

---

# **Feedback Points on Country Evaluation Process**

**Core Evaluation Team**

# Clarifications/ Questions/ Observations (1)

---

## *Country specific questions*

- National Reference Groups are the forum where additional (if any) country specific questions will be identified for inclusion in the Country Evaluation ToR.

## *Evaluation Scope*

- Where a national statement on the Paris Declaration exists (e.g. Hanoi Core Statement) this should be the focus of the country evaluation (on the assumption that by extension this will cover the core of the Paris Declaration).

# Clarifications/ Questions/ Observations (2)

---

## ***Level of enquiry***

- If/ how should the evaluation deal with the community (intended beneficiary) level of enquiry ?

*> Identify solid evaluative material that relates to this level and can be drawn upon in the PD evaluation, assess significance of any critical data gaps and consider possible ways of addressing given the limited resources available to the evaluation*

# Clarifications/ Questions/ Observations (4)

---

## ***Usefulness of the Country Evaluation***

- The limited appreciation amongst stakeholders (across Govt, donor community, CSOs & Parliamentarians) of PD/ AAA presents a big challenge to getting the full participation of all stakeholders in the Evaluation

*> May require specific approaches (including a communication plan) to get buy-in and profile for the Evaluation.*

## ***Outcomes focus***

- "Results Frameworks" may help in looking at the progression from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness.

# Clarifications/ Questions/ Observations (5)

---

## *Resourcing: Consultant selection*

- May prove difficult to find good quality advisers for the Evaluation Teams. Suggested that the Core Evaluation Team could recommend a pool of consultants who could bring an added benefit of a consistency of understanding on evaluation approach/ methods
- Importance of a 'credible team' if the Evaluation is to have sufficient standing within the country. Recommended that core of the team is national supported by an international/ regional consultant.
- Sectoral treatment in Q3 may require additional specialist consultant inputs.

# Clarifications/ Questions/ Observations (6)

---

## ***Financing***

- Evaluation financing;
  - 1<sup>st</sup> preference – from national sources (can include \$ raised in-country from donors),
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> preference – from Trust Fund managed by the Secretariat and/or direct funding from the Evaluation Department of donor(s).

## ***Procurement***

- Recommended default position to use Government procurement processes.

## ***Evaluation Standards***

- To conform with national or DAC standards and guidelines for Joint Evaluations

# Clarifications/ Questions/ Observations (7)

---

## *Synergy*

- Linking with the Aid Effectiveness Working Party **Monitoring Survey** (12 indicators); timing for next round [end 2010] likely to limit utility for the country evaluations.
- Taking advantage of the ongoing **studies** through the **clusters under Aid Effectiveness Working Group** involving some of the countries participating in the PDE.
- Country evaluations will look at donor behaviour as a group but given the numbers involved will give only a general view on how effectively Donor HQ commitments are translating through into action and field office behaviour change. May get a more in-depth view on this important question through the **Donor HQ study** (but narrow to one or two agencies).

# Clarifications/ Questions/ Observations (8)

---

## *Evaluation process and capacity building*

- Anticipated value of the evaluation process to capacity development (Govt. officials) in terms of awareness of the vital issues being addressed by the evaluation.

# Clarifications/ Questions/ Observations (9)

---

## *Timing/ sequencing*

- Importance of clear briefings to senior management/ colleagues within Government (and CSOs & Parliamentarians) to get their support for and **shared understanding** of the breadth & depth of the evaluation.
- > *Need for Secretariat/CET to provide (asap) all participating countries with a short brief on the Country Evaluation process which workshop participants can draw on in discussions with their colleagues.*
- Proceeding immediately to **initiate preparatory work** on consultant selection and procurement process whilst remaining open to respond to any final changes to the Generic ToR.

# Clarifications/ Questions/ Observations (10)

---

## *Timing/ sequencing continued*

- Sequencing for February/ March 2010 of sub-regional/ national workshops; Core Evaluation Team with Evaluation Team Leaders, National Evaluation Coordinators and (possibly) other Evaluation Team members
- Value of participation of the Core Evaluation Team in a kick-off meeting involving Country evaluation team, NEC/ Evaluation management team and Group (Vietnam)

# **Suggestions to take forward – process of finalising the Generic ToR**

---

- To include in the Country Evaluation an assessment of the extent to which the process of the Monitoring Survey has had an effect on the engagement with and implementation of PD in-country

# Regional group networking/learning – some initial examples

---

- Samoa/ Cook Islands collaboration; resourcing (common international consultant involvement in national teams) and scheduling.
- Evaluation Governance and Management structures – sharing examples
- Interest in ‘infrastructure’ as a focus sector area in Cook Islands given the wider interest of Pacific Island states and the opportunity to share learning from the evaluation on this issue through the link with the Pacific Island Forum.

# Examples of plans for organising country evaluations

---

- Refreshing National Reference Groups from Phase I in line with the scope of Phase 2.
- National Reference Groups may take the form of a High Level Committee which is complemented by a ‘working group’ who is engaged in managing the operations of the Country Evaluation process
- Critical role of ‘Focal Points’ in each Ministry and each Donor agency to get wide and effective (open) engagement (‘buy-in’) with the evaluation process including a broader acceptance of responsibility for the evaluation across Government.

# Examples of plans for organising country evaluations cont'd

---

- Adjusting (advancing) the timing of the Country Evaluation to fit with use in national strategic processes
- Use of wider (other) funding national sources (including donor funds) to cover evaluation process side events (communication) and dissemination actions
- For efficiency and managing risk contracting a firm to provide the 'team' rather than forming the team through contracts with individuals.

# Countries / Regions

---

