

## **Partnership and Harmonisation TWG**

14 January 2008

Annotated Agenda

### **1. P+H TWG Annual Workplan**

***The TWG is requested to discuss, amend and approve the workplan for 2008***

The workplan has been prepared based on the CRDB workplan. The MDSP, which provides most of the resources for the implementation of the Strategic Framework for Development Cooperation Management related to the H-A-R Action Plan has also developed its workplan as part of this tripartite planning process.

The TWG work, which is intended to support the work of Government, is therefore consistent with CRDB/CDC's own plans and resource framework.

The 7 activity areas listed are consistent with the role and function of the TWG Terms of Reference (as amended in January 2007).

Priority activities include support to CDC in:

- Conducting the Paris Declaration survey exercise
- Developing inputs to the technical cooperation guideline
- Increased application and use of the ODA Database (including to improve data quality)
- Supporting the Mid-term Review of the H-A-R Action Plan (an approach to this will be developed after attending the PD evaluation meeting in Jo'burg)
- Accra preparation
- Aid Effectiveness Report (and any other CDCF preparation that is required)

There is sufficient flexibility to incorporate any additional priorities that emerge but this list of work is considered to represent the main priorities and is perhaps sufficient given the mandate, capacity and resources of the TWG.

### **2. Technical Cooperation – next steps in the process**

***The TWG is asked to take note of proposed steps to develop a TC Guideline and to provide comments and inputs***

This study was completed by the consultants in November and was shared with development partners. Comments have been consolidated and returned to the consultants for finalisation.

It is proposed that we proceed as follows:

- The final report is an independent review; it does not reflect the position of either RGC or DPs. It will be shared with RGC and with all TWGs for their reflection and dialogue;
- A case study will be commissioned to provide further practical guidance as well as to contribute to the global study that will be presented to the HLF in Accra;

- Based on these two papers, a short, practical and policy-relevant paper will be prepared by CRDB/CDC. This will form the basis for dialogue in the middle part of the year;
- Based on these discussions, and informed by global agreements in Accra, RGC will lead the development of a policy guideline in the final quarter of 2008. This will be endorsed by Government.

There will therefore be ample opportunity for all interested parties to comment and contribute further to this important process. The CRDB website page on TC will be regularly up-dated.

### 3. Paris Declaration survey exercise

***The TWG is invited to take note of preparations to conduct the survey and to comment or make suggestions as appropriate***

We have been preparing for this survey for some time and, based on the 2006 experience, we are well-positioned to provide a timely and accurate response. We have institutionalised many of the related processes and by using the ODA Database we expect to make the process much easier as well as to ensure that the survey results can be used for our own national aid effectiveness work.

The critical issue is to ensure that DPs provide the information by the required deadline. It is acknowledged that providing 2007 disbursement data and completing the survey by end-March is not easy for all partners, but there is a global commitment to this exercise and collaboration and cooperation is appreciated.

#### a) Resources

- All of the tools, a glossary and Frequently Asked Questions are available on the OECD/DAC website – [www.oecd.org/dac/hlfsurvey](http://www.oecd.org/dac/hlfsurvey).
- The National Coordinator will complete the country spreadsheet based on returns provided by DPs in the ODA Database and then supplemented by DPs.
- There is no need to complete the 'Donor Questionnaire' (number 2) if information has been entered into the ODA Database as it will be consolidated into the main "Country Spreadsheet" from there.
- CRDB/CDC will follow up with the lead donor facilitators to validate and obtain any additional information that is required.

#### b) Data entry and validation

- The OECD/DAC has undertaken significant consultations to revise the definitions and guidance. These definitions are included in the "Definitions and Guidance for the Questionnaires" paper ([www.oecd.org/dac/hlfsurvey](http://www.oecd.org/dac/hlfsurvey))
- Non-financial data (e.g. source of funds/implementation, coordination of TC, use of PFM and procurement systems, missions and PIUs) should have been entered by end-2007. Data quality is still a significant concern
- Indicator 10 requires that DPs record all missions and analytical work. For mission and analytical work that is not associated with a project – and therefore not entered into the ODA Database – a separate sheet should be submitted to CRDB/CDC via the DP focal points by the end of January
- The CRDB/CDC website - [www.cdc-crdb.gov.kh/cdc/paris/paris\\_declaration.html](http://www.cdc-crdb.gov.kh/cdc/paris/paris_declaration.html) - contains further technical details and guidance on using the ODA Database for the Paris Declaration survey
- CRDB/CDC will export the data and will present it for validation to DPs via the DP focal points.

- Disbursement data is required by the end of February.
- The Country Spreadsheet and the Country Report (see Annex One) will be prepared by CRDB/CDC. Interim drafts will be shared via the DP focal points and will be endorsed at a final validation meeting (end-March).
- UN agency data will be consolidated for presentation to the OECD/DAC but will be made available locally in disaggregated form.

#### c) Management Arrangements

- A sub-group will be established as the principal point for dialogue and clarification of procedural issues (e.g. definitions).
- DPs are encouraged to contact the DP focal point in the first instance if any assistance is required:
  - Helen Appleton (DFID)
  - Marjolaine Nicod (DFID)
  - Dylan Gelard (UNDP)
- A final validation meeting will be held (provisionally in the week of March 24th) to allow time to finalise the data to be submitted to OECD/DAC.

A list of indicators and data sources is presented in the table below:

**Paris Declaration Indicators – Source of Data**

Paris Declaration Indicator		ODA Database Required fields	Notes
Name of implementing partner / point of delivery		3, 18a	
Indicator of disbursement to Government sector		18b	
1	Operational development strategy	---	<a href="http://www.worldbank.org/aer">www.worldbank.org/aer</a>
2	PFM and procurement systems	---	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/hlfsurvey/indicators/2a">www.oecd.org/dac/hlfsurvey/indicators/2a</a>
3	Aid reported on budget	14	CDC to calculate budget baseline based on PIP
4	Coordinated capacity development	9, 14	New definition/test – <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/hlfsurvey/glossary">www.oecd.org/dac/hlfsurvey/glossary</a>
5ai & ii	Use of country PFM systems	14, PD 5a	
5bi & ii	Use of country procurement systems	14, PD 5b	
6	Parallel PIUs	PD 6	
7	In-year predictability	14	CDCF figures will be used for scheduled disbursements
8	Untied aid	14, PD 8	Data provided by OECD/DAC. Also recorded in ODA Database
9	Use of programme-based approaches	9, 14	
10a	Coordinated missions	PD 10a	ODA Database only records project-related missions
10b	Coordinated country analytical work	PD 10b	ODA Database only records project-related work
11	Results-oriented frameworks	---	<a href="http://www.worldbank.org/aer">www.worldbank.org/aer</a>
12	Mutual accountability	---	RGC and DPs are required to agree on presence of mechanisms that mutually review progress (e.g. JMIs, TWG)

Note: refer to OECD/DAC "Note on Definitions and Guidance" for advice on definitions – [www.oecd.org/dac/hlfsurvey](http://www.oecd.org/dac/hlfsurvey)

#### 4. Any other Business

***The TWG is invited to raise any other issue of relevance***

## Annex One

### Format of Paris Declaration survey Country Report

<b>INDICATOR 1:</b> OPERATIONAL NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ To what extent does the national development strategy (or poverty reduction strategy) set out clear and prioritised objectives for the country?</li><li>■ To what extent are national plans or strategies able to influence the activities undertaken by government and donors by means of making linkages between the plans and budgets, fiscal policies or other resource-allocation instruments?</li><li>■ What are the remaining challenges in operationalising national development strategies?</li></ul>
<b>INDICATOR 2A:</b> RELIABLE COUNTRY PUBLIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ What reforms have been implemented or are planned to improve the quality of public financial management systems?</li><li>■ What efforts are being made to improve financial management at sub-national levels?</li></ul>
<b>INDICATOR 2B:</b> RELIABLE COUNTRY PROCUREMENT SYSTEMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ What actions have been taken or are planned to reform and improve the quality of procurement systems (laws, regulations and institutions)?</li><li>■ If legal or institutional frameworks are established (Procurement Acts, Regulatory Authorities, anti-Corruption laws), what steps are taken to build capacities or allocate resources to effectively implement them?</li></ul>
<b>INDICATOR 3:</b> AID FLOWS ARE ALIGNED ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ Please list the main reasons why there are gaps between what is disbursed by donors and what is recorded in annual budget estimates</li><li>■ How can the gaps be narrowed?</li><li>■ What efforts are being made, or need to be made, by donors to ensure the necessary information disclosure to the relevant government authorities?</li></ul>
<b>INDICATOR 4:</b> STRENGTHEN CAPACITY BY CO-ORDINATED SUPPORT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ What are the challenges in strengthening capacity development and improving the provision of technical co-operation?</li><li>■ What steps are being made by relevant country authorities to identify and communicate clear objectives and strategies for capacity development?</li><li>■ What are the steps taken by donors to integrate technical co-operation as part of country programmes and coordinate support among donors?</li></ul>
<b>INDICATOR 5A:</b> USE OF COUNTRY PUBLIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ Please describe the constraints and challenges placed on donors in making use of partner country's public financial management systems (budget execution procedures, financial reporting procedures, auditing procedures)?</li><li>■ Are procedures currently in place to use country systems beyond general or sector budget support (e.g. project and basket fund modalities)?</li></ul>
<b>INDICATOR 5B:</b> USE OF COUNTRY PROCUREMENT SYSTEMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ Please describe the constraints and challenges placed on donors in making use of partner country's procurement systems?</li><li>■ Are procedures currently in place to use country procurement systems beyond general or sector budget support (e.g. project and basket fund modalities)?</li><li>■ Please describe cases where donors apply safeguard measures.</li></ul>
<b>INDICATOR 6:</b> AVOIDING PARALLEL IMPLEMENTATION STRUCTURES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ For which reasons are parallel PIUs established?</li><li>■ What steps, if any, are being taken both by donors and governments to phase-out parallel PIUs and/or mainstream PIUs into line ministries?</li></ul>
<b>INDICATOR 7:</b> AID IS MORE PREDICTABLE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ Please list the main reasons where there are gaps between what was scheduled for disbursement and what was actually recorded as disbursed by government.</li><li>■ How can donors improve realism of predictions on volume and timing of expected disbursements?</li><li>■ What efforts are being made by the government to 1) meet the various requirements (administrative, technical, financial, etc.) for timely execution of projects and disbursement of funds; and 2) fully capture disbursements in its accounting systems?</li><li>■ Have any additional steps been taken to improve predictability of donor funding over the longer term?</li></ul>

<p><b>INDICATOR 8:</b> AID IS INCREASINGLY UNTIED</p>	<p>■ What efforts are being made by donors at country level to untie aid?</p>
<p><b>INDICATOR 9:</b> USE OF COMMON ARRANGEMENTS OR PROCEDURES</p>	<p>■ Please describe what use is currently being made of PBAs (i.e. approaches that meet all 4 criteria set out in the survey <i>Definitions and Guidance</i>). ■ What are the challenges in channelling a greater proportion of aid in support of PBAs?</p>
<p><b>INDICATOR 10A:</b> JOINT MISSIONS</p>	<p>■ Please describe what efforts are being made to rationalise and improve co-ordination of donor missions?</p>
<p><b>INDICATOR 10B:</b> JOINT COUNTRY ANALYTIC WORK</p>	<p>■ Please describe what mechanisms are available to rationalise and co-ordinate country analytic work, either by theme, sector, or other?</p>
<p><b>INDICATOR 11:</b> RESULTS-ORIENTED FRAMEWORKS</p>	<p>■ Are there transparent and monitorable performance assessment frameworks in use in your country? In which areas? (country level, sector level etc.) ■ Is there an operational strategy for improving statistical capacity and/or administrative reporting on results in your country? And how is it implemented? ■ How does information on performance feed back into decision-making at national or sectoral levels in your country? And by which mechanisms.</p>
<p><b>INDICATOR 12:</b> MUTUAL ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS</p>	<p>■ If a mutual assessment of progress <b>HAS</b> been conducted in your country, what are the key features of this mutual assessment? (Annual reporting, periodic independent evaluation etc.? At national, sector, budget support and/or others levels? Who is involved? ■ If a mutual assessment of progress <b>HAS NOT</b> been conducted in your country, what actions would be needed to initiate such a mutual assessment?</p>

source: OECD/DAC [www.oecd.org/dac/hlfsurvey](http://www.oecd.org/dac/hlfsurvey)