different modalities and what have been the development results?”</p>	<p>Mainly Phase 2 Country Evaluations; Other relevant evaluations and monitoring results; other elements as relevant, esp. targeted and tested inputs from research and literature reviews. Phase 2 Donor HQ Studies; Phase 1 HQ, Country Evaluations, Synthesis and special studies. Phase 2 Country Evaluations</p>

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Overview of sources of evidence for answering the Evaluation questions (elaborated in Generic ToR)
<p>d) Has PD implementation led to sustainable increases in institutional capacities and social capital at all levels to deliver services and respond to development challenges? Why, how and where, and what are the effects?</p>	<p>Phase 2 Country Evaluations; Phase 2 Donor HQ Studies; Phase 1 HQ, Country Evaluations, Synthesis and special studies; Other relevant evaluations and monitoring results; Targeted and tested inputs from research and literature reviews.</p>
<p>e) Has the implementation of the PD had unintended consequences for development results, negative or positive? Is there evidence of better ways to make aid contribute more to development results?</p>	<p>Important open-ended questions</p>
<p>f) Has the PD enhanced ODA's impact on achieving [the goals of the national development strategy] and the MDGs?"</p>	<p>Mainly Phase 2 Country Evaluations; Other relevant evaluations and monitoring results; other elements as relevant, esp. targeted and tested inputs from research and literature reviews. Phase 2 Donor HQ Studies; Phase 1 HQ, Country Evaluations, Synthesis and special studies.</p>
<p><i>Framework for conclusions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What has been the relevance of the Paris Declaration and the ways it has been implemented to the challenges of aid effectiveness? ii. To what extent has each of the five principles of the Paris Declaration been observed and implemented, and the Accra Agenda priorities reflected? Why? Have there been conflicts or trade-offs between them? iii. What has the Paris Declaration achieved for aid effectiveness and development results? How significant are these contributions? How sustainable? Is there evidence of better ways to make aid more effective and contribute more to development results? iv. What effects has the implementation of the Declaration had on the respective burdens of 	

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Overview of sources of evidence for answering the Evaluation questions (elaborated in Generic ToR)
<p>aid management falling on partner countries and donors, relative to the changing volume and quality of aid and of the aid relationship itself? Are these effects likely to be transitional or long term?</p> <p>v. What has been the added value of Paris Declaration-style development cooperation compared with the pre-PD situation, and seen alongside other drivers of development in the country, other sources of development finance and development cooperation partners beyond those so far endorsing the Declaration?</p> <p>vi. What are the key messages for a) national stakeholders, and b) donor countries and agencies?</p> <p>vii. What are the key implications for aid effectiveness in the future taking account of new challenges and opportunities (e.g. climate change) and new actors and relationships?</p>	

Appendix D

First Illustrative Outline for Evaluation Synthesis Report

Preface

Acknowledgement

Acronyms (Few)

Executive Summary (Max. 5 pp.)

- Purpose and background
- Overall conclusions (on common and country-specific questions)
- Key lessons (on common and country-specific questions)
- Key recommendations if applicable (on common and country-specific questions)

A. Introduction (Max. 4 pp.)

- The Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action: Engagement of country X
- Purpose and scope of the Phase Two Evaluation
- Approach, methodology and limitations

B. Findings on the Common Evaluation Questions

1. “What are the factors that have shaped and limited Paris Declaration implementation and its potential effects on aid effectiveness and development results?” (The Paris Declaration in context): (Max. 15 pp.)

2. “Has the implementation of the Paris Declaration led to an improvement in the efficiency of aid delivery, the management and use of aid and better partnerships? How?” (Process and intermediate outcomes) (Max. 15 pp.)

3. “Has the implementation of Paris Declaration strengthened the contribution of aid to sustainable development results? How?” (Development outcomes) (Max. 15 pp.)

4. Conclusions (Max. 10 pp.)

- What has been the relevance of the Paris Declaration and the ways it has been implemented to the challenges of aid effectiveness?
- To what extent has each of the 5 principles been observed and implemented and the Accra Agenda priorities reflected? Why?
- What has the Paris Declaration achieved for aid effectiveness and development results? How significant are these contributions? How sustainable?
- What effects has the implementation of the Declaration had on the respective burdens of aid management falling on partner countries and donors, relative to the changing volumes and quality of aid and of the aid partnership itself? Are these effects likely to be transitional or long term?
- What has been the added value of Paris Declaration-style development cooperation compared with the pre-Paris Declaration situation, and seen alongside other drivers of development in the country, other sources of development finance and development cooperation partners beyond those so far endorsing the Declaration?
- What are the key messages for a) national stakeholders, and b) donor countries and agencies?
- What are the key implications for aid effectiveness in the future, taking account of new challenges and opportunities (e.g. climate change) and new actors and relationships?

C. Key Lessons and Recommendations (if applicable) (Max. 5 pp.)

Annex 1: Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness

Annex 2: The Accra Agenda for Action

Annex 3: Generic Terms of Reference for Country Evaluations

Annex 4: Generic Terms of Reference for Donor/Agency HQ Studies


Annex 5: Selected Additional References

Annex 6: Glossary of Shared Definitions for Key Terms in the Evaluation

Appendix E


Two framework diagrams from preparatory studies

Schematic Depiction Figure 1



Source: Approach paper p.10, from Stern et al, Linkages Study.

Schematic Depiction Figure 2



Source: Booth and Evans (2006) *An Options Paper*, p. 9 Figure 2.2