



ROOM DOCUMENT 2

FOLLOW UP TO THE GBS EVALUATION

This note has been prepared by DFID for information at the 6th meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 27 – 28 June 2007.

1. Information sheet
2. Donor Questionnaire + Annex 1 (for Donors)
3. Country Government Questionnaire + Annex 1 (Burkina Faso)

Accompanying information to the Survey of Responses to the Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support

Why are we undertaking a survey of the JEGBS?

The Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support (JEGBS) was probably one of the largest joint evaluations ever undertaken by donors under the DAC and has been widely received as a huge success. It took over two years to complete, cost approximately USD \$ 4 million and evaluated spending of nearly USD \$4 billion in seven partner countries over a period of ten years.

In light of this it is relevant to try to gauge the levels of influence/impact the evaluation is beginning to have on how budget support is being delivered.

What is the aim of the survey?

The aim of the survey is twofold. The first is to enable us to learn from one another with respect to how the JEGBS was received and disseminated; whilst the second, is to try to gauge the level of impact the findings have had and will have on our organisations – both donors and recipient governments.

Who should fill out the survey?

The survey should be filled out by the people responsible for aid instruments/budget support policy and guidance in donor agencies; and by people from policy analysis departments or aid co-ordination units in partner country governments.

How should the survey be filled out?

The survey should be filled out in electronic form as the text boxes are expandable (if this proves problematic due to internet access please fill out the questionnaire provided and use additional pages if necessary). These, alongside a list of the evaluations recommendation can be downloaded from www.tinyurl.com/r???

Who should the completed surveys be returned to?

Please e-mail the completed questionnaire and the list of recommendations to James Bianco (j-bianco@dfid.gov.uk) and copy in Nathalie Bienvenu (nathalie.bienvenu@oecd.org). If it is not possible to e-mail please post them to James Bianco.

Who should I contact if I have any questions regarding the survey?

If you have any questions regarding the survey please e-mail James Bianco (j-bianco@dfid.gov.uk) or telephone on +44 1355 84 3639

Is there a difference between the questionnaires being sent to donor agencies and countries that participated in the evaluation?

Yes there are some differences in the questionnaires, the country specific questionnaires focus on the findings specific to that country. Should you wish to view this questionnaire it is also available for download from www.tinyurl.com/r???.

What will be done with the information collected from the survey?

Once the information from the survey has been collated it will be presented at the DAC Network on Development Evaluation and e-mailed to all participants in the exercise.

DONORS - Survey of Responses to the Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support

Organisation/Government Institute	
Date	
Name of respondent	
e-mail address	

Question		Response
1	How did your organisation go about disseminating the evaluation and its recommendations?	[Please Include groups focused on (Politicians, Senior management, Heads of Country offices, Civil Society Groups etc.) and types of dissemination methods employed (presentations, lectures, etc).]
2	<p>a) Of the 31 recommendations stemming from the evaluation which does your organisation think most important?</p> <p>b) Are there any recommendations that your organisation questions or has rejected?</p>	<p>[Please see Annex 1 and rank top 5 – please elaborate on your ranking in this section]</p> <p>[If so please mark on Annex 1 and elaborate in this section]</p>
3	Have any of the recommendations been incorporated into <i>policy</i> documents?	[If they have been, please elaborate on which ones, if they have not are there any plans to do so, and if so by when?]
4	Have any of the recommendations been incorporated into <i>operational</i> documents (for example country planning documents/guidance documents)?	[If they have been, please indicate which documents and which recommendations – if they have not, are there plans to do so, and if so by when?]
5	Have monitoring systems been put in place to enable the effective tracking of the implementation of recommendations by your organisation?	[if yes, how does it work, if not are there plans to design a monitoring system to do this?]
6	Do you have any other comments relating to the evaluation, its findings, the way it was disseminated, its relevance/impact or any other issues you would like to record?	

ANNEX 1 - Recommendations stemming from the Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support

	Recommendation	R A N K	R E J E C T
1. On the Scope and Focus of PGBS			
a	PGBS may be relevant in a wide variety of contexts. Follow an incremental approach to using it. (section 7 ¹)		
b	Follow the general principles and good practices for budget support of the OECD DAC guidelines but take more account of overlap and interactions between sector-focused and general budget support. (Section 7)		
c	Do not overload PGBS with unrealistic objectives or with too many reform tasks (6.30)		
d	Keep a focus on its central role in strengthening public expenditure management (6.30)		
2. On capacity development related to PGBS			
a	Support capacity development by using government systems, and accelerate moves to bring aid funds on-plan and on-budget. (6.28)		
b	Recognise the centrality of PFM reform in developing national capacity to manage results. (6.28)		
c	Strengthen the policy analysis, budgeting and expenditure management capacities of line ministries as well as finance ministries. (6.28)		
d	Also pay attention to capacity issues as they affect local governments. (6.28)		
e	Support government-led capacity development strategies for PFM. (6.28)		
3. On Policies and Strategies it Supports			
a	Focus more on income poverty and growth implications of public policy and expenditures, and on how PGBS can complement other modalities in that area. (6.14)		
b	Pay more attention to the quality, including the poverty incidence, of basic, public services. (6.11)		
c	In doing do, move on from simplistic assumptions about “pro-poor expenditures” to deeper analysis of sector and sub-sector strategies and their expenditure implications. (6.11)		
d	Consider long-term financing strategies for the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), in terms of their sustainability, their aid financing requirements and the appropriate balance of expenditures across sub-sectors. (6.11)		
e	Take a pragmatic, country-by-country approach to supporting cross-cutting issues through PGBS. (6.16)		

¹ Reference to relevant section of the synthesis report

4. On performance assessment and conditions		R A N K	R E J E C T
a	Implement the Paris Declaration commitments on alignment and managing for results. (6.54)		
b	Keep disbursement linked conditions to a minimum and ensure genuine agreement with government. (6.54)		
c	Performance assessment systems should track the implementation of strategies as well as the achievement of results. (6.54)		
d	Decisions to increase or reduce levels of PGBS support should mainly be based on medium-term assessments of overall performance. (6.54)		
e	Take a pragmatic approach to notional earmarking and similar signalling devices, but ensure that they are designed to minimise transaction costs. (6.46)		
5. On Managing Risk			
a	Retain the IMF's role in monitoring, reporting and advising on macro-economic performance, but do not link all PGBS funds to the IMF's own conditions. (6.75)		
b	Accompany PGBS with support to revenue collection (6.77)		
c	Assess fiduciary risk from the perspectives of all stakeholders, not just donors. (6.91)		
d	Support common approaches to diagnosis and monitoring of PFM standards. (6.91)		
e	Strengthen shared analysis of corruption and the way it affects the poor. (6.91)		
f	Exploit the potential for budget support to help strengthen Public Financial Management and limit corruption. (6.91)		
g	Undertake more systematic analysis of political risk in relation to budget support. (6.99)		
6. On Managing Aid			
a	Develop aid strategies to optimise complementarity between aid instruments, including budget support at country and sector level. (6.59)		
b	Develop genuinely long-term budget support instruments (6.59)		
c	Donors should engaged in PGBS should increase the in-country discretion afforded to their local offices and support strengthening of both central and sectoral capacity of governments. (6.59)		
e	Donors engaged in PGBS should increase the in-country discretion afforded to their local offices and support strengthening of both central and sectoral capacity of governments. (6.59)		
f	Independent Monitoring of aid performance could play an important role, and should incorporate monitoring of the Paris Declaration benchmarks. (6.59)		

COUNTRIES - Survey of Responses to the Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support

Organisation/Government Institute	
Date	
Name of respondent	
e-mail address	

Question		Response
1	<p>a) How did your organisation go about disseminating the evaluation and its recommendations?</p> <p>b) Have any joint government/donor discussions taken place on the findings of the evaluation? If so, did the discussions lead to any changes with respect to the GBS programme or do you anticipate changes in the future?</p>	<p>[Please Include groups focused on (Politicians, Senior management, Heads of Country offices, Civil Society Groups etc.) and types of dissemination methods employed (presentations, lectures, etc).]</p> <p>[Please include formal and informal exchanges and an overview of the scope of the changes.]</p>
2	<p>a) Are there any recommendations that your government deems particularly important? Have any of the recommendations lead to any changes, or do you anticipate that they will in the future?</p> <p>b) Are there any recommendations that your government questions or has rejected?</p> <p>c) Has your organisation noticed any change in donors approach to delivering GBS subsequent to the findings of the evaluation being published?</p>	<p>[Please see Annex 1 and rank top 5 – please elaborate on your ranking in this section]</p> <p>[If so please mark on attached recommendation list and explain why in the space provided here]</p> <p>[If yes please inform us of the changes, if not please inform us what you would like to see change.]</p>
3.	<p>Do you have any other comments relating to the evaluation, its findings, the way it was disseminated, its relevance/impact or any other issues you would like to record?</p>	

ANNEX 1

BURKINA FASO

Recommendations stemming from the Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support

	Recommendation	R A N K	R E J E C T
1. Design of PGBS			
a	Donors should make the design of their programmes consistent with the performance assessment system and provide multiannual funding commitments.		
b	Review the necessity of targeted modalities for HIPC.		
2. Aid coordination			
a	Establish an all-inclusive forum embracing all aid modalities and instruments.		
b	Improve the functioning of the sector and thematic working groups.		
c	Define sector policies clearly as frameworks for aligning all aid including project aid, and for strengthening PGBS alignment at more operational levels.		
d	Strengthen coordination in capacity development and inter-sectoral/ sectoral initiatives.		
3. Capacity building and decentralisation			
a	Ensure full alignment of donors' technical assistance and support to PFM reforms behind the PRGB and the emerging strategic framework for PFM reform.		
b	Widen support to sectoral and decentralised levels.		
c	Continue to strengthen accountability systems, including the role and capacities of national stakeholders.		
d	Reform/decentralise institutions to cope with a higher level of service delivery and strengthen national monitoring, evaluation and audit institutions.		
4. Policy and strategy		R A N K	R E J E C T
a	Improve capacity for poverty analysis and pro-poor orientation of policies and strategies.		
b	Improve the quality of services; further strengthen budget classification to allow for pro-poor budgeting and expenditure monitoring/tracking.		
c	Develop a national strategy to promote enterprises, trade and the private sector.		