

- General Ideas
 - Minimum of document as it is
 - Details
 - Conclusion

- Scoring
 - 0-3
 - very restrictive
 - Percentages
 - Scale 1-10

- Status of countries given values

- How countries progressing measured against baseline

- Must be easy use

- State Holders/Partnership Countries

- Procurement
 - Financial Management how fit with development plan
 - Clarify assumptions

- Narrative Scoring
 - Trajectory change on reforms started
 - Institutional issues


- Appreciation of Indicators
 - Uniform scoring same standard
 - What are we looking for


- Set the Goal
 - Not adjustments along the way
 - Set the standards

- Agreements
 1. Baseline Indicators } Scoring must be very careful
 - Performance Indicator }
2. Confusion in the objective of assessment tool
 3. Procurement Data
 4. Setting Standards
 5. Implementation issue
 6. Political Economy
 - Broader Governance Area

- How do we score other which are not in the Indicators
Capture as additional practice
- Might be to detailed for a Universal Indicator
 - Could be captured as sub-indicator
 - Established platform
- Scoring Methodology
 - Should be very simple
 - Should they be weighting system - – to implement our strategy guide as to how diff. objectives of the government should be made as a way of objective
 - which be based on perception
 - scoring that is across the board

** Weighting – internal use of country but not for a higher level
- On Question
 - sub indicators determines scoring not indicators
 - what size of evidence/reflective of hour to operationalize them
 - relationship between performance indicator and BIS – to allow flexibility
- Scoring
 - Qualitative vs. Quantitative


 BIS


 P.I.
 - Group between scores - impact
- Proposal
 - Tool – explanatory note.
 - Range will allow flexibility & show that level of comfort that the country tries to improve.
 - Helps identify the risk and risk management-what level of detail is needed.
 - Scoring system of 0-3 may be acceptable for purposes of setting standards
 - there must be an explanatory note to clarify why the specific score is given.
 - Aggregate scoring must correspond to the level of activity

Question No. 3:

- Duplication of indicators
 - tool may be improved by eliminating duplications
 - quantitative and qualitative indicators will make it more focused
 - re-organizing the indicators

Question No. 4

- pass/fail may be applied to those indicators where quantitative and qualitative indicator are not applicable.

Question No. 5

- average of scales
- most frequent score
- based on the lowest score

Issue:

- Which is the best method?
 - Averaging
- Scoring method must be consistent with
 - assessing performance
 - identifying the risk
 - capacity development
- How do you translate aggregate score to Paris Declaration
 - given option 2
 - Apply scoring – pillar basis not aggregate
 - to accurately reflect the state of affairs of one country
 - evaluate by pillar measure

Agreement

1. action plan – measures/strengths
2. not to aggregate – by pillar
 - Appropriate level of aggregate
 - Easiest way to measure progress

Scoring Method

- applicable only if there are sub-indicators, yet if the indicator has no sub-indicators then the score of such indicator shall be the score
- be pilot test to some countries

Interdependent – not average

Not interdependent – average

Weigh the pillars so that the aggregate will fit into P.D

Method No. 1 and 2 – Sub indicators

Method No. 3 – Pillars

Question No. 8

How do we propose to roll it out?

1. Completed
 - Tested
 - Disseminated
2. Regional meeting
 - Revised the document to include performance indicators.
 - Review and comment on review version
 - Set guidelines
 - Next regional meet – comment on the guidelines