



ROOM DOCUMENT

Item V, i

More Timely, Credible and Cost-Effective Performance Information on Multilateral Partners: A Proposed Approach

This document has been prepared by Cida for consideration at the 9th meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 15-16 June 2009.

**9th meeting
15 – 16 June 2009**

DRAFT

**More Timely, Credible and Cost-Effective
Performance Information on Multilateral
Partners: A Proposed Approach**

Evaluation Division
Strategic Policy and Performance Branch
Canadian International Development Agency

May 2009

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms	ii
Executive Summary	3
1.0 Introduction	10
1.1 Is a New Approach Needed?	10
1.2 Characteristics of the New Approach.....	11
2.0 Background: Joint Evaluations and Alternative Approaches	12
2.1 A Very Brief History of Joint Evaluations	12
2.2 The Search for Alternative Approaches	15
2.3 Limitations of the Peer Review and MOPAN Approaches	17
2.4 CIDA’s Review of the Effectiveness of the Multilateral Delivery Channel	19
3.0 The Proposed Approach and Its Components.....	20
3.1 Meta-Evaluation	21
3.2 Review of Effectiveness Management Systems	23
3.3 Field Mission	25
4.0 Resource Requirements	26
5.0 A System for Gathering Effectiveness Information.....	28
5.1 Elements of the Proposed System	28
5.2 Rate of Production and Scheduling	29
5.3 Lead Agency and Management Group Implementation Arrangements	30
5.4 Governance and Reporting	31
Appendix 1: Evaluation Scoring Chart.....	33

List of Acronyms

CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
COMPAS	Common Performance Assessment System
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ECG	Evaluation Cooperation Group
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GFATM	Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria
ICRC	International Commission of the Red Cross
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFI	International Financial Institution
MDB	Multilateral Development Banks
MfDR	Managing for Development Results
MOPAN	Multilateral Performance Assessment Network
RBM	Results-based Management
UN	United Nations
UNAIDS	United Nations Joint Program on HIV/AIDS
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WFP	World Food Program
WHO	World Health Organization

Executive Summary

Introduction

This paper proposes a new approach to collecting and disseminating information on the effectiveness of multilateral development organizations, an approach which builds on the strength of past practice in joint external evaluations undertaken by multiple bilateral and multilateral partner organizations.

Such an approach would not be needed if current systems and practices in assessing and reporting on multilateral agency effectiveness met the needs of key stakeholders, especially those bilateral agencies providing substantial direct financial support to multilateral agencies and their programs. Unfortunately, an overview of effectiveness reporting material available (including from the agencies themselves) reveals some important weaknesses.

- The current set of effectiveness reports generated by the agencies themselves including annual effectiveness reports and annual reviews of the results of internal and external evaluations is inconsistent in quality and scope across different organizations and does not provide a reasonably comprehensive, credible and comparable assessment of the performance of multilateral partners¹;
- Attempts to address these inconsistencies through such bodies as the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) are leading to improvements in evaluation quality over time as one element in the system but they do not yet address problems of inconsistent coverage;
- Attempts at collaboration among bilateral and between bilateral and multilateral organizations to gather effectiveness related data have focused either on examining the strength of internal accountability systems (Professional Peer Reviews of the Evaluation Function) or on assessing the perceived performance of multilateral organizations in partnering with bilateral organizations (the Multilateral Organization Performance

¹ It is of course true that many Multilateral Development Banks and Some UN organizations publish annual, systematic reports on their development effectiveness including project portfolio assessments and annual summaries of evaluation reports. Unfortunately these vary in coverage and quality and do not yet represent a full system for reporting on multilateral partner effectiveness.

Assessment Network). They have not yet been able to provide credible information on field tested performance indicators; and

- While joint evaluations of multilateral organizations have been effective in the past at examining overall agency effectiveness and have served as the catalyst for important organizational change initiatives, they have done so at considerable cost in terms of time and financial investment. Typically, they have taken 2-3 years from conception to completion and, for large organizations, 1.5 million USD or more. One result has been sporadic coverage of major multilateral partners often driven by the interest of a small group of bilateral agencies with important multilateral organizations not covered while others are reviewed more than once.

Given these limitations of the current diverse sources of effectiveness information, many bilateral organizations find they cannot credibly respond to the accountability requirements placed on them by their Parliaments. In particular, bilateral agencies are regularly called on to provide a technically sound and systematic accounting of the field effectiveness of multilateral partners and their programs.

In addition, developing country partner governments require similar evidence of multilateral agency effectiveness to form the basis of decisions regarding their own programming and the most effective use they can make of external support.

Basic Characteristics of the Proposed New Approach

The proposed new approach;

- employs a common methodology and assessment criteria to be applied in assessing each multilateral organization;
- is a joint approach to be implemented by bilateral organizations working together and in cooperation with both multilateral partners and developing country governments;
- allows for burden sharing and division of labor; and
- builds on proven methods including joint evaluation and structured reviews of management for development systems in the multilateral organizations.

By employing a common methodology the approach ensures consistent coverage of core effectiveness issues while providing an assured level of credible information reporting on consistent indicators of effectiveness. This in turn allows for building a common body of knowledge over time which can be accessed by all key stakeholders for both accountability and decision purposes.

By relying on joint implementation the new approach ensures that the resulting information will be meaningful for the multilateral organizations involved and will represent the views of a substantial constituency rather than a single bilateral partner. It will also reduce the internal management and coordination burden for the multilateral partners which otherwise will be faced by single-agency initiatives.

The proposed approach also allows for burden sharing and a division of labor since the assessment of a single multilateral partner is led by one bilateral agency with two to three others serving on the management group and with all working on behalf of a broader key stakeholder base.

Standardized methodologies and terms of reference and joint implementation and information sharing also allow for the new approach to achieve reasonable coverage of multilateral partner organizations in a relatively short time frame and within reasonable cost parameters.

Methodology Components of the Proposed New Approach

The proposed approach has three main methodological components to be implemented during each joint evaluation:

1. A meta-evaluation of the published and readily available evaluations which are pertinent to a given organization and its programs, especially including the evaluations produced by its own evaluation function but not limited to them;

Perhaps most importantly, the sample of evaluations to be reviewed for any one multilateral organization will mainly represent the work of its own evaluation function. In essence the meta-evaluation will examine what the organization's own evaluation function is telling stakeholders about agency performance.

The meta-evaluation also brings into the process a missing element in the Peer Review process. While the Peer Review tells us to what extent the agency's own evaluation function can be relied on, the meta-evaluation tells us what that system

has to say about agency performance. As a result the meta-evaluation does not replace but builds on the strengths of the Peer Review process.

2. A direct review of the organizations systems and procedures (including personnel capacity) for managing for development and/or humanitarian results. These systems include evaluation, results-based management, reporting on effectiveness, and knowledge management. This review would include interviews with the staff involved in these system as well as key users within the organization and a review of relevant documents; and,
3. A brief field evaluation component dealing with selected agency programs in one or two developing countries with the intent that they should not be representative of all agency programming but they should illustrate the operation of the three systems above at the level of developing country operations. The field evaluations would also encompass systems for country program planning and implementation. The field evaluations will also present opportunities for feedback from recipient countries on the effectiveness of the multilateral partners.

Common Evaluation Criteria

The joint evaluations to be carried out under the proposed system would use a common set of evaluation and review criteria based on the OECD/DAC criteria with some modification to reflect the importance of systems for managing for development effectiveness as an indication of expected organizational performance over time.

There are six main assessment criteria and 13 sub-criteria:

Main Criteria	Components
1. Relevance: International and National Development Goals	1.1 Agency development programs and projects are aligned with national and international development goals. 1.2 Agency humanitarian activities are coordinated with other agencies and align with national priorities. 1.3 Agency takes part in local planning and coordination bodies.
2. Comparative Advantage of the Multilateral Partner	2.1 Agency programs and projects focus on its specific, stated role and comparative advantage
3. Managing for Development Effectiveness	3.1 Effective systems for assessing performance and reporting on development and humanitarian effectiveness. 3.2 Effective results-based management systems. 3.3 Reliable and useful evaluation systems and processes. 3.4 Effective knowledge management systems and processes.
4. Objectives Achievement	4.1 Extent development and humanitarian program and project objectives are achieved.
5. Cost Effectiveness	5.1 Agency programs and projects are cost effective.
6. Sustainability	6.1 Benefits accrued to participants will continue after project or program closure. 6.2 Agency projects and programs address the capacity of local institutions to sustain results. 6.3 Agency projects and programs provide adequate human and other resources (including host government resources).

Reasonable Time and Cost Requirements

Based on experience with recent, focused and time limited organizational evaluations and meta-evaluations the time and cost requirements of the proposed approach are reasonable enough to form the basis of an effective system for joint evaluation of multilateral organizations. Any one evaluation can be usually completed within a single calendar year based on the common criteria and the evaluation methods proposed. Using very conservative budgeting assumptions, the cost of a single study is estimated at approximately 250,000 – 300,000 USD.

Given the limited time requirement of less than one year from concept to completion and the

relatively modest budget requirements, it seems likely that interested bilateral agencies could collaborate on four to five such evaluations each year and thus provide good coverage of the most active and important multilateral organizations on a five year cycle.

Planning, Management and Implementation Arrangements: The Role of the Lead Agency and the Management Group

Historically, one of the most time consuming and expensive aspects of joint evaluations has arisen from the complexity of consultations and joint planning, procurement, management, implementation and review arrangements. These can be avoided under the proposed arrangement since the investments in management and financial terms are modest enough to be handled by a **lead agency** for each evaluation provided it works with the support of a management group of 2-3 supporting bilateral organizations.

Under the proposed approach a lead agency would have lead responsibility for each joint evaluation of a multilateral organization, although it would receive administrative, managerial and financial support from other interested bilateral agencies cooperating through a project management group.

The lead agency would commit to use of the common terms of reference, three core methodology components (meta-evaluation, management systems review, and limited field evaluation), common assessment criteria and a common reporting format. Given those constraints, however, the lead agency would use its own rules and procedures for procurement.

The management group would be jointly responsible for ongoing project management and for quality assurance and reporting.

Selection of multilateral organizations for evaluations would be done collectively under the coordination of a secretariat and based on criteria which include providing results which are timely in the planning and programming cycle of the organization being evaluated but also including the interest and willingness of bilateral agencies to take on the necessary investment in financial and managerial resources.

Governance and Reporting

One important question is where should the organizational and reporting home of any system for time and cost effective joint evaluations of multilateral organizations be placed. In the case of MOPAN, this question was resolved by the creation of a MOPAN secretariat which can be located within one of the member bilateral agencies and can be moved from time to time

depending on interest.

One possibility would be to establish a Task Team under the DAC Evaluation Network of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD to further develop the approach and assist in its implementation. Evaluation Network Task Teams have been established in the past to, among other projects, establish evaluation quality standards, develop a glossary of evaluation and results-based-management terms and, jointly with the United Nations Evaluation Group, establish standards for and coordinate the Professional Peer Reviews of the Evaluation Functions among UN agencies.

At least in the early stages, coordination of the process of nominating organizations for evaluation and the assignment/acceptance of lead agency roles could be the responsibility of the Task Team. Eventually, a rotating secretariat based on the MOPAN model could be the most effective method of coordination. It could also have a knowledge management role in being the recipient and publisher of record of the final reports.

Draft reports would be submitted for review by the members of the management group and the multilateral organization (although the latter would not have any right of veto or final editing on the evaluation report),

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Is a New Approach Needed?

This paper proposes a new approach to collecting and disseminating information on the effectiveness of multilateral development organizations, an approach which builds on the strength of past practice in joint external evaluations undertaken by multiple bilateral and multilateral partner organizations.

Such an approach would not be needed if current systems and practices in assessing and reporting on multilateral agency effectiveness met the needs of key stakeholders, especially bilateral agencies providing substantial direct financial support to multilateral agencies and their programs. Unfortunately an overview of effectiveness reporting material available (including from the agencies themselves) reveals some important weaknesses.

- The current set of effectiveness reports generated by the agencies themselves including annual effectiveness reports and annual reviews of the results of internal and external evaluations is inconsistent in quality and scope across different organizations and does not provide a reasonably comprehensive, credible and comparable assessment of the performance of multilateral partners;
- Attempts to address these inconsistencies through such bodies as the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) are leading to improvements in evaluation quality over time as one element in the system but they do not yet address problems of inconsistent coverage;
- Attempts at collaboration among bilateral and between bilateral and multilateral organizations to gather effectiveness related data have focused either on examining the strength of internal accountability systems (Professional Peer Reviews of the Evaluation Function) or on assessing the perceived performance of multilateral organizations in partnering with bilateral organizations (the Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network). They have not yet been able to provide credible information on field tested performance indicators; and

- While joint evaluations of multilateral organizations have been effective in the past at examining overall agency effectiveness and have served as the catalyst for important organizational change initiatives, they have done so at considerable cost in terms of time and financial investment. Typically, they have taken 2-3 years from conception to completion and, for large organizations, 1.5 million USD or more.

Given these limitations of the current diverse sources of effectiveness information, many bilateral organizations find they cannot credibly answer the accountability requirements placed on them by their Parliaments and Treasuries. As one example of this type of requirement, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) must on a regular basis provide the Treasury Board of Canada with a technically sound and systematic accounting of the field effectiveness of the multilateral partners and their programs it supports, including an assessment of the value added they bring to the development process.

In addition, developing country partner governments require similar evidence of multilateral agency effectiveness to form the basis of decisions regarding their own programming and the most effective use they can make of external support.

1.2 Characteristics of the New Approach

The new approach is described in more detail in Section 3.0 below but its main characteristics are:

- It employs a common methodology for to be applied in assessing each multilateral organization;
- It is a joint approach to be implemented by bilateral organizations working together and in cooperation with both multilateral partners and developing country governments;
- It allows for burden sharing and division of labor; and,
- It builds on proven methods including joint evaluation and structured reviews of management for development systems in the multilateral organizations.

By employing a common methodology the approach ensures consistent coverage of

core effectiveness issues while providing an assured level of credible information reporting on consistent indicators of effectiveness. This in turn allows for building a common body of knowledge over time which can be accessed by all key stakeholders for both accountability and decision purposes.

By relying on joint implementation the new approach ensures that the resulting information would be meaningful for the multilateral organizations involved and would represent the views of a substantial constituency rather than a single bilateral partner. It would also reduce the internal management and coordination burden for the multilateral partners which would be faced by single-agency initiatives.

The proposed approach also allows for burden sharing and a division of labor since the assessment of a single multilateral partner is led by one bilateral agency with a small group of others serving on the management group and working on behalf of a broader key stakeholder base.

Standardized methodologies and terms of reference and joint implementation and information sharing also allow for the new approach to achieve reasonable coverage of multilateral partner organizations in a relatively short time frame and within reasonable cost parameters.

The Sections which follow explore both the need for and the characteristics of the proposed approach in more detail.

2.0 Background: Joint Evaluations and Alternative Approaches

2.1 A Very Brief History of Joint Evaluations

For over two decades, joint, independent evaluations have formed a critical part of the spectrum of effectiveness information on multilateral partners. Throughout the period bilateral development partner agencies (and to some extent developing country governments) have been investing in jointly funded and governed evaluations of the most important multilateral organizations receiving their support. From the first pre-evaluation study of the United Nations Fund for Population (UNFPA) in 1989 through to the comprehensive external evaluation of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) published in 2007, agencies have cooperated in these major undertakings.

Just a partial listing would include:

- United Nations Children’s Fund: UNICEF: Published 1992
- United Nations Fund for Population (UNFPA): Published 1993
- World Food Program (WFP): Published 1994
- The Finance Mechanism of the Montreal Protocol: Published 1995
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP): Published 1996
- World Health Organization (WHO): Published 1997
- World Food Program (WFP) Enabling Development Policy: Published in 2005
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); Published in 2005
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO): Published in 2007.

In addition, of course, bilateral and multilateral organizations have jointly supported and managed large thematic evaluations which were global or regional in scope including the Joint Evaluation of Emergency Assistance to Rwanda (1996), the Global Evaluation of External Support to Basic Education (2003), the Joint Evaluation of the International Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami (2006) and Phase One of the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration (2008).

2.1.1 Benefits of Joint Evaluations of Multilateral Agencies

Joint Evaluations of specific multilateral organizations have demonstrated a number of key strengths and have served critical needs of sponsoring bilateral agencies, partner developing countries and the agencies concerned. The most readily apparent benefits of large-scale joint evaluations of multilateral organizations include:

- Their ability to serve as a platform for joint funding which, in turn, allows the planning, commissioning and carrying out of large scale, complex and lengthy evaluation studies with high technical standards which would not otherwise be possible under single-agency funding;
- Their acknowledge “political” weight and profile which ensures both the close cooperation of the agency under evaluation and a reasonable hearing granted to findings, conclusions and recommendations;
- The assurance of consistent follow-up and the monitoring of how evaluation

recommendations are implemented based on the participation of many sponsoring agencies in the governing bodies of the organizations concerned;

- The fact that these comprehensive evaluations can often be both the catalyst and a major element in the blueprint for organizational change and reform. Recent very vivid examples include the IFAD Action Plan implemented in response to the 2004 External Evaluation and FAO's strategic response to the 2007 Independent External Evaluation; and
- At least theoretically, these large scale joint evaluations allow different bilateral agencies to harmonize their evaluation requirements and reduce both global systemic costs (which would be incurred under separate evaluations) and the burden of time and support required of the agencies undergoing evaluation.

2.1.2 Limitations and Constraints of Joint Evaluations

Despite the relatively widely acknowledged advantages of joint evaluations, over time they were subject to criticism relating to their duration and cost. Specifically:

- From original conception, through early planning (including joint development of terms of reference), international tendering, mobilization of the evaluation team, field and headquarters research, report preparation, peer review, and on to final reporting these evaluations could easily take three years or more to complete;
- They represent a very significant management and coordination burden for the staff of the bilateral agencies and national governments involved in planning, management and governance;
- They were, by the standards of a single agency, expensive undertakings with costs sometimes in excess of two million US dollars; and
- They represented a significant draw on the time of senior and middle managers at headquarters and country level with the organizations under evaluation.

In response to these challenges, bilateral agencies have collaborated in a search for alternative methods for assessing the effectiveness of multilateral organizations.

2.2 The Search for Alternative Approaches

In an effort to continue to meet the need to assess and evaluate the effectiveness of multilateral organizations in a more timely way and with lower direct and indirect costs to all concerned, bilateral agencies have either initiated their own processes or collaborated in collective efforts to find more cost and time efficient solutions to the challenge of evaluating these efforts.

One of the most significant of these efforts has been the Professional Peer Reviews of the Evaluation Function which represent a joint effort of the OECD/DAC Evaluation Network and the United Nations Evaluation Group working under a DAC/UNEG Taskforce on Professional Peer Reviews. Another important initiative has been the work of the Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN).

2.2.1 Professional Peer Reviews of the Evaluation Function

As noted in the report of the Professional Peer Review of the Evaluation Function of the Office of Internal Oversight Services of the United Nations:

“Peer Review of evaluation is an approach used to assess multilateral agencies’ own evaluation capacity and performance. It reviews to what extent a multilateral agency’s own central evaluation function produces evaluations that are credible and useful for learning and accountability purposes as tested by internationally recognized professional evaluation peers.”

The Peer Reviews rely on three main methodologies: a self assessment, interviews and group discussions with key stakeholders and a review of documents including evaluation reports and documents relating to policy and governance of the evaluation function. Completed Peer Reviews include:

- Peer Review of the UNDP Evaluation Office – 2005;
- Peer Review of the Evaluation Function at UNICEF – 2006;
- Peer Review of the Evaluation Function at the World Food Program – 2007;
- Peer Review of the Evaluation Function of the Office of Internal Oversight Services of the United Nations – 2009.

The logic behind the Peer Review Process links the quality of the evaluation function in a given organization to the reliability of the evaluation reports it produces: reports

which could presumably then be relied on by key stakeholders as a measure of overall agency effectiveness. It is important to note however, that the Peer Review Process was never intended to pronounce on the overall development effectiveness of the organizations under review. Its findings are limited to the reliability and integrity of the evaluation system itself in relation to the UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards.

2.2.2 Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN)

The Multilateral Organization Assessment Network (MOPAN) is a network of like-minded donors that jointly conduct an annual in-house survey assessing the performance of multilateral organizations. Current members are Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, The Netherlands, Norway, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

Up to 2008 the main focus of MOPAN has been to undertake an annual survey on multilateral organizations. The survey was a perception survey of multilateral organization partnership behavior towards national stakeholders (governments, NGOs, private sector) in developing countries as well as towards other international development agencies. The aim was to provide better information on and dialogue with multilateral organizations as one means of seeking improvement of overall multilateral organization performance at a country level.

Table 1: MOPAN Survey Coverage of Multilateral Organizations 2003 to 2008.

MOPAN Survey	Multilateral Organizations Covered	Remarks
2003	WHO, UNICEF, World Bank, AfDB, ADB, IDB	Pilot Year for MOPAN Survey Explicit Focus on Health
2004	UNDP, AfDB, FAO	
2005	UNFPA, UN-AIDS Secretariat and World Bank	
2006	UNICEF, International Labour Organization, ADB	
2007	WHO, UNDP, AfDB	
2008	World Bank, FNUAP, European Commission	

Having reached a consensus in 2007 that members required further information on the effectiveness of individual multilateral organizations beyond the Annual MOPAN Survey, MOPAN members began moving towards a new common approach for the assessment of multilateral effectiveness. This work included a comparative analysis of existing bilateral donor assessment approaches which revealed a set of assessment criteria common to the donors involved: 1) domestic policy relevance; 2) international policy relevance; and 3) internal performance; and 4) external performance.

Recommendations on how a harmonized approach might be applied in the future were also provided. After a first pilot testing in late 2008, MOPAN members have begun the second and more comprehensive test phase of the common approach in early 2009.

2.3 Limitations of the Peer Review and MOPAN Approaches

Despite their continued development, both Professional Peer Reviews and the MOPAN Common Approach have some important limitations from an accountability and effectiveness reporting perspective. While they definitely have an important contribution to make to the development of a harmonized system of assessment and effectiveness reporting, they do not meet some of the most important requirements for accountability faced by bilateral development partner organizations in particular. For example:

- Professional Peer Reviews may well provide certification of the reliability of an organization's evaluation function but in themselves they do not comment on the development effectiveness of the organization in question. Without some form of systematic review of the **findings** of the evaluation reports and other products emanating from the function, stakeholders will not have any means of assessing organizational effectiveness;
- While evaluation as a function has an important role to play in improving agency effectiveness, it cannot, by itself, be read as an assurance of effectiveness. As an example, evaluation would presumably need to be accompanied by effective results based management and effectiveness reporting systems (which are themselves linked into programming processes) to contribute to overall agency effectiveness. Hence a positive peer review of the evaluation function will not certify that an agency is effectively managing for development results;
- Neither MOPAN, nor the Peer Review process include either a structured analysis of the findings of agency-specific evaluations or any element of field verification of the realities described in the organization's documents.
- MOPAN has an advantage over the Peer Review process in that it covers other management systems directly related to agency effectiveness such as

results-based-management (RBM) and knowledge management. On the other hand, it relies mainly on a survey of agency managers and partner staff at headquarters and field level, combined with a review of agency documents. MOPAN does not assess how well multilateral organizations deliver on their individual development objectives but rather the multilateral organizations behaviors, systems and processes that help ensure those results. In short, MOPAN, even under the common approach, is not able to draw on direct observations or measures of agency and program effectiveness at field level.

For bilateral partner agencies at least, these limitations of both the Peer Review and MOPAN systems render them ineffective in meeting the requirement from their Parliaments that they be accountable for the field effectiveness of the multilateral organizations (and their programs) that they support.

For bilateral agencies (and presumably for partner developing countries as well), there is a need for a different approach to shared accountability for the effectiveness of multilateral organizations. This approach should combine some of the advantages of the more traditional joint evaluations with a focus on timelines (as in MOPAN) and making use of an organization's own accountability functions (as with the Peer Review Process).

Its basic characteristics should include:

- Capacity to make use of existing evaluative material relating to agency effectiveness, including the output of its own evaluation function;
- An internal focus on more than just the evaluation function of an organization in order to assess how well the organization manages for development results;
- Some verification of agency effectiveness at the level of developing country programs through field evaluations;
- Suitability for implementation within a limited time frame of approximately one year;
- Be of a small enough scale to be implemented by a single development partner agency using its own systems and processes for procurement and contracting but with financial and managerial support from a small group of partners;

- Be modest enough in its budget requirements for four to five studies to be carried out each year; and
- Follow a common set of evaluation and assessment criteria so it can be centrally reported and can be relied on by all bilateral development partners and by other key stakeholders.

In responding to a direct requirement from the Canadian Treasury Board, the Canadian International Development Agency recently completed a review of the effectiveness of Canadian support to multilateral development and humanitarian organizations which allowed it to develop some of the elements of such an approach.

2.4 CIDA's Review of the Effectiveness of the Multilateral Delivery Channel

In late 2007, CIDA was required to conduct a structured and fairly rigorous review of its use of multilateral organizations as a key channel for the provision of Canadian development and humanitarian assistance to developing countries. The study was to be planned in the fourth quarter of 2007 and implemented in early 2008 with reporting by the end of the 2008/09 fiscal year. Much of the planning period was devoted to developing a financial and operational profile of CIDA investments in multilateral organizations in order to identify a core set of 23 organizations accounting for more than 80% of CIDA funding through multilaterals.

Significant time was also devoted to developing a sample frame of over 500 evaluation reports of the 23 organizations and their major programs either publicly available or accessible on request by the evaluation team.

The CIDA Review had two main elements:

- a) A meta-evaluation of a selected sample of 117 evaluation reports published between 2004 and 2008 and including only evaluations which were agency-wide in scope or which covered either a global, regional or large scale country program of work implemented by the agency; and
- b) An assessment of each agency's capacity to manage for development effectiveness through review of its systems and processes for program and project evaluation, results based management, and for monitoring and reporting on the

effectiveness of its programs to its governing body and to key stakeholders among bilateral and developing country partners.

The assessment of management for development results relied on interviews with organizational staff involved in the functions mentioned as well as a review of policy documents, guidelines, manuals and reports of all three systems (evaluation, RBM and results reporting).

Following development of the concept paper the actual review itself required 12 months to complete, including all internal review processes at CIDA and submission to the Treasury Board of Canada in March 2009. Its overall budget requirement was less than USD 150,000 but it did not include any field evaluation work.

3.0 The Proposed Approach and Its Components

The proposed approach gathering timely, credible and cost-effective information on the effectiveness of multilateral organizations draws on (but is not limited to) the approaches tested by CIDA during its review of the effectiveness of multilateral organizations. It has three main components:

1. A meta-evaluation of the published and readily available evaluations which are pertinent to a given organization and its programs, especially including the evaluations produced by its own evaluation function but not limited to them;
2. A direct review of the organizations systems and procedures (including personnel capacity) for managing for development and/or humanitarian results. These systems include evaluation, results-based management, effectiveness reporting and knowledge management. This review would include interviews with the staff involved in these system as well as key users within the organization and a review of relevant documents; and
3. A brief field evaluation component dealing with selected agency programs in one or two developing countries with the intent that they should not be representative of all agency programming but they should illustrate the operation of the three systems above at the level of developing country operations. The field evaluations would also encompass systems for country program planning and implementation. The field evaluations will also present opportunities for feedback from recipient countries on the effectiveness of the multilateral partners.

It is worth discussing each of these components in some more detail.

3.1 Meta-Evaluation

3.1.1 Developing a Sample of Evaluation Reports for Review

The 2009 Review of the Effectiveness of CIDA's Multilateral Delivery Channel was able to identify over 500 evaluation reports relating to United Nations Organizations, members of the Red Cross and Red Crescent family, and Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs). By eliminating project evaluations this number was reduced to just over 300 and a selection of 117 agency wide, global or country program evaluations was developed. For significant multilateral development agencies it will be possible in all but a few instances to identify a significant number of agency-specific evaluations, especially if the definition of relevant evaluations is broadened to include significant sector-specific evaluations carried out at country level. Thus the menu of possible types of evaluations to be reviewed should include agency-specific evaluations at the level of:

- Agency wide evaluations (joint, external or internal);
- Evaluations of agency programs which are global or regional in scope;
- Evaluations of an agency's complete country program;
- Sector-wide or thematic evaluations of agency programming in a given country; and
- Evaluations of large programs/projects at field level which are representative of the agency's approach, especially those which reflect new or reformed approaches to program/project development and implementation.

For each of the major agencies it should be possible to develop a set of 40-50 recent evaluation reports for review.

Perhaps most importantly, the sample of evaluations to be reviewed for any one multilateral organization will mainly represent the work of its own evaluation function. In essence the meta-evaluation will examine what the organization's own evaluation function is telling stakeholders about agency performance.

The meta-evaluation also brings into the process a missing element in the Peer Review process. While the Peer Review tells us to what extent the agency's own evaluation function can be relied on, the meta-evaluation tells us what that system has

to say about agency performance. As a result the meta-evaluation does not replace but builds on the strengths of the Peer Review process.

3.1.2 Reviewing and Scoring Evaluations

Criteria to be used for assessing the findings of each of the evaluations under review can be derived from the DAC Evaluation Criteria combined with some of the most important effectiveness indicators used in the recent re-design of MOPAN and the development of its new Common Approach. In the case of the recent CIDA review they included six main criteria and 13 sub criteria as noted in table 2.

Table 2: Evaluation Review Criteria

Main Criteria	Components
1. Relevance: International and National Development Goals	1.1 Agency development programs and projects are aligned with national and international development goals. 1.2 Agency humanitarian activities are coordinated with other agencies and align with national priorities. 1.3 Agency takes part in local planning and coordination bodies.
2. Comparative Advantage of the Multilateral Partner	2.1 Agency programs and projects focus on its specific, stated role and comparative advantage
3. Managing for Development Effectiveness	3.1 Effective systems for assessing performance and reporting on development and humanitarian effectiveness. 3.2 Effective results-based management systems. 3.3 Reliable and useful evaluation systems and processes. 3.4 Effective knowledge management systems and processes.
4. Objectives Achievement	4.1 Extent development and humanitarian program and project objectives are achieved.
5. Cost Effectiveness	5.1 Agency programs and projects are cost effective.
6. Sustainability	6.1 Benefits accrued to participants will continue after project or program closure. 6.2 Agency projects and programs address the capacity of local institutions to sustain results. 6.3 Agency projects and programs provide adequate human and other resources (including host government resources).

The evaluation findings of each reviewed evaluation as they relate to these criteria can then be classified on a four-point scale (highly unsatisfactory, unsatisfactory, satisfactory and highly satisfactory). In addition, each analyst would provide comments gathered from each evaluation regarding factors which led to the classification and which may have contributed to a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating. The Evaluation Scoring Chart is outlined in Appendix 1 to the Report.

The evaluation scoring chart is an essential tool for use by the team analyzing and classifying evaluation results. For quality assurance reasons, each member of the analysis team should conduct an independent scoring of a small set of test evaluations so that they can meet and compare their scoring and ensure that each understands the scoring criteria and is applying it consistently. The team leader can also conduct selected random reviews of scoring during the review process.

The analysis of the results should include a review of the frequency of scores against criteria along with analysis using rolling codes of the factors which contribute to positive or negative findings. Finally, the average scores across the five criteria can be used to develop an overall development effectiveness index.

3.2 Review of Effectiveness Management Systems

This component of the proposed approach is comprised of direct review and analysis of the already mentioned four key sub-systems for managing for development effectiveness:

1. Program and Project Evaluation;
2. Results-Based Management;
3. Reporting on Development Effectiveness; and,
4. Knowledge Management.

The data for this component can be gathered from interviews with selected key managers and document reviews carried out at the headquarters of the agency involved (supplemented where appropriate with data from a regional office if one is located in countries where a field evaluation mission is scheduled).

The group participating in the interviews should be kept very compact for reasons of cost and to lessen the burden on the organization under evaluation. It could include:

- Multilateral Organization staff engaged in the four functions;
- A small number of senior organization staff engaged in strategic and program planning and development;
- Selected embassy or mission staff from the sponsoring bilateral agencies and a few developing countries dealing with the organization and based in its headquarters location; and
- Selected headquarters staff of the participating bilateral agencies (2-3).

The interviews carried out at headquarters level would be cross-referenced to interviews at field level as described in Section 2.3 below.

In addition to selected interviews this component would include a review of a sample of guidelines, overview documents, reports and policy material describing the four systems under review. Increasingly, this will include a review of management information distributed electronically and business process reporting systems available to officers at the level of their desk top.

Based on these data sources, the evaluation team can then apply a simple scoring system to each of the four key functions used to manage for effectiveness².

As well as assessing the overall state of systems devoted to managing for effectiveness, the evaluation team should arrive at an assessment of the trend in the development of these systems. Where new systems are being established with considerable resources and senior management support or where existing systems are being strengthened through investments in quality assurance or linkages to program management, a positive trend indicator can be assigned.

Whenever existing systems for managing for effectiveness are being reasonably maintained and utilized, the team neutral rating should be assigned. If, on the other hand, existing systems are receiving reduced attention and resources or being downgraded in terms of organizational management and governance processes, a negative trend indicator should be assigned.

In this way the review of management systems can provide participating agencies not only with an overall rating of management for effectiveness but an indicator of expected progress in strengthening these systems over time. For those to whom

² During CIDA's review of the multilateral channel a very basic rule was used for assigning a given rating to each system under review: zero points where the system was essentially so weak as to be non-functional or seriously compromised, one half point where it was functional but lacking in some element(s) necessary for full effectiveness, and a full point where the system being reviewed was clearly producing reliable results and being used by internal and/or external stakeholders.

bilateral agencies are held accountable for their multilateral investments, an indication of likely future performance may be as important as an assessment of current practice.

Based on the experience of a recent review of IFAD's management for development results systems a two-person team should be able to conduct a systematic review of these systems based on a two-week mission to headquarters and a subsequent review of documents.

3.3 Field Mission

As already noted, the field evaluation component of the proposed approach is quite narrow in scope and modest in duration. Two to three countries could be covered in missions of one and a half to two weeks by a team of two international and one national evaluation consultant. They should not include MOPAN survey countries for the year in question to avoid duplication of MOPAN activities.

The primary focus of the field evaluation missions is to validate the operation of key organizational systems and procedures to (in close cooperation with the host country and other development partners) identify plan, implement, monitor, evaluate and be accountable for the effectiveness of assisted programs and projects.

Subject matter to be covered would include:

- The role of the country office in program and project evaluation either independently or in cooperation with headquarters evaluation units;
- The frequency, quality and utility of country-level evaluations led by the organization or by its counterpart in the national government;
- Evidence that agency-wide initiatives and systems and procedures described at headquarters level for evaluation, RBM, effectiveness reporting and knowledge management are reflected in practice at country level;
- Evidence of the required technical and operational support being made available to country offices;
- Evidence among development partners including national governments, other bilateral agencies and multilateral partners that the organization plays an effective role in national sector and program planning and coordination forums;
- Evidence that the organization meets the expressed needs of its national

partners in its areas of expertise; and

- Some, very limited evidence of the relevance of the programs the organization supports to be gathered from secondary sources or through limited site visits.

The most important element in the field evaluation mission is the emphasis on validating information on systems and procedures among practitioners in the field, including the organizations own staff as well as its national partners. These are not impact evaluation studies and should not be allowed to grow beyond the confines suggested by the listing above.

4.0 Resource Requirements

The experience of the *Review of the Effectiveness of CIDA's Multilateral Delivery Channel* and several recent agency reviews, including a review of IFAD's Action Plan in response to the 2005 Independent External Evaluation can be used to assess the likely budgetary and personnel resources required for implementing the proposed approach to time and cost effective joint evaluations of Multilateral Organizations.

Table 3: Estimated Resource Requirements for Proposed Approach

Component	Sub-Component	Personnel Requirements	Person Days	Estimated Cost in USD
1. Meta-Evaluation	Identify and Secure Evaluations	Meta-Evaluation Team of One Senior Evaluator and Two Analysts	10	5,000
	Training and Quality Assurance	Meta-Evaluation Team	10	5,000
	Review and Scoring	Meta-Evaluation Team	60	35,000
	Analysis and Reporting	Senior Evaluator and Access data-base specialist	12	10,000
Sub-Total				55,000
2. Effectiveness Management Systems	Preliminary Document Review	Senior Evaluation Team of Two Persons (Can be from Partner or Developing Countries) with Research Analyst Support (1)	20	17,000
	Headquarters Mission	Senior Evaluation Team	24	20,500
	Follow-up Document	Senior Evaluation Team	6	5,100

Component	Sub-Component	Personnel Requirements	Person Days	Estimated Cost in USD
	Review			
	Follow-up Interviews	Senior Evaluation Team	2	1,700
	Systems Assessment	Senior Evaluation Team	4	3400
	Reporting	Senior Evaluation Team	10	8,500
	Travel Costs	Air Fair x 2 Plus DSA	26	17,800
Sub-Total				74,000
3. Field Evaluation Mission	Mission Planning, Scheduling	Senior Evaluation Team of Two Persons plus one National Consultant in Each Country	10	8,500
	Field Missions to Two Countries	Senior Evaluation Team of Two Persons plus one National Consultant in Each Country	60	45,400
	Analysis	Senior Evaluation Team of Two Persons plus one National Consultant in Each Country	10	8,500
	Reporting	Senior Evaluation Team of Two Persons plus one National Consultant in Each Country	10	8,500
	Travel Costs	Air Fares Plus DSA	44	27,200
Sub-Total Field Mission				98,100
Estimated Costs				227,000
Contingency at 10%				22,700
Total Estimated Cost in USD				249,700

Thus the total external cost of the evaluation (not including management time and expenses accrued by lead and supporting bilateral agencies) is estimated at about 250,000 USD.

In terms of elapsed time, the most time consuming element of the evaluation process is the meta-evaluation study which experience indicates can be done over an eight-month time frame. From the selection of the organization to be evaluated to the completion of the process should require less than a calendar year, especially considering the following factors:

- Use of a standardized set of evaluation criteria and a generic terms of reference;
- A common structure for each evaluation team (2 international evaluation experts including one subject-matter expert);
- Reliance on a single bilateral agency for procurement and contracting of the consultants with financial and managerial support from a maximum of two to three other bilateral agencies;
- A common reporting format; and
- Reporting directly to the supporting bilateral agencies and to the Task Group of the Evaluation Network of the DAC.

5.0 A System for Gathering Effectiveness Information

5.1 Elements of the Proposed System

While this paper has described a potential approach and methodology (along with estimated costs) for conducting more cost and time efficient evaluations of multilateral organizations, the question remains how one or more of these evaluations could be woven into a system. Without a systematic approach, bilateral and multilateral agencies alike will be unable to meet the accountability requirements of their key stakeholders.

There are five important elements which could make up such a system:

1. The annual rate of evaluations to be undertaken by the system;
2. The process for identifying and scheduling multilateral agencies for evaluation;
3. The process for lead agencies and management group members to be assigned (or more likely to assign themselves) to conduct an evaluation in a given year;
4. The arrangements for implementing each evaluation including financing, procurement, and management of the evaluation; and,
5. The system for reporting and compiling the results of the evaluations as they accumulate.

In order to be effective the system would need to have the following characteristics:

- It would need to be credible enough to satisfy the requirement for a more

evidence-based assessment of multilateral organization effectiveness than is currently provided by the Peer Reviews of the evaluation functions or by the MOPAN Common Approach;

- It would need to provide coverage of the most important multilateral development and humanitarian organizations (including the Multilateral Development Banks) over a reasonable period (four to six years);
- It would need to be more cost efficient and more timely than classical joint evaluations so that, if need be, a single bilateral agency or a small group of agencies could fund one evaluation; and
- It needs to be capable of being implemented without a massive investment of time and financial resources applied to the management of the process by one or more bilateral agencies.

With these requirements in hand it is possible to outline the main elements of the proposed system:

5.2 Rate of Production and Scheduling

Many bilateral agencies face the requirement to evaluate their most important programs, including their most substantial support to multilateral organizations on a four to five year cycle. At the same time each agency has a core set of organizations which can be relied on to absorb over three quarters of its investment in support of multilaterals. As already seen from CIDA's perspective there are 23 organizations accounting for almost 90% of its investment.

It should be possible to identify the twenty most critical multilateral agencies for most bilateral donors and to set up an evaluation schedule which would account for all twenty on a five year rolling schedule at a rate of four per year. In deciding which organizations should be scheduled in a given year the participating bilateral agencies should attempt to ensure that the studies contribute to existing planning and budgeting cycles wherever possible, for example:

- Multilateral Development Bank (MDB) evaluations should be scheduled so that they can contribute to regular replenishment meetings wherever possible;
- Evaluations of UN agencies reporting to ECOSOC may be scheduled so as to contribute to the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review (TCPR)

wherever possible; and

- Care should be taken to avoid duplicating major independent evaluation processes which are already under way such as the regular evaluations of UN-AIDS and GFATM or the comprehensive evaluation of the GEF.

Given those constraints, the major scheduling criteria should be the interest of one or more participating bilateral agency in conducting the evaluation and the availability of financial and professional resources: with the proviso that each of the approximately 20 most significant organizations should be evaluated every 5 years.

5.3 Lead Agency and Management Group Implementation Arrangements

Bilateral organizations participating in the proposed initiative should be interested in and capable of managing a joint evaluation of the type proposed – with support from two to three other bilateral agencies. That is they should be willing at one or more points in the five year cycle to assign a part time staff person (an evaluation manager) and commit a significant proportion of the approximately 250,000 USD budget. For smaller bilateral organizations this could be reduced to a willingness to contribute to funding a significant portion of one or more evaluations and to be available to assist as a member of the management group of one or more evaluations.

On an annual basis, participating agencies could identify their priority multilateral organizations for evaluation the following year. This list could then be proposed for self-identification of lead bilateral agencies, membership in the management and budget support groups, and assigning of budgets.

Once an agency had accepted the challenge of leading an evaluation, it would then be able to use its own procurement and contracting rules to identify and contract the evaluation consultants both international and national. This will be necessary to retain the timeliness characteristics of the proposed system.

Whenever a multilateral organization is chosen as the subject of a review the board of the organization should be notified and the terms of reference (which will be generic with only small modifications for the organization in question) shared with the appropriate office, presumably evaluation and external relations.

The lead bilateral agency will serve as the lead of a management group of 3-4 bilateral agencies. The management group will collaborate on project management and quality assurance while relying on:

- Use of a standardized terms of reference;
- Application of the proposed methodologies: meta-evaluation, review of management for development systems, and limited field evaluation;
- Application of the standardized assessment criteria and scoring formats; and
- Use of a standard reporting format.

The standardized terms of reference, methodological approach, assessment criteria and reporting format will be shared, as will the review results, with the multilateral organizations under review.

5.4 Governance and Reporting

One important question is where should the organizational and reporting home of any system for time and cost effective joint evaluations of multilateral organizations be placed. In the case of MOPAN, this question was resolved by the creation of a MOPAN secretariat which can be located within one of the member bilateral agencies and can be moved from time to time depending on interest.

One possibility would be to establish a Task Team under the DAC Evaluation Network of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD to further develop the approach and assist in its implementation. Evaluation Network Task Teams have been established in the past to, inter alia, establish evaluation quality standards, develop a glossary of evaluation and results-based-management terms and (jointly with the United Nations Evaluation Group) establish standards for and coordinate the Professional Peer Reviews of the Evaluation Functions among UN agencies.

At least in the early stages, coordination of the process of nominating organizations for evaluation and the assignment/acceptance of lead agency roles could be the responsibility of the Task Team. Eventually, a rotating secretariat based on the MOPAN model could be the most effective method of coordination, it could also have a knowledge management role in being the recipient and publisher of record of the final reports.

Draft reports would be submitted for review to the management group under coordination of the lead agency and to the multilateral organization (although the latter would not have any right of veto or final editing on the evaluation report).

Appendix 1: Evaluation Scoring Chart

Criteria	Not Demonstrated	Highly Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory
Relevance: International and National Development Goals					
Agency programs and projects align with National and International Development Goals.	The document makes no mention of National Development Goals	Agency programs and projects ignore or run counter to national development goals and priorities.	Agency programs and projects only occasionally align with national goals and objectives.	Agency programs and projects largely align with national goals and objectives in the relevant sectors	Agency programs and projects fully align with national goals and objectives in the relevant sectors as described in the national poverty reduction strategy.
Agency humanitarian activities coordinate with other agencies and align with national priorities	The document makes no mention of humanitarian activities.	The agency distances itself from other agencies and ignores national humanitarian priorities.	Agency only occasionally coordinates with other humanitarian agencies and sometimes aligns with national priorities.	Agency consults both international humanitarian agencies and the local government in all its humanitarian activities.	Agency actively integrates with international humanitarian agencies and incorporates local priorities into all humanitarian activities.
Agency takes part in local planning and coordinating bodies	The document makes no mention of local assets	The Agency makes no effort to take part in local planning and coordinating bodies.	The agency rarely takes part in local forums and rarely takes advantage of local systems and procedures.	The agency takes part in some local sector-relevant forums and takes advantage of country systems and procedures.	The Agency takes part in all local sector relevant forums and takes advantage of country system and procedures.

Comparative Advantage					
Agency programs and projects focus on its specific, stated role and comparative advantage of the multilateral partner.	Document does not mention agency comparative advantage.	The evaluation indicates that projects and programs are clearly outside the identified role and comparative advantage of the agency.	The evaluation indicates that some elements of agency programs and projects fit within its defined role and comparative advantage but others are outside.	The evaluation reports that most or all programs and projects fit within agency defined role and comparative advantage.	Evaluation illustrates specific management practices and approval criteria which ensure programs and projects fit within agency defined role and comparative advantage.
Quality of Internal Management					
Effective agency level strategic planning and priority setting.	The document makes no mention of strategic planning	The evaluation addresses systems for strategic planning and finds they are absent or seriously flawed.	The Agency has systems for agency level strategic planning and priority settings; and program and project design, but the systems are weak or unresponsive to change.	The Agency implemented functional systems for agency level strategic planning and priority settings; and program and project design, though it may not include quality assurance.	The Agency implemented valuable systems for agency level strategic planning and priority settings; and program and project design, including quality assurance.
Effective Results Based Management system.	The document makes no mention of RBM	The Agency lacks a Results Based Management system entirely.	The Agency's Results Based Management techniques are in place but are largely ineffective: they influence program and project design in only minor ways.	RBM system's are in place and often influence program and project design.	The Agency's RBM system reliably enhances program and project design.
Reliable program evaluation.	The document makes no mention of program evaluation.	The Agency has no functional system for program evaluation.	Program evaluation is in place but is rated as weak and/or lacking sufficient independence.	Program evaluation may not include an independent evaluation group reporting to the president or governing body, but it has reasonable and effective procedures for program evaluation.	Program evaluation includes an independent evaluation group reporting to the president or governing body

<p>Effective Knowledge Management.</p>	<p>The document makes no mention of knowledge management.</p>	<p>The Agency has no knowledge management strategy.</p>	<p>The Agency lacks a useful system for learning lessons and communicating them to staff and partners. The Agency does not emphasis innovation in its programming.</p>	<p>The Agency's has a functional system for learning developmental lessons and for communicating them. It sometimes but rarely includes innovation in program/project design.</p>	<p>The Agency has implemented an effective strategy for knowledge management. The agency has adequate process for learning development lessons and for lessons learnt transfer. The agency is occasionally innovative.</p>
<p>Effectiveness</p>					
<p>Achievement of objectives</p>	<p>The document makes no mention of the agency's ability to meet development objectives.</p>	<p>Agency programs and projects achieve very for or none of the development outlined in their terms of references or concept papers.</p>	<p>Agency programs and projects achieve few of the objectives outlined in their terms of references or concept papers.</p>	<p>Agency programs and projects achieve a majority of the objectives outlined in their terms of references or concept papers.</p>	<p>Agency programs and projects achieve all objectives outlined in their terms of references or concept papers.</p>
<p>Cost-Effectiveness</p>					
<p>Agency Program and Projects are Cost Effective</p>	<p>The document makes no mention of cost effectiveness.</p>	<p>Agency programs and projects waste resources, accruing few benefits at considerable cost.</p>	<p>Agency programs' and projects' benefits do not merit their cost.</p>	<p>Agency programs' and projects' benefits merit their cost.</p>	<p>Agency programs' and projects' benefits outweigh their cost.</p>
<p>Sustainability</p>					
<p>The stream of benefits accrued will continue after project or program closure</p>	<p>The document does not comment on the likelihood of sustaining a stream of benefits.</p>	<p>The likelihood of maintaining a stream of benefits is non-existent or negligible.</p>	<p>The likelihood of maintaining a stream of benefits is small or modest.</p>	<p>The likelihood of maintaining a stream of benefits is substantial. Sustaining outcomes is more likely than not.</p>	<p>The likelihood of maintaining a stream of benefits is very high. Sustaining outcomes is expected</p>

<p>Agency programs and projects address the capacity of local institutions needed to sustain results.</p>	<p>The documents makes no mention of local capacity.</p>	<p>The agency makes no effort to build local capacity.</p>	<p>Agency builds little capacity. Local institutions will require external help to operate.</p>	<p>Agency builds reliable capacity. Local institutions can operate without external intervention.</p>	<p>Agency builds strong capacity. Local institutions can grow with external intervention.</p>
<p>Agency programs and projects provide adequate human, financial and physical resources (Including host country resources)</p>	<p>The document does not outline the adequacy of human, financial and physical resources.</p>	<p>Almost all agency activities fail due to a lack of sufficient resources.</p>	<p>Agency activities are regularly constrained by a lack of resources.</p>	<p>Reasonable agency activities are very rarely constrained by a lack of resources.</p>	<p>Agency resources exceed typical needs, allowing the project or program to pursue specialized, costly, and ambitious activities.</p>

