



PARIS DECLARATION MONITORING AND EVALUATION: COMPLEMENTARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

Explanatory Note

Purpose

As the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration and the 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration get under way, various stakeholders have expressed a need for clear communication around the relationships and differences between the Paris Declaration Monitoring and Evaluation activities, the specific work involved, and the governance and management arrangements. This note is designed to help clarify these issues for countries involved in both processes.

1. Substance, timing and coverage

The agreed texts of both the Paris Declaration itself and the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) called specifically for systematic monitoring and independent evaluation at the international level of the implementation of the aid effectiveness commitments. The two exercises are different in several key ways and are intended to be complementary.

The Monitoring Survey aims to track progress made against selected indicators – the “how much” or “how far”, whereas evaluation aims at assessing the results achieved and fundamental reasons, the “why?” or “why not?”

The three **Monitoring Surveys** (in 2006, 2008, and 2011)¹ are intended to provide “snapshots” of the evolution of aid effectiveness against 12 quantitative indicators, with numerical targets. They are thus focused on a selection among the total of 56 commitments set out in the Declaration, with this evidence being complemented with qualitative monitoring information provided by partner countries, which forms the basis for the country chapters. The aim has been to carry out the standard Survey in the widest possible group of partner countries (54 in 2008). The results of the 2006 baseline Survey were a point of reference for the 2008 Phase 1 Evaluation and, together with the 2008 survey results, will be an input to the Phase 2 Evaluation. The 2011 Survey results will only be available after the Evaluation has

¹ Surveys undertaken in 2006, 2008 and 2011 seek to capture progress against the 12 Paris Declaration indicators drawing on data from 2005, 2007 and 2010 respectively.

been finalized, but the two will provide important and complementary findings and conclusions leading up to the Seoul High Level Forum.

The **Evaluation** is a more in-depth exercise, conducted at only two points, in 2007 and 2010². It aims to examine and explain the overall performance in implementing the PD and AAA commitments in individual countries and as seen from the donor side. The Evaluation also aims to assess the contributions made to improving aid effectiveness and, to the extent possible, to development results. The evaluation results therefore deepen understanding of progress and challenges in the implementation of the PD, and provide explanations for some of the trends highlighted in the Monitoring Survey.

A group of 24 partner countries have volunteered to participate in Phase 2 of the evaluation (added to the eight in Phase 1) and seven donor/agency headquarters studies will be added to the eleven conducted in Phase 1. These country and agency evaluations, together with other sources of information and analysis, will provide the basis for the Evaluation synthesis.

Both the findings of the Phase 1 Evaluation and the 2006 Monitoring Survey results were reported and discussed at the Accra High Level Forum. The 2011 Monitoring Survey will establish the extent to which the targets agreed in the Paris Declaration have been met, while the Phase 2 Evaluation is intended to go further into the assessment of effects on aid effectiveness and development results. The evidence generated by both the Phase 2 Evaluation and the 2011 Monitoring Survey will be key to inform the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness which will be held in Seoul at the end of 2011.

2. Workload and possible overlaps for participating countries

Almost all countries participating in the Evaluation have also taken part in the Monitoring exercise to date, and they will be encouraged to complete the cycle by participating in the Monitoring Survey in 2011. Countries involved in the Evaluation do take on an additional workload to that presented by participation in the Survey. Often, the same people will have to help carry the load, but they have clearly judged that the benefits of participating in both complementary processes will be worth the additional commitment.

It will be especially important to avoid confusion between the Monitoring Survey (with its focus on the agreed Paris Declaration indicators) and the data collection techniques that will be applied as one of the key methods for answering the major set of Evaluation Questions. The Evaluation recognizes the value of the Monitoring Survey and will specifically use the relevant results of the 2008 Monitoring Survey to help answer some of its own sub-questions on aid effectiveness. But the evaluation sub-questions are broader and qualitative and thus the Evaluation will also apply a range of other methods.

² Country evaluations carried out during 2007 and 2010 and the Synthesis reports published in 2008 and 2011.

3. Governance and relationships with the WP EFF

Consistent with the principles of the Paris Declaration itself, it is good practice to ensure that initiatives such as the Monitoring and Evaluation of the Paris Declaration are coordinated and harmonized as much as possible, avoiding unnecessary duplication and excessive demands on partner countries. The Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP EFF), supported by the OECD/DAC Secretariat, is a central forum and mechanism for the necessary communication, coordination and harmonization, and for organizing the High Level Fora on Aid Effectiveness.

The Working Party, through a dedicated Task Team, has direct responsibility for implementing the Monitoring Survey.

Consistent with the necessary independence of good evaluation practice, the Evaluation is overseen by an International Reference Group made up of representatives of evaluation offices of the participating countries and agencies, supported by the Paris Declaration Evaluation Secretariat at DIIS. At the same time, communication, coordination and harmonization are ensured by regular direct contact (and a good number of overlapping memberships) between the Working Party and the Evaluation Reference Group, as well as between the OECD/DAC Secretariat and the Paris Declaration Evaluation Secretariat.

For questions or further clarification, please contact:

Niels Dabelstein, Paris Declaration Evaluation Secretariat (nda@diis.dk)

Robin Ogilvy, OECD/DAC Secretariat (robin.ogilvy@oecd.org).