

Agenda Item V. Governance Evaluations

**Aid Effectiveness and Governance Evaluations:
Creating Synergies and Leveraging Key Findings
to Inform Policy Dialogue on the Road to Busan and Beyond**

This note was prepared by DFID and the EVALNET Secretariat, on behalf of a Core Group, for discussion at the 12th meeting of the Evaluation Network.

Contacts:

Helen Wedgwood, DFID H-Wedgwood@dfid.gov.uk

OECD EVALNET Secretariat megangrace.kennedy-chouane@oecd.org



**12th Meeting
23-24 June 2011**

**AID EFFECTIVENESS AND GOVERNANCE EVALUATIONS:
CREATING SYNERGIES AND LEVERAGING KEY FINDINGS
TO INFORM POLICY DIALOGUE ON THE ROAD TO BUSAN AND BEYOND**

For discussion

- We welcome comments or suggestions on any aspect of this work stream.
- Specific feedback on the idea of holding a policy seminar later this year would be particularly helpful. What would make the event most relevant and useful?
- Any suggestions for key topics for the evaluation briefs relevant to current international policy dialogue would also be welcome.

Context

1. 2011 is a key point in the international aid and development policy calendar, marked by intense international scrutiny and dialogue on the effectiveness and impact of international development cooperation, especially relating to commitments made in the previous decade.
2. Against the background of uneven progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and in the current global economic and political context, HLF4 will consider progress against commitments and targets agreed in the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (PD) and the 2008 Accra Agenda for Action (AAA).
3. Commitments on the way forward for the coming decade will be announced by the international development community at Busan in which the transparency, accountability and results of aid are expected to form a key focus. Agreements on the role of development cooperation in conflict affected and fragile contexts around state-building and governance are expected, alongside wider commitments on state-building, ownership and capacity development.
4. Evidence on the effectiveness of international development cooperation is intended to play a key role in the priorities and negotiations of the Busan outcome statement. While the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey and associated monitoring of the DAC Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations will supply information, a deeper understanding of aid relationships and their impact on development outcomes will be provided by Evaluation, most importantly, the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration itself.
5. Several other evaluations currently underway will provide further evidence on high priority policy questions, such as the effectiveness of donor support to anti-corruption, what works in public sector reform and public financial management, and the impact of budget support.

Building synergies and leveraging evidence

6. During 2010 the DAC Evaluation Network (EVALNET) agreed on the need to strengthen coordination and lesson-learning between joint international evaluations¹ and to intensify efforts to communicate

¹ Side meeting of DAC EVALNET Feb 2010 – Coordination Paper *“Looking ahead, the evaluations as a cluster have potential to add value to the broader evaluation of the Paris Declaration. Opportunities may exist for synthesis of findings, policy briefings and other contributions for the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness. In view of this, the February meeting agreed to explore further emerging findings, conclusions and recommendations together in late 2010 and through 2011. Further discussion on these points will be necessary in coming months as the studies begin to generate results, with a view to a decision on appropriate next steps in early 2011”.*

their findings and contribute to policy dialogue.² By playing this role, EVALNET can provide a critical “service” for the broader development community.

7. While the evidence from the individual evaluations mentioned is already communicated to specific policy channels, the close topical links between them suggest that additional insights may be derived from summarising findings and lessons across the whole set.
8. Because individual evaluation terms of reference and budgets have not made provision for this kind of work, there is a risk that potentially powerful evidence is under-utilised. A further risk is that with so many closely related but separately communicated evaluations entering the public domain at roughly the same time, policy makers may miss significant links between findings, draw selectively from them or ignore those they find unpalatable.
9. An EVALNET workstream guided by a Core Group of EVALNET members and in collaboration with the evaluation teams is being initiated to review and summarise findings and lessons from across the relevant studies into a series of topical Evaluation Briefs. These would be designed to feed in to policy discussions in the lead up to Busan and beyond. Discussions have begun with the DAC Governance Network (Govnet) on contributions into ongoing seminar series and/or a dedicated seminar involving evaluation team leads in the Autumn.
10. Timing and progress of the work is necessarily bound by the availability of the final evaluation reports. Currently only the Paris Evaluation is completed but we expect Budget Support studies from end June, Anti-Corruption in mid July, Public Sector Governance Reform and Public Financial Management in August/September. A seminar pulling together key findings could not reasonably take place until perhaps a month or so after completion of the reports – in September/October 2011.

Scope

11. The evaluations proposed for inclusion in the workstream include the international joint evaluations of the Paris Declaration (PDE); support to anti-corruption (AC); budget support (BS); public financial management (PFM); and public sector governance reform (PSGR). Annex A summarises the timing and management arrangements for each.
12. The evaluations analyse closely related aspects of aid effectiveness and public sector governance - a particular area of concern for effective international development co-operation, not least because of increased demand for accountability for large volumes of international assistance, concern over the pace and progress of development trends, knowledge gaps around effective approaches to reform in different contexts and the role of external partners.
13. The topics examined by these evaluations are themselves often closely interwoven in the fabric of country level aid partnership arrangements. Government and development partnership dialogue structures often consider these as inter-related issues. For instance increased use of Budget Support – including Sector and General Budget Support - has broadened and deepened development agencies’ engagement with PFM issues and strengthening national systems.
14. Similarly, the scope of the Paris Declaration covers the broad over-arching framework within which DAC members and partners operate. Findings from other studies are expected to provide in-depth analysis of several elements covered by the broader Paris Declaration Evaluation – including aid instruments, country ownership and centre of government capacity for planning, financial

² DAC EVALNET Strategic Reflections discussion November 2010: [Link to meeting documents](#).

management and delivery, accountability and incentives for reform. Annex B outlines an initial mapping of topics covered by each evaluation, highlighting the links between them.

15. These linkages underline the potential for read-across between the individual study findings to enhance understanding of what works and why, and under what circumstances, feeding into future strategy.
16. While it was recognised that many other studies on topics of aid effectiveness and support for governance are also underway and/or recently completed, it was felt that the five larger joint evaluations merit particular attention to ensure they contribute to international dialogue to the fullest extent possible.

Approach

17. The basic task is to review the evaluations to identify common themes and lessons, for complementary, consistent and opposing findings, and summarise these into accessible communication briefs on key topics relevant to discussions in international aid policy dialogue channels. These would then be disseminated through short briefing papers, seminars and contributions at relevant discussions.
18. While the design of most of the evaluations have taken account of each other in order to minimise duplication and enhance complementarity, they retain distinct evaluation frameworks and were not designed with meta-evaluation in mind. Considering this and the predominant use of qualitative and case study methods across widely differing contexts, emphasis will be on systematic report-based review. The comprehensive PDE evaluation framework and synthesis method will be helpful as an organising framework on which to draw.
19. A Core Group drawing on members directly involved in or managing the evaluations has been set up, and currently includes SIDA, DFID, Netherlands, Denmark, PDE Secretariat and EVALNET Secretariat, but is open to anyone interested. Its role is to steer the work, for instance by identification of key topics and outline for the evaluation briefs, comment on drafts and validation of final products, and to promote their proactive use in relevant policy fora.
20. An initial meeting of evaluation team leaders and some Management Group members to share thinking on themes, content and approach was held in March. There was agreement to collaborate on review work and contribute to seminars and key meetings as appropriate, building on individual evaluation briefing and dissemination plans to avoid duplication. Further discussion on topics and analysis would be needed as the evaluation findings become available and a more detailed plan covering key dates and stages, meetings and seminar options will be developed by the Core Group drawing on today's discussion.

Partnerships

21. Sida had earlier suggested hosting a policy seminar or workshop to bring together key stakeholders. This could be held under the auspices of the EVALNET and hosted by a member, and/or done by an independent thinktank. Funding would be available for such an event from Sida and DFID.
22. Within GOVNET there is a keen interest in these specific evaluation findings and, more broadly, in improving results measurement, evaluation and communication in their work. Practitioners feel that the relative weakness of results information and impact evidence in governance support has negatively impacted their work. A proposal to take stock of current knowledge and practice on demonstrating results in governance and monitoring progress was discussed at the 8 June GOVNET meeting and received strong support. Members are interested in collaborating with EVALNET as they take this work forward and welcomed the initiative to synthesise key policy messages from

evaluation. It was felt that this work would be particularly useful to GOVNET as an input to their contribution at Busan.

23. EVALNET Secretariat has supported the process since the side session discussions in 2010 by reviewing evaluation plans and DEREc to identify relevant work, and has been regularly consulted since. A co-ordination space has been established on the Evaluation Web Platform (<https://community.oecd.org/community/deveval/govcluster>) to facilitate sharing of documentation, contact details and schedules.³ The website will provide space for discussion and coordination. The DAC Secretariat will host and manage the website, support meetings, liaise with GOVNET and facilitate other HLF stakeholder engagement within the Secretariat.

Risks

24. The major risk is the various study timelines and availability of findings from the individual evaluations to allow sufficient time to feed in to the fixed HLF4 timeline which contains some tight deadlines for evidence contributions. However, it is understood that the results of the PD Monitoring Survey and Progress Since Paris report will be drafted in time for the July Working Party Meeting on Aid Effectiveness, and that final reports will be available in September, around the expected release of a draft options paper for the Busan HLF outcome document.
25. Likewise, other important channels exist for consideration of findings particularly through GOVNET, specialist policy dialogue channels etc. While some technical-level discussions of the Busan outcome document will be on-going through the summer period, we expect September to see an intensification of engagement at senior and political levels. A well-targeted policy seminar at this stage, preferably linked to key HLF meetings and the issue of the 2nd draft Busan Outcome Document, may prove well-timed.
26. Another risk may be the difficulty of generating interest in the outputs, given the high volume of other work going on in the lead up to Busan. Policy channels are quickly becoming saturated with (competing) information. It will be important to avoid duplication and focus on concise, readable and well-targeted outputs; this effort should be informed by discussions on communication at the June network meeting.
27. A positive mitigating factor of this work stream is the relevance of these policy messages beyond Busan. Regardless of the outcomes of the High Level Forum, the evidence and policy recommendation outputs will be valuable contributions to ongoing GOVNET work and other discussions in the broader development community – where good governance is a high priority for many.

³ The evaluation platform is password protected and requires an individual MyOECD login and password. Contact the Secretariat for access: megangrace.kennedy-chouane@oecd.org.

Annex A: Evaluation Country Coverage, Management and Timelines

	Anti Corruption	Budget Support	Public Financial Management	Public Sector Governance Reform	Paris Declaration (countries in common with the other evaluations)
Countries	Bangladesh Nicaragua Vietnam Tanzania Zambia	Zambia Tunisia Mali (Tanzania)	Burkina Faso Ghana Malawi	Bosnia Herzegovina Cambodia Indonesia Mozambique Uganda	Bangladesh Cambodia Ghana Indonesia Mali Malawi Mozambique Uganda Vietnam Zambia
Management group	Norway (lead) AsDB Danida Sida Sadev UK	EC (lead) Belgium Denmark Canada Finland Germany Ireland Netherlands Norway Sweden Switzerland UK	AfDB (lead) SIDA DANIDA UK (for Phase 1)	UK (lead) SIDA Ireland	Netherlands (co-chair) Malawi Sweden Malawi Colombia USA Vietnam (co-chair)
Reporting timelines	<u>June 2011:</u> Country reports. <u>July 2011:</u> Synthesis report. Policy Briefs tbc.	<u>June -Aug 2011:</u> Country reports. (Tanzania begins late 2011) [Synthesis and Methods Note Sept 2011 tbc]	<u>Dec 2010:</u> Quantitative study (Phase 1). <u>July 2011:</u> Draft Country studies; <u>Aug 2011:</u> Final Country Reports <u>September 2011:</u> Synthesis Report Draft Final. Policy Briefs tbc	<u>July 2011:</u> Draft Country Studies end <u>Aug 2011:</u> Final Country Reports & Draft Synthesis Report; <u>September 2011:</u> Synthesis Report draft Final; <u>Sept-Oct 2011:</u> Policy Briefs	<u>May 2010:</u> Inception report & operational matrix. <u>Jan 2011:</u> Country/donor agency reports. <u>June 2011:</u> Synthesis report. <u>May – Sept 2011:</u> Dissemination. (plans tbc)

Annex B: Initial Topic Matrix

Topic/Evaluation Coverage	Anti Corruption	Budget Support	Public Financial Management	Public Sector Governance Reform	Paris Declaration (countries in common with the other evaluations)
Contribution to development outcomes	Accountable and effective states; Aid Effectiveness Burden on poor people	Enabling environment for growth; Public spending impact and benefits for the poor	Global standards to enhance resource efficiency and leverage finance	State capability, accountability, responsiveness; Relationships between political, executive, judicial arms National Ownership & Policy Leadership Service delivery	Aid efficiency, predictability, effectiveness; leveraging aid volumes; Untying; Coherence
Understanding drivers of reform; ownership and leadership	Codes of Conduct; Domestic demand; Donor Risk/Aid Mgt	International and domestic economic; National budget issues – predictability PD/AAA; Aid volumes and dependency	Accountancy Standards Domestic accountability PEFA/ Aid Risk Management;	Domestic political parliamentary and governance; External drivers – international standards	PD/AAA National strategies; aid policies; Donor-govt dialogue
Capacity strengthening- apex bodies	Anti-Corruption Commissions	National Development Policy bodies	Ministries of Finance; Sectoral Ministries;	Public Service Commissions and Governance;	Aid Coordination; National Dev Policy Bodies
Strengthening National Systems (TA, priorities, relevance, predictability, coordination)	Judiciary Police Anti Corruption Commission;	Central Budget; Audit; Procurement; Planning and	Public Financial Management Budgetary and Accountancy systems	Legal and Regulatory Bodies;	Aid alignment to national systems; Predictability; Conditionality; Untying

	Internal Audit;	Prioritisation Delivery Poverty Impact; M+E			
Performance management systems progress and global standards	Audit functions;	National M+E systems; PAFs	PEFA; National Audit	Central and MDA relationships	PAFs Aid Policy monitoring; PD Monitoring
Aid and Budget Transparency	X	X	X	X	X
Domestic Accountability - technical mechanisms and political	Public Accounts and scrutiny bodies; Parliaments and civil society	Public Accounts; Development Scrutiny bodies; Parliaments and Civil Society	Public Accounts;		
Mutual Accountability, Partnership & Policy Dialogue	Peer Review; Independent scrutiny;	PAFs – national and donor	PEFA; PAFs	Political and partnership dialogue	PAFs- national and donor
Aid Instruments, Predictability, Alignment & Use of National Systems	X	x	X	X	X
Quality of Donor Coordination, Coherence & Consistency	X	x	X	X	X
Harmonised support for national & sectoral strategies	X	x	X	X	X

Results, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation	X	x	X	X	X
Risk Management Approaches	x	x	X		X
Focus on poverty, gender and inclusion outcomes	X	X	X	X	X
Civil Society & Private Sector Roles	X	x	X	X	X