

Comments on  
the Draft Generic TORs for Donor/Agency HQ Evaluation  
Received by 20 November 2009

Japan:

1. Concerning the donor/HQ evaluation schedule, we plan to implement the evaluation as a third party evaluation in the next fiscal year. Japan's fiscal year begins in April, so we can set forth an evaluation team after the new fiscal year starts in April. Therefore, we suggest to change the timing of selecting an evaluation team from " by latest 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010" to "by latest April 2010" (page 11, paragraph 28 i , and, page 15 ).
2. Concerning the Question 2 (page 9, paragraph 19), it is not appropriate to ask a question focusing on a specific aid modality, because it does not go along with the aim of the Paris Declaration. In the Paris Declaration, complementary modalities are also encouraged to employ to maximize aid effectiveness, so it would be better to delete the Question 2.

Sweden:

Sweden has established a reference group for the second phase of the evaluation of the Paris Declaration. The group is chaired by the Secretariat for Evaluation at Sida and has members from SADEV, Sida and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It has agreed on the following comments on the Generic Terms of Reference for Donor/Agency HQ Evaluations.

1. The main concepts of the evaluation (commitment, incentives and capacity) are not clearly defined which may cause inconsistency in interpretation.
2. The evaluation questions are quite many, and it will be difficult address all of them properly. We are not clear on whether all questions should be answered, or if it is possible to drop some of them.
3. If field studies are to be undertaken in these evaluations they need to be properly

coordinated among the donors, both to avoid overlap and to allow for a good sample. The ToR could provide guidance on whether field studies should be undertaken only in partner countries which participate in the evaluation, or if other countries could be visited as well.