



ROOM DOCUMENT 1

DAC NETWORK ON DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION PROGRAMME OF WORK AND BUDGET 2009-2010

This document has been prepared by the Secretariat for consideration at the 8th meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 18-19 November 2008.



**8th meeting
18 – 19 November 2008**

DAC NETWORK ON DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION PROGRAMME OF WORK AND BUDGET 2009-2010

Introduction

1. The overall DAC programme of work and budget (PWB) is presented in DCD/DAC(2008)31/REV2 and contains the agreed main strands of work of the Network following the consultative process undertaken earlier during 2008. This note complements the overall PWB by providing some further details on the work streams of the evaluation network.

Overall objective and areas of focus of the Network on Development Evaluation

2. The DAC Evaluation Network is a unique body in the international evaluation architecture bringing together evaluation managers and specialists from development agencies and ministries of OECD member countries, with representation also from multilateral development institutions. Its overall purpose is to increase the development effectiveness of aid policies and programmes through high quality independent evaluation. Evaluation supports evidence-based decision making and is a means to influence donor and partner behaviour through lesson learning and by providing accountability for results of development programmes. The usefulness to a range of development partners is also an important dimension for the Network. The main areas of focus are: strengthen individual members' evaluation systems, improve the quality of evaluations, harmonise evaluation processes, facilitate joint evaluations, support partner country evaluation capacities, and improve knowledge sharing in evaluation. It serves as a platform for mutual learning and co-ordination among members.

3. The Network produces evaluation guidance for practical application and joint evaluation studies, and provides a web-based evaluation resource centre as a service to its members and the broader public. The Bureau of the Network is structured with a chair (currently vacant) and two vice-chairs (Belgium and the UK) supported by the Secretariat. Network members are encouraged to lead and actively participate in individual work streams. Partner countries and civil society are often invited to take part as members of task teams and steering groups for individual work streams.

4. The Network and its meetings are serving as a platform for sharing experiences, exchanging ideas and developing new joint initiatives that may be conducted by those interested. It is important to provide a platform function, while keeping in mind the need for implementing the agreed work programme of the Network, which is based on the DAC members' priorities as expressed through the voting exercise of the DAC work programme.

Program of Work and Budget 2009-2010

5. The Network's suggested work streams for 2009-2010 came out well in the voting exercise of all DAC activities which was held in the beginning of 2008. The Network's work streams ranked 7 and 14 out of 31, which places them in Category A of top ranked output results. The text below details the Network's two work streams: a) New approaches to planning and implementing joint evaluations in a changing aid context and; b) Harmonised evaluation quality standards including application to impact evaluation.

a) New approaches to planning and implementing joint evaluations in a changing aid context.

6. The DAC Evaluation Network will continue to have a lead role in developing more collaborative and harmonised approaches to joint evaluations of development co-operation. Harmonising evaluation processes are directly related to the behavioural change agenda implied by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action. Also in line with the objectives of the Paris Declaration, joint evaluation approaches contribute to learning which can help support more effective aid strategies and programmes. Moreover, joint evaluations can address multiple agency concerns and reduce the burden on partners and are therefore contributing to a more coherent assessment approach.

Strands in work stream:

- i) *Develop and test recommendations on programming joint evaluations in a new aid context:* This strand will develop and build on the Guidance for Managing Joint Evaluations; the working paper on experiences with joint evaluations; ongoing joint evaluations such as the evaluation of the implementation of the Paris Declaration; and the results of the review study ‘Challenges, opportunities and approaches for increasing joint donor programming of evaluations’. The component is expected to generate more harmonised and aligned approaches to plan and implement joint evaluations. The task team is lead by DFID, with support from Sadev and the Secretariat, and includes a number of members.
- ii) *Sharing evaluation plans and facilitating joint evaluations:* In order to improve information sharing, enhance transparency and facilitate identification of possible future collaboration, members of the Network have agreed to strengthen and share future evaluation plans and work programmes. It is also a regular feature on the Network meeting agenda. The restricted Network website can also be further improved to support this work. It is anticipated that testing new and ongoing approaches for sharing evaluation plans will result in identification of new opportunities for joint and collaborative work. It will also contribute to greater transparency and provide a better overview of the collective evaluation domain.
- iii) *Evaluation knowledge sharing:* The Network’s websites are a key component and will be continuously updated and improved (within the technical restrictions of the platform). The DAC Evaluation Resource Centre (DEReC) will be further expanded and its functionality further improved.
- iv) *Evaluation of the Paris Declaration:* The second phase of this evaluation will be launched in connection with the evaluation quality standards workshop in February 2009 (see below). The overall guidance for the evaluation has so far been provided by an international reference group with broad membership, co-chaired by a partner country representative from Sri Lanka and a donor country representative from Denmark, with a small management group co-ordinating the overall evaluation process. Feedback from partners on in-country evaluation capacity and experience from the first phase of the evaluation will be analysed in response to the recommendations contained in the evaluation of the DAC.
- v) *Evaluation capacity development (ECD):* Evaluation capacity development is an element which is an intrinsic feature in all strands of this work stream. For example, joint evaluation work needs to meet donors’ accountability requirements as well as address partner countries’ priorities and needs by taking into account the evaluation capacity development dimension. The Network will develop a strategy on how it can collectively

engage in ECD (perhaps beyond the currently agreed approach to share useful experiences and lessons from ECD initiatives) and will consult with multilateral agencies, particularly the World Bank, and UNEG on lesson of ongoing work and possible plans for strengthening ECD efforts. The Secretariat will continue the work on experiences in francophone Africa and build further on insights from this work. This strand also includes consideration on how to capitalise on experiences of partner countries' participation in the evaluation of the Paris Declaration (as indicated above). As the Network continues collective and individual ECD efforts, links and synergies with the broader efforts on capacity development within DAC and with the WP-EFF will be explored.

b) Harmonised evaluation quality standards including application to impact evaluation

7. The Evaluation Network has a lead role in developing internationally accepted norms and standards for development evaluation. It is expected that this work stream will improve the quality of evaluations and thereby strengthen the usefulness of evaluations for policy and decision making, as well as support accountability and learning. Harmonised standards would also further the implementation of the Paris Declaration in the field of evaluation.

Strands in work stream:

- i) *Finalise work on DAC Evaluation Quality Standards:* This strand of the work stream builds on and complements previous normative work on evaluation. Agreed standards would facilitate future collaborative or joint undertakings. The DAC Evaluation Quality Standards were approved by members in 2006 for a test phase of three years. The standards have been published in three languages and according to the 2007 survey they are widely used. A workshop will be co-hosted by Australia and New Zealand and is planned for February 2009. Drawing on member's concrete experience with the draft standards and the outcomes of the workshop, the standards will be finalised in 2009 and then actively and broadly disseminated.
- ii) *Revised Guidance for Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities:* The Network is, together with the Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation, developing guidance on evaluating conflict prevention and peacebuilding activities. The working draft of the guidance is currently being applied in the field (DRC, Haiti, Sri Lanka and possibly Sudan) and is also used as a reference tool in other evaluations. An informal stocktaking meeting with participating agencies should take place to gather experiences from the various field applications. A workshop to share experiences from the use of the working draft, as well as a review report of experiences, are envisaged before the guidance can be finalised. The time of finalisation depends on when the various evaluation exercises are concluded so sufficient feedback can be obtained. The task team is lead by Switzerland (from the Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation) and Norway (from the Evaluation Network).
- iii) *Evaluation methodology of general budget support:* Budget support is now used in many countries as a means for helping recipient governments to implement and/or accelerate their comprehensive poverty reduction, or sector strategies. Relatively few budget support evaluations have been done so far. Those that have been done are mainly addressing the process of the assistance, giving less attention to the upper chains of results. The aim is to develop a methodological approach which takes into account the specificities of budget support compared to classical development programmes and projects. The European Commission is leading this work together with several members.

- iv) *Assessment of progress with impact evaluation*: The DAC Network will collaborate with NONIE¹ to promote quality impact evaluation and foster a program of impact evaluation activities, based on a common understanding of the meaning of impact evaluation and of approaches to conduct impact evaluation. Links with other impact evaluation actors will also be sought. The Network will need to take stock of the work of the various entities and consider if the work and results meet the needs of the members collectively.
- v) *Stocktaking of professional peer reviews of evaluation functions*: Several new professional peer reviews are planned in this area of ongoing collaboration between the Network and the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG). During the 2009-2010 PWB a stocktaking of experiences should be undertaken. The work is co-led by the Netherlands and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) from UNEG.

Budget and Voluntary Contribution needs

8. The work streams of the Network are financed by OECD Part 1 resources (which consists of one staff post, general administrative support, translation and interpretation, and conference facilities) and by voluntary contributions by members. The voluntary contributions covers one project post of a young professional, one assistant post, consultancy support, travel to task team meetings and workshops, costs of invited participants from developing countries, and costs for dissemination of documents and publications. The total estimated cost for the Network for 2009-2010 is 1.084 KEUR and the voluntary contribution needs are estimated at 527 KEUR.² More detailed figures can be found in the work programme DCD/DAC/(2008)31/REV2. [The VC funding process is currently ongoing. The DAC Senior Level Meeting on the 8-9 December is the final VC pledging opportunity should the target level of VCs not be met during the pledging window.] DAC members channel their VCs through a set of ten accounts, out of which evaluation is one.

9. Substantive and financial reporting on the use of VCs is done annually to the members of DAC.³ In addition, the performance is assessed through the OECD Programme Implementation Reporting (PIR) process, which measures the impact and quality of DAC outputs. The PIR does so by showing members how OECD activities performed overall in the previous biennium; informing each Committee how it might improve its performance through adjusting its priorities or choices of outputs; and finding ways to increase the impact of the OECD and its outputs. Written comments made by members on individual output results, both in terms of quality and impact are also included in the PIR analysis.⁴

10. The performance of the DAC is also regularly evaluated. In the recent evaluation, conducted in 2007, the DAC Network on Development Evaluation was found to have consistently produced high quality products. Moreover, the participation rate from member capitals in the Evaluation Network was found to be one of the highest of all DAC subsidiary bodies.⁵

11. Members are invited to take an active part in the co-ordination process in capitals in following up on the VC pledges and in any further re-adjustments that may prove necessary as the work programme implementation evolves. The Secretariat will provide substantive and financial reporting to members in line with the agreements by the DAC on reporting of voluntary contributions.

¹ The Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation, comprising the Evaluation Network, the UN Evaluation Group, the MDB evaluation co-operation group and partner countries.

² The total resources required for the next biennium for the whole DAC is approximately 25.9 MEUR of which 15.7 MERU are required in voluntary contributions (VCs). See annex 3 in DCD/DAC(2008)37.

³ See DCD/DAC(2008)19 for the 2007 report.

⁴ The document DCD/DAC/RD(2007)10/RD3/REV1 gives an indication of how respondents viewed DAC outputs 2005-2006.

⁵ See C(2007)99