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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

This report is a contribution to the formulation of an action plan for monitoring implementation of the Paris Declaration over the medium term. It includes a mapping of existing monitoring activities focused on efforts to improve aid effectiveness at country, regional and international levels. Drawing upon this information and on discussions around the Paris Declaration Baseline Survey of 2006, it proposes an overall approach and specific activities, timelines and coordination requirements for Paris Declaration monitoring up to the year 2010. Using the report as a starting point, the Co-chairs of the Joint Venture on Monitoring the Paris Declaration intend to draw up a more detailed plan of activities for the consideration of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness and Donor Practices. (§§ 1-3)

The emphasis of the proposals is on cost-effectively generating information that is useful to both country-level actors and international stakeholders, and helps to stimulate concrete actions in line with the Paris commitments. There are two overriding concerns: 1) to keep the internationally mandated monitoring effort to the agreed minimum, so that work burdens remain at a reasonable level; and 2) to avoid the risk that the 12 agreed indicators come to be regarded as sufficiently representing the commitments entered into by the Paris Declaration signatories. To meet the second concern, a strong recommendation is made that countries, regional bodies and donor groups undertake to track their performance on commitments going beyond those captured by the 12 indicators wherever there is a will to do so. The report’s principal recommendations are drawn together in a text box at the end. (§§ 4-8)

Mapping of existing monitoring activities

Part 1 of the report is based on a survey of available information on international and regional monitoring initiatives and related activities in a purposive sample of 36 countries. It shows that there is already a good deal of monitoring activity wholly or partially directed at the aid effectiveness agenda set out in the Paris Declaration. Country-level activities vary greatly, particularly between those countries where Harmonisation Action Plans or national Aid Policies were initiated after the Rome Declaration and are now well established, and those – at the other extreme – where the country has not even been involved in post-Paris activities such as the Baseline Survey. (§§ 9-17)

Experience in those countries where the government and donors have been active on harmonisation and alignment for some years (e.g. Vietnam, Tanzania, Nicaragua) provides a rich source of guidance on monitoring approaches that are both cost-effective and action-oriented. They illustrate the value of linking monitoring to a locally agreed action plan. They also demonstrate the feasibility of tracking implementation of commitments other than those covered by the 12 internationally agreed indicators. Examples include aid complementarity (donor division of labour); incentives for collaborative behaviour; and specific issues relating to fragile states. (§§ 18-32)

Regional bodies led by the development banks have shown they can play a useful role in facilitating communication between country and international levels as well as between countries. Regional events have already shown a potential for reducing the unevenness of experience across countries by encouraging information exchange. Regional monitoring activities also exist, especially in Africa (§§ 33-35)
There are a number of international initiatives other than the Paris Declaration monitoring surveys themselves that touch upon aid effectiveness issues and call for inputs at country level. Three processes in particular need to be taken into account, in order to avoid overlaps and exploit useful complementarities: 1) the World Bank’s progress reporting on aid effectiveness, enshrined successively in the CDF Progress Report and forthcoming Aid Effectiveness Review; 2) the Development Cooperation Forum hosted by UN ECOSOC; and 3) the Joint Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration. In addition, international initiatives which call for some country-level data collection on issues closely related to the Paris commitments include: the PEFA Performance Measurement Framework; the Education for All Fast Track Initiative; and the EU Aid Effectiveness Package. There is some potential to reduce duplication by harmonising measures and information sources among these initiatives (§§ 36-48)

Other current activities include some undertaken by donor organisations focusing mainly on implementation of their own commitments. They include work on commitments outside the 12 indicators such as incentives (World Bank) and complementarity (EC). The DAC Peer Review process has been adjusted to give a central place to agencies’ performance in the area of aid effectiveness. Two special areas of work which are running parallel to Paris Declaration monitoring but involve closely related issues are the Good Humanitarian Donorship initiative and the OECD DAC Fragile States Initiative. (§§ 49-56)

Proposed medium-term plan

Part 2 of the report sets out an overall approach, and then makes specific proposals. The specific proposals start with the required direct follow-up to the Paris Declaration Baseline Survey. They then deal with the other monitoring activities that are to be encouraged in order to have sufficiently rounded coverage of the commitments in the Declaration. The report ends with a summary treatment of the timeline to 2010. (§ 57)

The overall approach proposed is one that sees the core of the monitoring effort as based on initiatives at the country level, where the tracking of indicators is directly linked to action plans that are locally agreed. A principle of subsidiarity should be applied, such that monitoring effort is rooted in country-level initiative unless there are sound reasons for regional activities (e.g. the SPA’s monitoring of alignment in budget support) or for international exercises in the collection of standardised, comparable information across a limited range of variables, such as the Paris Declaration monitoring surveys. (§§ 58-63)

The report’s specific proposals take as their starting point the already agreed minimum follow-up to Paris, based on 12 indicators and surveys in 2006 (the now completed baseline exercise), 2008 and 2011. The importance of acting early in 2007, to extract the process benefits from the Baseline Survey and prepare adequately for the 2008 exercise, is stressed. Recommendations are made on support for dissemination and discussion of the baseline results; encouragement of the trend towards adoption of country HAPs or Aid Policies; ‘marketing’ of the benefits to countries of participating in the survey, with a view to a more inclusive survey in 2008; firmer guidance on the definitions of the indicators with a view to reduced transaction costs and more robust data in 2008; minor but important adjustments to the data collection approach; and close liaison with other bodies responsible for data supply on particular indicators. It is suggested that these large and urgent tasks will require an increase in the capacity of the DAC Secretariat to support the survey process. (§§ 64-70)

Distinctive features of the 2008 survey will include better coverage of country systems and donor alignment in the field of procurement, and a somewhat different mechanism for assessing progress on Indicators 1 and 11 (country operational plans and performance assessment frameworks). The recommendation on the latter is to bring the data collection (construction of descriptive country profiles using the template established for the World Bank CDF Progress Report and Aid Effectiveness Review) into a closer relationship with the rest of the data collection for the survey, while asking the World Bank to
remain responsible for the award of scores based on the profiles. We also suggest there is scope for adding supplementary questions and spaces for more elaborate answers on the Country Worksheet where the survey data are entered by National Coordinators. This would be with a view to extracting more actionable findings from the survey while keeping a close focus on the same 12 indicators. Additional space devoted to progress on untying is especially needed. (§§ 71-79)

The management of the surveys in 2008 and 2011 should be geared to extracting the maximum process benefits from the data collection and analysis efforts. This implies timely preparation, partly with a view to encouraging a wider set of countries to participate, and intensive follow-up so that lessons are disseminated and acted upon. The Third High Level Forum in Ghana in September 2008 will require a reasonable complete set of findings for the reference year 2007, which poses a difficult scheduling challenge. The HLF should be an occasion for fresh thinking about whether monitoring of the Paris commitments should continue after 2010 and, if so, in what form. (§§ 80-85)

The internationally mandated monitoring just described will be a sufficient follow-up to the Paris Declaration only if it is accompanied by continued and extended national monitoring based on locally agreed plans covering a wider set of the Paris commitments. The international and country processes should be synergistic. Extending the country coverage of the survey should be used to promote wider adoption of country HAPs, and steps should be taken to incorporate more country learning into the conduct of the survey, by engaging National Coordinators fully in the preparations for 2008 and 2011. Opportunities should be taken wherever possible to avoid wasteful duplication by harmonising measures across the DAC, SPA, PEFA, GHD and Fragile States exercises. Regional lesson sharing and learning exercises have proven their worth and should be continued. (§§ 86-96)

To get a rounded monitoring of the Paris commitments, additional voluntary monitoring by donor organisations is as important as locally initiated country-level follow-up. Some of the same principles apply. We propose that donor monitoring will be more actionable if it is linked to agreed action plans for change, such as the joint plan of the Nordic Plus group. Internal monitoring of change within agencies is an important complement to standardised international data collection from the point of view of getting implementation of the commitments. (§§ 97-100)

Summary timeline

The timeline proposed is an outline, needing more detailed scheduling. It assumes that discussions have taken place to avoid any major duplication of survey-related activities with other international initiatives such as the Development Cooperation Forum. The most challenging immediate issue is how to have sufficient new data for a report in 2008 which is ready before September. Complete financial data on the previous year are likely to be available too late for inclusion, meaning that indicative data will need to be sought. The survey will need to be carried out earlier in the year than was the case in 2006. (§§ 101-103)

INTRODUCTION

1. A team based at the Overseas Development Institute, an independent London-based think tank, was commissioned to make proposals on suitable arrangements for monitoring the Paris Declaration
commitments over the medium term (2006-2010). This is their report.¹ The proposals in the report are intended as the basis for a more detailed action plan to be prepared by the Co-chairs of the Joint Venture on Monitoring the Paris with the support of the OECD DAC Secretariat.

2. The ODI team undertook a comprehensive mapping of existing monitoring processes in the field of aid effectiveness. They then carried out telephone interviews with National Coordinators of the 2006 Baseline Survey and other informants connected with initial Paris Declaration follow-up work at global, regional and country levels (a list of interviewees is provided at Annex 1). The report draws on the experience, lessons and stakeholder concerns brought together by these enquiries. It identifies the key principles that need to be observed by a medium-term monitoring plan that is consistent with the aims and approach of the Paris Declaration, and makes proposals for the consideration of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness and Donor Practices (WP-EFF) on how best to apply these principles in view of the lessons of recent experience.

3. The report has two parts:

- Part 1: a description and analysis of existing monitoring efforts in the field of aid effectiveness at country, regional, international and other levels.


4. Both the analysis of existing activities and the proposals on future monitoring arrangements are based on four simple, but essential, criteria:

- There should be a demand for the data generated by monitoring (and the monitoring arrangements should be suited to meeting the demand).

- There should be a positive balance between the required effort and the (expected or realised) pay-off from the monitoring activity.

- The results – the data and/or the process – generated by the monitoring activity need to be useful for the stakeholders involved in it.

- Monitoring efforts should build on existing arrangements and/or encourage the creation of arrangements that are of wider use (e.g. meet other monitoring needs or help in managing aid at country level).

A well-designed monitoring plan can help to sustain the momentum of an initiative over a time period, and in this way provides an important impetus for implementation.

5. The report adopts a broad understanding of monitoring of aid effectiveness. Any activity that generates relevant data on a repeated basis is classed as monitoring of aid effectiveness, whether this reporting is qualitative or quantitative in nature and regardless of the final destination of the information. In the same spirit, the proposed Medium Term Monitoring Plan (MTMP) for the Paris Declaration is an outline of activities and outputs that will provide regular information allowing the tracking of progress on the commitments outlined in the Paris Declaration. The emphasis of the proposed MTMP is on cost-

¹ We are grateful for oral and written comments on previous drafts from members of the Joint Venture on Monitoring the Paris Declaration.
effectively generating information that is useful to both country-level actors and international stakeholders, and helps in stimulating changes in line with the Paris commitments, especially at country level.

6. A central question addressed in the report is whether the medium-term monitoring effort should seek to cover all 56 commitments of the Paris Declaration. *A key feature of the proposed approach is to keep the internationally mandated monitoring effort to a minimum, centred upon the 12 indicators that have already been adopted.* This is intended to keep the work burdens involve to a reasonable level, especially for country partners. At the same time, there is a danger that the 12 indicators will come to be regarded as fully representing the commitments entered into in Paris, deflecting attention from the need to track progress on the Declaration as a whole.

7. *To reduce this risk, signatories to the Paris Declaration are strongly encouraged to support monitoring of other commitments where there is a will to do so – within countries and regions, and among donor organisations and networks too.* Locally agreed Harmonisation and Alignment Action Plans appear a particularly suitable framework for monitoring activities that go beyond the 12 agreed indicators at the country level. Support should be given to the various initiatives which will be looking closely at the commitments made on the donor side, including incentives for changing practices and the promotion of greater complementarity in aid delivery. Together with the forthcoming Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration, these steps should serve to keep attention focused on the actions flowing from the Declaration as a whole.

8. *Within this context, the report makes proposals for building upon the 2006 baseline exercise in preparation for the Third High Level Forum, to be held in Ghana in September 2008.* These proposals are consistent with the Baseline Survey report. They include efforts to widen the country coverage of the survey without compromising the survey’s ability to measure progress against a baseline. They also call for a refinement of the questionnaires and Country Worksheets used in 2006. Steps are proposed a) to overcome some of the technical and organisational snags revealed by the 2006 process, and b) to generate a small amount of additional information on the obstacles currently impeding Paris Declaration implementation at country level and promising experiences in addressing these.
PART 1: A MAPPING OF ON-GOING MONITORING ACTIVITIES

9. In order to map on-going monitoring activities, available information on a sample of 36 countries was surveyed. This mapping of on-going activities helped the team a) to draw on relevant experience in thinking about the best approach to a monitoring plan for the Paris Declaration, and b) to understand well the ‘environment’ for a Medium-Term Monitoring Plan for the Paris Declaration, with a view to avoiding duplication of efforts. Part 1 reviews and assesses existing mechanisms at three levels – country, regional and international – and concludes by considering some relevant processes that are not so clearly distinguished by level of activity.

Country-level aid effectiveness monitoring activities

10. Existing country-level processes are quite diverse, in terms of origin, history and purpose. Some countries have monitoring activities that pre-date the Paris Declaration (and even the Rome Declaration). In others, such activities are much more recent (in a number of countries, prompted by the 2006 survey) or long-considered but not yet operational (e.g. intended monitoring of Harmonisation Action Plans). A number of countries monitor aid flows and types of aid received, but not aid effectiveness as such. Some cases involve joint monitoring mechanisms between government and donors, while others involve independent monitoring agencies based in non-governmental institutions. Still others involve donors reporting on their own activities while government reports separately on its activities. Several country-level processes mainly involve sub-groups of donors (e.g. budget support donors), while others have a wider remit. The scope and focus of local monitoring efforts is sometimes narrower and sometimes wider than the 12 indicators adopted for the 2006 survey. Importantly, the country-level monitoring activities described here reflect the situation of countries which are advanced with regard to aid policy and aid management.

National aid policies and Harmonisation Action Plans

11. The main aid effectiveness monitoring mechanism that is found at country level is the monitoring of the implementation of the Harmonisation Action Plan (HAP), Aid Policy, or other local strategy that contains aid effectiveness commitments (for instance the Joint Assessment Mission in Sudan or the Uganda Joint Assistance Strategy). Of the sample of 36 countries examined, 16 have an HAP or equivalent. Of these 13 include an agreement to monitor the implementation of the commitments in the action plan, while of these, 10 have a fleshed-out monitoring framework that includes detail of what is to be monitored over what time period and by whom.

12. Examples of well developed HAPs exist in Cambodia, Ghana, and Nicaragua. In these cases, the HAP has a clear monitoring framework, and responsibilities for generating, receiving and reviewing monitoring reports are clearly allocated. In a few countries, there is a commitment to monitor the aid
effectiveness commitments set out in the Aid Policy but the plans still lack detail on mechanisms. A number of countries in the sample are considering developing a HAP or Aid Policy.

Types of monitoring mechanisms

13. **Existing monitoring mechanisms can be more government- or more donor-owned.** They are sometimes jointly owned in a very clear way, and can also involve independent review mechanisms. For example, monitoring in Afghanistan rests primarily with the government’s Aid Coordination Unit (which in turn reports to the Joint Coordination and Monitoring Board) and in Nicaragua, a Technical Unit has been created in the President’s Office, and this reports to the *Mesa Global*, a joint donor and government forum. In Albania, a Donor Technical Secretariat has moved ahead with initial steps towards monitoring of aid effectiveness (which are intended to prepare the ground for a joint donor-government effort).

14. Examples of effective joint monitoring activities which cover both donor behaviour and government behaviour exist in Vietnam and in Cambodia:

- In **Vietnam**, the Hanoi Core Statement (HCS) commits donors and government to annual joint assessments of progress; this has been supported by the Partnership Group on Aid Effectiveness (see Box 1.1).

- In **Cambodia**, the Partnership and Harmonization Working Group is expected to prepare six-monthly reports on progress on implementation of the Government’s H-A-R Action Plan.

### Box 1.1: Vietnam’s Partnership Group on Aid Effectiveness (PGAE)

The main role of PGAE is to foster a consensus on aid effectiveness among the various stakeholders. The group has proven to be a successful mechanism in this respect, as its work has resulted in a consolidated aid effectiveness action plan and a localized version of the Paris Declaration Action Plan – the Hanoi Core Statement. Together, these documents provide the group with clear targets aiming to improve the effectiveness of aid in Viet Nam. A corresponding monitoring framework increases peer pressure and fosters the implementation of the commitments.

The most important challenge of the PGAE has been to reach a common understanding of aid harmonization and effectiveness concepts and related issues. Over the past few years, joint donor/donor and donor/Government groupings have proliferated. There are many working groups, whose activities are sometimes overlapping with each other. Confronted with increasing transaction costs of endless dialogue, the PGAE has played an important coordination role in keeping the focus on the HCS commitments.

*Source*: ‘From Paris to Practice: Tools for Better Aid Coordination and Management’, workshop report, June 2006, Bangkok

15. **Monitoring mechanisms involving an independent review have been developed in a few countries.** They include Tanzania, Mozambique, and (at more initial stage) Cameroon. Box 1.2 contains details on the Tanzanian independent monitoring mechanism. These mechanisms vary considerably in terms of institutionalisation and mandate. While in Mozambique, independent consultants have been commissioned on a year-to-year basis, in Tanzania an Independent Monitoring Group has been created which is permanently hosted by a well-established local research institute (ESRF). In some circumstances, independent assessments may be easier, or more cost-effective, than joint assessments by government and donors.

16. In a number of countries, monitoring of aid effectiveness is still in the planning stages only (e.g. Malawi, Mali, Madagascar, Bolivia). Elsewhere it is currently not on the agenda at all. There are

---

2 Rwanda’s draft Aid Policy is a case in point. The Aid Policy commits the parties to discussions with the aim of establishing an independent monitoring mechanism, but does not discuss how existing devices such as the Donor Self-Assessment (feeding into the Paris Declaration Survey) will be taken forward.
suggestions that the 2006 survey process has raised the local profile of aid management; but, as reflected in the survey report, the circle of participating countries remains limited.

**Box 1.2: Tanzania: combining qualitative and quantitative monitoring of progress**

Tanzania’s Independent Monitoring Group (IMG) produced its first report in 2002. In its initial report, the IMG argued that in its view quantitative indicators would be of limited use. ‘Donor and GoT performance is too multi-faceted and qualitative for it to be fruitful to place large reliance on quantified indicators, although some would be useful.’

At the same time, the Action Plan for the Implementation of the Tanzanian Assistance Strategy (2002) outlined a number of monitoring tools that would be used alongside the reports from the IMG, including a quarterly record of progress on donor modalities, a record of donor reporting of statistical data on disbursements, quarterly updates on planned and actual missions, and so on. In this way, considerable amounts of quantitative data on aid effectiveness issues would be routinely collected.

Development Partners and the GoT responded to the 2002 IMG report by saying that tracking indicators should be considered part of the RD/PD commitment to monitor progress. The IMG produced a follow-up report in 2005 which monitored progress on issues identified in their 2002 report, such as the establishment of a quiet time, the development of SWApS in all major sectors, pay reform in relation to capacity building, enhanced staffing for the Ministry of Finance, and many other issues. The report draws on some quantitative information, but focuses heavily on a qualitative assessment of progress in these areas.

17. There are also a few cases where monitoring of aid effectiveness is not based on a HAP or Aid Policy. In Mozambique and Burkina Faso, for instance, monitoring takes place on commitments by budget support donors, which is linked to a MoU or equivalent rather than a statement of government policy. In Afghanistan and the Sudan, aid effectiveness monitoring is part of a joint donor and government agreement that is much wider than aid effectiveness alone (the Afghan Compact and the Sudan Joint Assessment Mission). However, in all these cases, there is some formal statement of aid effectiveness commitments that is agreed with the government.

**Institutional arrangements and inclusiveness**

18. In the majority of cases, existing monitoring of aid effectiveness is undertaken by a technical unit, which reports to a broad group of donors or a mixed body of donor and government representatives. Examples of such mixed bodies include the Development Assistance Group in Ethiopia and the Consultative Group (CG) in Cambodia. A number of countries are still in the process of defining who will have the responsibilities for preparing and receiving reports that monitor H&A commitments.

19. In several countries (e.g. Mozambique, Burkina Faso), aid-effectiveness monitoring centres upon the budget-support relationship. Such an arrangement has some strengths but obvious limitations, as it means that significant shares of aid remain outside the purview of the monitoring. It is important that aid effectiveness monitoring mechanisms speak to the widest possible range of donors in country (including non-DAC donors), even if the H&A agenda is most actively engaged with by budget-support groups.

20. The Consultative Group or Roundtable mechanism is likely to be the most important forum in this respect. CGs are not particularly active at present in some countries. However, in various countries and at several regional workshops, suggestions have been made about reshaping them in ways that would make them a better platform for aid effectiveness monitoring. It has been proposed to rename the CGs and reinvigorate them as Results and Resources Processes. Where a Results and Resources Process is adopted, the option of attaching to it a review of progress on Paris Declaration commitments is an obvious one.
Scope and focus of existing monitoring activities

21. Those countries that developed an HAP or Aid Policy after the signing of the Paris Declaration tend to have monitoring frameworks or instruments that are closely related to the agreed scope of the Paris Declaration Baseline Survey. In some countries, this has included monitoring of Indicators 1, 8, and 11 at country level (e.g. Albania, Ghana and Malawi). However, both among the early adopters of aid-effectiveness monitoring and among those that have developed their approach only recently, there are efforts to go beyond the scope of the survey. In Tanzania, there has been a particularly strong emphasis on a wide-ranging qualitative monitoring and reporting, as part of the Independent Monitoring Group mechanism. In several other cases, existing monitoring mechanisms capture commitments that are contained in the Paris Declaration, but are not reflected in the 12 internationally agreed Indicators (see Box 1.3 on Vietnam’s effort to establish and monitor localised targets).

22. Most sub-headings of the Paris Declaration (or areas of commitment) are covered by one or more indicators. However, there are four areas that are not associated with any indicator. These are:

- ‘complementarity: more effective division of labour’ (Paris Declaration, para. 35),
- ‘incentives for collaborative behaviour’ (para. 36),
- ‘delivering effective aid in fragile states’ (para. 39), and
- ‘promoting a harmonised approach to environmental assessments’ (para. 41).

23. Some of these commitments are monitored by a few existing country mechanisms.

Complementarity: more effective division of labour

24. Mozambique, Rwanda, and Moldova have some existing or planned monitoring mechanisms addressing this commitment, or at least some elements of it. For example, monitoring the number of silent partnerships and coordinated arrangements is planned in Moldova. In other countries (Uganda, Tanzania, Ghana) there are ongoing exercises in developing a division of labour among donors; but no formal monitoring of progress in this area have (yet) been established. Complementarity appears as one of the key areas of the Paris Declaration currently not reflected in an internationally agreed indicator. However, it may be that this is a commitment where a satisfactory form of monitoring can be built from the bottom up.
Box 1.3: Vietnam: Localised indicators and targets

‘Two key initiatives/documents on aid effectiveness in Vietnam have emerged from the Partnership Group on Aid Effectiveness: the Vietnam Harmonisation Action Plan (HAP) and the Hanoi Core Statement (HCS). Both enjoy high-level support among donors and the GoV. The HAP and its accompanying Monitoring Framework are intended to provide the development community in Vietnam with both a vision and concrete steps to achieve aid effectiveness based on the principles of country ownership, alignment and harmonisation, and streamlining. As part of HAP, donors have committed to supporting the formulation and implementation of the GoV’s Five Year Socio-Economic Development Plan (2006-2010), as well as to align with the government’s sector/sub-sector policies, strategies, and priorities.

Vietnam is also developing a Master Plan on ODA Mobilisation and Utilisation to establish the strategic direction for ODA use over the coming 2006-2010 plan period. A baseline survey is to be conducted as part of the HAP, which could become a crucial document in demonstrating the flaws of more traditional/less harmonised approaches to aid delivery and in showing progress over time.

The HCS was a rapidly formulated local response to the signing of the Paris Declaration in 2005, placing Vietnam at the cutting edge of local responses to the Paris agenda. The Vietnamese document sets 14 key indicators relating to ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results, and mutual accountability. It includes comprehensive progress indicators and suggests targets for 2010. In some instances it is more ambitious than the Paris targets themselves. The PGAE is in the process of revising the HAP so that adequate targets are in place to put the HCS into action.’


Incentives for collaborative behaviour

25. The Rwandan Donor Self-Assessment is the only country-level monitoring instrument that we have identified that captures (qualitative) information relevant to the question of incentives for collaborative behaviour. The Global Donor Platform for Rural Development has pilot activities in four countries (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Nicaragua and Tanzania) to promote harmonisation and alignment in rural development. However, currently there are no monitoring activities associated with this, and it is not clear how far the issue of incentives is addressed. These examples are suggestive of an as yet unrealised but genuine potential.

Delivering effective aid in fragile states

26. The Fragile States Initiative recently piloted its Principles for Engagement in Fragile States. One element of the pilots was to attempt to generate a national matrix of agreed actions between donors and government, which could potentially lead to country-level monitoring of aid effectiveness (amongst other things) in fragile states. No monitoring mechanisms have yet become effective, but the process is still at an early stage.

Promoting a harmonised approach to environmental assessments

27. Few country level monitoring systems monitor the commitment to harmonise environmental impact assessments. However, Cambodia and Vietnam both monitor progress towards harmonised EIA.

---

3 The Global Donor Platform for Rural Development is an initiative by donors with a particular interest in rural development. Established in 2003, it is currently lead by the German Ministry for Development (BMZ) and by the FAO Investment Centre. See www.donorplatform.org.
Other potential for widening the scope of country-level monitoring

28. **Two other commitment areas not directly addressed by the agreed Indicators are to some degree the subject of existing monitoring at country level:** harmonised conditions (paras. 16 and 21); and use of multi-year frameworks (para. 26).

29. The MoU governing general budget support in Mozambique provides a harmonised framework of conditions, but donors are allowed to retain bilateral conditions in Annex 10 of the MoU. The Mozambique independent report on programme aid monitors the number of donors that have ‘Annex 10 exceptions’ to the conditionality matrix, the aim being to bring down the number of bilaterally imposed conditions. A number of countries track the number of donors who provide funds within a multi-year plan (Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique). The SPA also surveys this with respect to budget support in Africa (see below).

30. **A number of monitoring mechanisms track progress in areas that are not formal PD commitments but which are closely in line with the spirit of the Declaration.** Examples are agreements on, and monitoring of, compliance with quiet periods (Ethiopia, Tanzania, Mozambique) and reductions in the overall number of missions (Mozambique). In some countries, aid policy pronouncements state clearly that the monitoring mechanism should not be limited by the Paris Declaration but should consider all relevant aspects of the aid relationship (proposed independent monitoring group in Malawi, as well as IMG in Tanzania).

31. **Some countries have sought to develop forms of monitoring which are particularly action oriented.** Rwanda (Box 1.4) provides a good example where donors are asked to provide information on existing obstacles, and on plans for increasing alignment in addition to the information collected on the Paris Declaration indicators.

---

4 ‘Bilateral agreements, which will be distributed to all signatories of this MoU, have precedence over this MoU. However, to the extent possible, given existing contractual and statutory provisions, PAPs will not include in their bilateral agreements any additional conditions or administrative and reporting requirements to those agreed upon in this MoU. Where PAPs have existing bilateral agreements, these will be amended in line with the MoU. In the exceptional cases where PAPs do have different or additional conditions or administrative or reporting requirements in their bilateral agreements, these are shown in Annex 10’.
Box 1.4: Rwanda: Aid Policy and national monitoring framework – from information to action

In collecting data for the Paris Declaration Survey, the Government of Rwanda developed a Donor’s Self Assessment Workbook, which has served to gather additional relevant data on performance against the government’s Aid Policy and which asks donors to develop statements of intent on various areas of performance. The Workbook is expressly designed to capture a considerable amount of qualitative data.

For instance, donors are asked to provide the following information in addition to that requested in the Paris Declaration Survey:

• Details of all assistance provided outside sector strategic plans
• Total amount of project assistance that was disbursed to a) stand-alone projects and b) basket funds or other pooled finance mechanisms
• Whether they provide budget support in other developing countries
• Total aid committed to the government sector as part of a plan for three or more years

Donors are asked to outline the constraints that prevent (i) alignment of all ODA to sector strategic plans or the PRS, (ii) moves towards budget support, (iii) use of national systems, (iv) provision of complete and timely information to the Development Assistance Database, (v) use of joint analytic work, and (vi) increased predictability. Donors are also asked to comment on the degree of flexibility they have over the sectors in which they intervene and their authority to delegate to other development partners.

Donors are also asked to outline their forward plans for increasing the alignment of their support to GoR plans and strategies and bringing assistance on budget, for moving towards GoR preferred aid modalities, for improving the effectiveness of technical assistance, for moving towards use of national procurement, accounting, audit and monitoring systems, for increasing the proportion of aid provided within plans for three or more years, and for ensuring that their activities are concentrated in areas of comparative advantage.

Concluding observation

32. In the above review of country-level experiences, emphasis has been placed on relevant processes that already exist. Generally, the examples cited come from the small group of countries that are quite advanced in pursuing a country-led aid effectiveness agenda. This should not obscure a major finding of the mapping exercise, which is that aid-effectiveness monitoring mechanisms currently exist only in a minority of countries. Building appropriate country-level mechanisms for following up on the Paris commitments remains a challenge for the future.

Regional aid effectiveness monitoring activities

33. Regional activities of relevance to aid-effectiveness monitoring have been until recently patchy and sporadic. However, under the impetus of the Paris Declaration the picture is changing, and regional activities are becoming an important focus for exchanges of experience among countries and between countries and regional organisations.

34. Regional development banks have engaged with the Paris Declaration both by hosting or organising regional workshops and by monitoring their own HAPs, where they exist. For instance, the African Development Bank carried out a Process Review that surveyed AfDB offices in five countries on selected aspects of the Paris Declaration. The focus was on information on progress and process for internal purposes. The review drew primarily on the information provided by AfDB’s employees. The IADB, as well as the AsDB, hosted regional workshops on aid effectiveness in 2006.

35. Regional monitoring efforts are most developed in Africa. These include: the Strategic Partnership with Africa (SPA) surveys, aspects of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries’ Capacity-Building
Programme, and the Mutual Review of Development Effectiveness, which is carried out by OECD DAC and UNECA on behalf of NEPAD. Of these three, the SPA budget support survey constitutes the most developed monitoring activity. The SPA Budget Support Working Group carries out an annual survey of alignment of direct budget support with national processes. The survey has been carried out in 15 to 18 African countries annually since 2003. It has been loosely coordinated with the DAC surveys on harmonisation and alignment in corresponding years. The closer coordination of this survey with current and future monitoring surveys by the DAC is an important issue for consideration.

**International-level aid effectiveness monitoring activities**

36. The international level is, of course, a major source of monitoring initiatives. These, however, tend to require activities to be carried out at country level. Importantly, some countries that are pilots or early adopters of a number of international initiatives around aid effectiveness (e.g. Mozambique, Vietnam) bear a relatively heavy burden. Furthermore, aid effectiveness is not ‘the only game in town’ in the field of data collection in response to international initiatives. Apart from the Millennium Development Goals themselves, indicator-based monitoring is increasingly being used around a range of issues, most notably related to governance. Consequently, a central concern underlying this section of the mapping exercise is the extent to which initiatives at the international level are coordinated in such a way that they contribute positively to developments at regional and country levels.

**International monitoring processes that overlap with the Paris Declaration monitoring**

37. The 2006 Paris Declaration Baseline Survey and the planned monitoring survey in 2008 are not the only important international processes following up on aid effectiveness issues. Three processes in particular need to be taken into account with a view to avoiding unhelpful overlap and realising potentially useful complementarities.

38. The *World Bank*’s Comprehensive Development Framework Progress Report of 2005 covered a wide range of aid effectiveness topics. The country profiles and the resulting quantitative scores on countries’ development plans and performance assessment frameworks prepared for the CDF Progress Report were the principal inputs on Indicators 1 and 11 for the Baseline Survey report. The Bank’s forthcoming Aid Effectiveness Review (AER) covers the Paris agenda even more closely. Early drafts of the AER country profiles were also consulted in preparing the Baseline Survey report. There have in this way been useful synergies between the World Bank exercises and the survey. There has also been a measure of duplication, and according to Chapter 2 of the Baseline Survey report the combined challenge of coordinating the Baseline Survey responses and commenting on the draft materials circulated by the Bank was more easily handled by the responsible authorities in some countries than in others. Furthermore, there are questions about the Bank’s readiness to continue supporting a process on the scale of the AER, and about the way Indicators 1 and 11 might be handled in future iterations of the survey. These are touched upon in the Baseline Survey report and in Part 2 of this report.

39. The second potentially relevant international platform is the Development Cooperation Forum to be hosted by the United Nations’ ECOSOC from 2007 onwards at a biennial rhythm. The Development Cooperation Forum is among the new functions assigned to the UN’s Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) by the 2005 UN Summit. It is intended to review trends in international development cooperation, including strategies, policies and financing, promote greater coherence among the

---

5 A non-profit programme funded by Austria, Canada, Ireland, Switzerland, Sweden and the UK, which aims to build the capacities of HIPC countries to design and implement strategies to finance their development optimally.

development activities of different development partners and strengthen the links between the normative and operational work of the UN. The Forum is expected to involve donor and recipient governments, UN agencies, OECD/DAC, the World Bank, the IMF, regional development banks, regional commissions, and other relevant regional and sub-regional institutions. It is expected to open with a multi-stakeholder dialogue and is scheduled for July 2007 in Geneva.

40. Finally, the Joint Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration has been explicitly designed to complement and not duplicate the survey-based monitoring effort. An initiative of the DAC Evaluation Network, it is now being overseen by a broadly based Reference Group co-chaired by Denmark and Vietnam, which held its inaugural meeting on 5-6 March 2007. The evaluation aims to add value to the monitoring work by providing detailed answers to the “Hows” and “Whys” of the ways in which the Paris Declaration has been translated into action by donors and partner countries. It will test and, if necessary, disprove the Declaration’s underlying assumptions.

41. The evaluation plans to draw fully on the data generated by the Baseline Survey, but will go into further depth with three separate series of evaluations/studies: a small number of country evaluations, managed by the countries and overseen by a local reference group; a set of donor agency evaluations, carried out mainly at headquarters’ level on the basis of documentary review and interviews with key actors; and a number of thematic studies, based to the extent possible on existing evaluations and research. The evaluation process is being rolled out during 2007, with a view to a report on interim findings being presented at the High Level Forum in 2008.

Other international initiatives requiring country-level monitoring

42. Three other international initiatives that bear to some degree upon the monitoring of aid effectiveness are: the PEFA Performance Measurement Framework; the Education for All Fast Track Initiative; and the European Union’s Aid Effectiveness Package.

PEFA

43. Although it is primarily an instrument for joint assessment of public financial management, the PEFA framework also contains three questions regarding aid harmonisation and alignment:

- D1) predictability of direct budget support;
- D2) financial information provided by donors for budgeting and reporting on project and program aid; and
- D3) proportion of aid that is managed by use of national procedures.

44. Thus far, PEFA assessments have been carried out or are under preparation in more than 60 countries. In several, they involve government self-assessments as an element of the assessment process (e.g. Ghana, Tajikistan).

45. In principle, it may be expected that PEFA assessments will draw on the same information used for completing the Paris Declaration survey and the SPA budget support survey where available. However, there is some risk of unnecessary duplication, especially where knowledge management within governments is weak and different indicator formats require at least some additional data gathering and analysing effort. It may be helpful to point out relevant areas of overlap in the guidance notes of the PEFA Framework, and the DAC and SPA surveys. There may also be a potential for greater harmonisation of indicators across monitoring instruments. Although designed to reduce burdens on country officials by
cutting the number of separate public finance assessments, PEFA assessments do involve staff from central ministries (especially ministries of finance) to a significant degree.

**Education for All Fast Track Initiative**

46. At sector level, the EFA Fast Track Initiative is a leading example of a multi-donor activity that incorporates an element of aid-effectiveness monitoring. The Initiative has developed a Donor Indicative Framework as a ‘tool for analysing – at country level – how advanced donors are in different dimensions of harmonising their policies and procedures in education and to promote and monitor progress at country level on donor harmonisation in education’. Although there has been no further work on this issue by the EFA FTI Harmonisation Working Group since the 2005 report was published, the agenda of the Working Group for the coming months does include integrating the Paris Declaration Indicators with the indicators of the Donor Indicative Framework.

**EU Aid Effectiveness Package**

47. This was adopted by the European Commission in March 2006, building on the 2004 EU Action Plan for Coordination and Harmonisation which included a Harmonisation Pilot Initiative. The EU’s contribution to improving harmonisation and alignment of aid involves four harmonisation pilot countries: Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua and Vietnam. Concerns about overloading local reporting systems have been taken into account in the design of these exercises. Reporting requirements and monitoring rest primarily with EU bilateral donors and Commission delegations in these cases.

**Wider monitoring efforts of international initiatives**

48. Two other international monitoring efforts are central to the current development assistance framework: monitoring of the MDGs and of the PRS initiative. The MDG monitoring effort is a very ambitious one, as the demands for (quantitative) data are very substantial. PRSP monitoring is focused around the Annual Progress Reports from governments to the IMF and the World Bank. PRS monitoring is process-focused to a degree, while MDG monitoring is strongly focused on outcomes. Neither of these two initiatives directly concerns aid effectiveness.

**Donor-focused monitoring**

49. Several individual donors have developed Harmonisation Action Plans for their organisations, and are monitoring the implementation of these in various ways. Usually, this consists of drawing on internal information, including information that is generated for other purposes such as the Paris Declaration Baseline Survey or the SPA budget support survey.

50. For example, the World Bank presently collects information from its country offices on areas such as the number of new Project Implementation Units. The Bank’s OPCS Department has also completed a study of internal incentive issues involved in its implementation of the Paris commitments. The European Commission has an ongoing programme of work to monitor and promote donor complementarity at country level.

51. The Nordic Plus Group of donors developed a Joint Action Plan (JAP) on harmonisation and alignment in response to the Rome Declaration in 2004, which includes a commitment to monitor its

---


8 Denmark, Finland, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the UK. As this is a significant number of relatively like-minded donors, the monitoring of this action plan is of more interest.
implementation. The Directors General of the Nordic Plus group of donors meet semi-annually, and on this occasion report on progress in implementing the JAP. As in the case of individual countries, the adoption of Harmonisation Action Plans generally forms the basis for such donor-focused monitoring. DFID is establishing a system for routinely collecting relevant information with the aim of reporting internally on progress with regard to Harmonisation and Alignment. The aim is to generate information in such a way that it can be used for both internal and external monitoring efforts linked to the Paris Declaration.

52. **DAC Peer Reviews** cover aid effectiveness issues since 2004, either as a special issue in the chapter focusing on country operations (Germany, Sweden, Netherlands, Belgium, United Kingdom, United States) or in a less structured way (New Zealand, Norway). There are a few Paris Declaration commitment areas that appear to be covered in most or all of the recent peer reviews examined: untying (Paris Declaration para. 31), use of common arrangements (para. 32) and division of labour (para. 33). The last mentioned is important as representing one of the commitments not covered by the 12 agreed indicators. While most issues have been picked up less systematically so far, a more systematic review of the five commitments will be included in coming reviews, as part of a new Chapter on Aid Effectiveness. This Chapter has been incorporated in January 2007 in the revised Assessment Framework for DAC Peer Reviews. It is expected this approach will generate information on individual donor activities, and that the donor community will use this information to draw lessons and to support change towards greater aid effectiveness.

**Other monitoring activities**

53. Two special areas of work are of wider relevance to the monitoring of aid effectiveness and embrace the international and country levels:

- monitoring the effectiveness of humanitarian aid, and
- improving aid delivery to fragile states.

54. **Existing and planned monitoring processes around the effectiveness of humanitarian aid are not currently well linked to monitoring of Paris Declaration commitments.** The reasons for this appear to be (i) a well-established institutional separation of responsibilities in many donor agencies for humanitarian as opposed to development aid, and (ii) the fact that humanitarian aid faces additional hurdles because, in most cases, there is no prospect of channelling such aid through government systems. The Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) is designed to improve harmonisation and coordination of humanitarian assistance around the Stockholm principles. Many of the major donors that are signatories to the Paris Declaration are also signatories to the GHD initiative, which has recently agreed a number of aid effectiveness indicators to be monitored at country level.

55. The Paris Declaration contains a commitment to delivering aid effectively in fragile states, where humanitarian aid is often predominant (paras. 38 and 39). The main initiative regarding Fragile States is the OECD DAC’s own Fragile States Initiative (FSI). The FSI is relevant to all DAC members. The FSI has been piloting the development of agreed action matrices around FSI principles at country level. 
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9 ECHO (the European Commission Humanitarian Aid department) is also a signatory to the GHD Initiative.

10 In addition to these officially-agreed indicators, there are a number of other indicators being trialled by the Humanitarian Policy Group at ODI, including indicators on the time-lag between commitments and disbursements, predictability of humanitarian aid, pooling and flexibility of funds, levels of funding to different types of implementing agencies, use of joint assessments and joint statements, and many more. These indicators have not been agreed by any joint group, and any monitoring mechanism has yet to be drawn up.
of which focus on aid effectiveness commitments. This is different than monitoring aid effectiveness in fragile states, but there is potential for greater synergies as the agenda develops.

56. A number of other monitoring activities are currently in the pipeline and/or at various stages of development and testing (for example, the Country Harmonization and Alignment Tool, CHAT, under preparation by UNAIDS; the Quality of Aid Management for Microfinance Index under preparation by the CGAP, a multi-donor microfinance initiative). **Indicator-based monitoring of aid effectiveness is a rapidly expanding field which will require continued efforts at harmonisation to limit transaction costs especially for recipient country governments, but also within donor agencies.**
PART 2: PROPOSED MEDIUM-TERM MONITORING PLAN

57. Part 2 of this report draws substantially on some of the main lessons from the 2006 Baseline Survey and on the discussions at the Sixth Meeting of the Joint Venture on Monitoring the Paris Declaration (22-23 Feb 2007) as well as on the understanding of the wider field of existing monitoring efforts gained from Part 1. It is in two main sections. The first sets out the overall thinking that informs the proposals, identifying the main building blocks of a medium-term monitoring plan and the principles that should guide their coordination. These second, longer, section makes proposals in detail. These begin with the direct follow-up to the 2006 Baseline Survey, in the form of the 2008 and 2011 survey rounds. They then deal with the way country-level and donor-focused processes might be encouraged to develop, so that overall a reasonably rounded monitoring of the Paris Declaration commitments is achieved that is effective in supporting the Declaration’s implementation.

Monitoring system: building blocks, stakeholders and their coordination

58. In the proposed plan, the core of the monitoring effort is at the country level, based on an internationally agreed and guided process; but one which leaves considerable scope for local variation. This is supplemented by further (voluntary) efforts at national and regional levels, as well as within donor organisations and among donors. The internationally guided effort is to be regarded as an agreed minimum and thus as one tool among others to further change towards greater aid effectiveness among the various stakeholders. The building blocks and the key stakeholders of the overall monitoring system are depicted in Figure 1.

59. The monitoring efforts that take place and are evolving at the different levels are linked by a shared concern and are grounded in the existing Paris Declaration as an internationally endorsed agreement. The Paris Declaration, the set of commitments, and the 12 indicators set out in it provide common reference points for monitoring efforts at all levels and carried out by all stakeholders.
60. **The main actors in carrying out monitoring of the Paris Declaration commitments and indicators are:**

- At the **country level**: national governments of recipient countries (and their aid coordination structures) in collaboration with donors operating in country;

- at the **regional level**: the Regional Development Banks as well as regional associations (such as the SPA);

- at the **international level**: the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness and Joint Venture on Monitoring the Paris Declaration with the support of the OECD DAC Secretariat, the World Bank and the UN (UNDP and ECOSOC); and
• at other levels: monitoring within donor agencies, which will play a crucial role in developing incentive structures that enable staff within development agencies to engage with the aid effectiveness agenda.

61. In addition, non-governmental organisations may play an important role in encouraging and supporting the monitoring efforts carried out by the various main actors.

62. The potential for this stakeholder structure to lead to overlapping mandates and duplication of efforts, with consequent overload on country systems, is clearly considerable. A particular example where there are dangers of this kind which need to be guarded against is the ECOSOC-led DCF. This report proposes a high-level initiative by the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness to ensure that the Development Cooperation Forum does not duplicate the medium-term monitoring plan of the Paris Declaration. Close liaison with the World Bank’ Operations Policy and Country Services vice-presidency will also be essential, with a view to a clear division of labour during the lead-up to the 2008 High Level Forum between the monitoring survey and the Bank’s qualitative and quantitative assessment work on aid effectiveness at country level.

63. Generally, the principle of subsidiarity should apply to the overall monitoring effort. That is, the key responsibility for country level processes lies with country level stakeholders, including governments and locally active donors. Decentralised monitoring that is developed at country-level and is a continuous process is best suited to take account of varying country circumstances. Monitoring at this level is also the most likely to be helpful in identifying specific obstacles to implementation of the Paris commitments and ways of overcoming them. The regional level offers other particular advantages. It provides a suitable platform for sharing experiences; and it can play an important role in linking the international-level and country-level processes. Only monitoring activities which require ‘system wide’ agreement so as to permit standardised information for comparative purposes need to be brought to the international level.

Proposed monitoring processes for 2006 to 2011

The internationally guided monitoring effort

64. The proposals outlined in the following pages do not begin from a blank sheet of paper. Some basic building blocks and milestones of the medium term monitoring effort at the international level have been previously defined and agreed. Most importantly:

• Monitoring will centre on 12 indicators as set out in the 2005 Declaration;

• the monitoring effort has a time horizon of five years (2006 to 2010); and

• during this time-period, three rounds of the survey are to take place: a Baseline Survey in 2006, and two subsequent surveys to monitor progress in 2008 and in 2010.

The Baseline Survey

65. The 2006 survey has served to establish a baseline. It has drawn on four main sources:

• The World Bank’s 2005 CDF Progress Report for Indicators 1 and 11;

• a baseline figure for indicator 2a based on the World Bank’s CPIA indicator for Budget and Public Financial Management;
• an OECD desk-based review of Indicator 8 (tying of aid); and
• a country-based questionnaire survey focused on Indicators 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 12.

66. For the 2006 Baseline Survey, Indicators 1, 2a and 11 were established in advance, using the scorings provided by the World Bank. The country profiles prepared in connection with the 2005 CDF Progress Report were used to support analysis of the quantitative scores for Indicators 1 and 11, with some updating of the descriptive information based on the discussion drafts of the Bank’s forthcoming Aid Effectiveness Review. Indicator 2b could not be covered, as there is at present no standardised source of information on the quality of procurement systems. The other elements of the monitoring effort were based on the survey returns, which included both numerical data and qualitative commentary supplied by the survey’s National Coordinators.

67. The report on the Baseline Survey has been finalised. It provides a quantitative and qualitative/descriptive account of the state of affairs in 2005, and outlines the major future challenges faced on each of the indicators apart from 2b.

68. **34 countries have contributed to the survey, with a substantial share of total ODA to those countries being accounted for by the donor responses.** A good deal has been learned both about the technical side – how the questions and the indicators work in practice – and about the process (positive effects as well as some drawbacks that might be avoided in future, including some concerned with timing and sequencing).

*Following up the 2006 baseline exercise and preparing for 2008*

69. The report on the Baseline Survey reflects initial experiences and summarises the status quo regarding how aid is provided. The debate and efforts for change that this initial evidence has generated among the various stakeholders will be critical for achieving the progress that is envisaged by 2010. **Efforts should be made to stimulate these ‘process’ effects, while at the same time preparing for the second survey in 2008.** With these two objectives in mind, the period between the Baseline Survey and the next round of survey-based monitoring should involve the following steps:

• **Support for the dissemination and discussion of results:** Members of the Joint Venture are well placed to promote discussion within and among donor agencies. Regional and country efforts to stimulate dissemination and discussion should be undertaken by Joint Venture members along with regional and country stakeholders.

• **Encouragement to the development of country-level Harmonisation Action Plans and country Aid Policies:** It is clear that these are important tools for achieving progress on the Paris commitments, as well as the best basis for ongoing local monitoring of aid effectiveness.

• **Encouragement to countries that for one reason or another did not participate in the baseline exercise, to join the 2008 survey and start preparing for this as soon as possible:** This is important from the point of view of spreading the process benefits of undertaking the survey, and also in order to get a broader baseline against which to draw conclusions in 2010. It applies particularly to countries currently classified as Fragile States, as these were not strongly represented in the baseline sample. There is also a strong case for inclusion of more francophone countries. The addition of new participants will pose some additional technical challenges for the survey analysis, but these seem likely to be manageable. More complete and effective coverage of francophone countries will also require additional investments in translation. These will require funding. Once the staffing and budgeting for the 2008 exercise has been settled (see
there would be a strong case for some ‘marketing’ work on the benefits that countries can expect to obtain from participating (and, no less important, continuing to participate) in the survey.

- **Review and further development of the guidance for the existing indicators**: The second survey needs to be both technically more robust than the baseline exercise, learning from the mistakes made in the first round, and capable of generating results which can be validly compared with those of the Baseline Survey. As the 2006 survey round has shown, for some indicators the margins of interpretation are still too wide and need to be narrowed. A clearer distinction needs to be made between allowing respondents to report genuine difficulties in applying centrally agreed definitions and allowing them to override the definitions. *Firmer guidance may be expected both to reduce the transaction costs involved in data collection and validation, and to help to ensure that the data collected are consistent and comparable across countries.* Careful thought will need to be given to ensuring that the 2008 results provide a more robust baseline for monitoring in 2010, without weakening the basis for valid comparisons between 2006 and 2008 too much.

- **Full consideration of any necessary adjustments to the data collection approach**: This should include a) agreement on roles and responsibilities in respect of particular indicators for which responsibilities were divided in the 2006 exercise (for example, Indicators 1 and 11), and b) any adjustment of the design of the Country Worksheet considered desirable to permit the capture of additional information, as discussed below.

- **Close liaison with the Joint Venture on Procurement to ensure timely preparation of the needed baseline data on Indicator 2b (quality of procurement systems)**: Because of the lack of a standardised measure of the quality of country procurement systems in 2006, no targets have been able to be set for improvement in this area, or for the extent that donors use country procurement systems. Preparation of an indicator and baseline scores is being undertaken during 2007 and is expected to add significantly to the quality of the information for analysis in 2008. A new set of targets for donor use of country procurement systems should be agreed on the basis of this work.

All of these steps need to be initiated as soon as possible. This adds up to a substantial body of work. *It will only be possible to complete it in a timely way if the capacity of the DAC Secretariat to support the survey is strengthened during 2007.* We understand that this is planned and recommend that it is treated as a top priority.

**The 2008 survey**

**Indicators**

- The following are proposed as key features of the first monitoring survey in 2008 in respect of scope:
  - It will include indicator 2b, and a new set of agreed targets under Indicator 5 relating to use of procurement systems;
  - it will involve a somewhat different mechanism for indicators 1 and 11;
  - but will use similar mechanisms for all other indicators; and
• the Country Worksheet will be slightly redesigned so as to encourage the survey’s National Coordinators to provide comments on a small number of qualitative questions, aimed at generating more information on actionable issues – that is, specific obstacles to implementation of Paris Declaration commitments arising in the experience of particular countries and ways that have been found to address these problems.

72. As noted above, the availability of values for indicator 2b will be a major step forward, since procurement is a key area of concern with regard to aid harmonisation and alignment. For this, a discussion needs to take place on the new Indicator 5 targets as well as on the suitability of the measures proposed for 2b.

73. Country processes would benefit in two ways if in 2008 the country profiling on Indicators 1 and 11 were treated as a more integral part of the survey exercise. A merged process would help to generate sensitivity at the country level to the inter-dependencies between progress on country institutions and donor practices. Also, the merged process could be taken as an opportunity to make explicit the links between the country profiles and the scoring systems used by the World Bank. This would increase transparency in a way that would be valued at the country level. This would in turn help to enhance the attractiveness of involvement in the survey, both for the 34 countries already participating and for those that need to be brought in before the next round.

74. It would also be important for a credible international body like the Bank to remain responsible for the numerical scoring of Indicators 1 and 11. This would require updating of the country profiles on Indicators 1 and 11 to be carried out according to clear rules, with some degree of external validation, in order that the scoring has a clear objective basis. This will be challenging but seems feasible and capable of generating potentially greater process benefits (e.g. country-level discussions about the degree to which national development plans can be made more operational and results-oriented).

75. According to our proposals, the mechanisms for assessing all other indicators would remain as in the 2006 survey, but some additional information would be captured by including a small number of additional questions in the Country Worksheets. The purpose of the additional questions would be to make the results of the survey more actionable – that is, more useful to governments and donors wishing to initiate changes in response to the findings on the indicators. The feasibility of extracting further information of a more actionable kind while remaining focused on the 12 agreed indicators is clearly indicated by experience in several countries, as explained in Part 1. It is also the case that some National Coordinators volunteered additional insights and reflections in 2006, suggesting that others might have done so if more space on the Worksheet had been provided explicitly for this purpose.

76. It is not proposed to create new indicators or to increase significantly the work burdens entailed, but only to provide greater opportunities for qualitative comment. With this in view, consideration should be given to whether the emphasis should be on capturing insights generated primarily by the National Coordinators, on their own responsibility, or on reporting more of the collective discussion at country level, with National Coordinators acting only as moderators and rapporteurs. Trade-offs between quality of dialogue and transaction costs would need to be taken into account in reaching a decision on this aspect.

77. There is a particular case to be made for creating space on the Country Worksheet for comment on Indicator 8 (untying). Many readers of the draft Baseline Survey report have commented on the poverty of the analysis of this indicator. While numerical data on ‘untying status’ by country and by donor were able to be drawn from OECD sources, inputs for a discussion of the reasons for the current position and possible ways of moving forward were not available. (The OECD’s own progress reporting on untying is limited to particular sub-sets of developing countries.) Collection of some country-level views on the
obstacles to further untying would enable analysis of this indicator to match that provided for other indicators.

Process

78. The following are proposed as key features of the 2008 round in respect of process:

- **inclusiveness:** encourage other major aid donors to participate (global funds, non-OECD donors, International NGOs; with a focus on those contributing significant shares of aid);

- **sequencing:** prepare indicators 2a and 2b, as well as 8, before undertaking the country-based questionnaire survey;

- **post-survey reporting:** survey report to include recommendations for action to be taken to meet goals in view of progress since 2006, and a stock-taking of how the aid effectiveness agenda has moved forward since 2005 (e.g. # of HAPs in place; # of JASs, etc.);

- **high-level follow up:** a full discussion at the Third High Level Forum in Accra, Ghana.

79. Placing greater emphasis on encouraging other major aid providers to participate, including INGOs and non-OECD donors, **needs to be moderated by a sense of the transaction costs involved.** This is why we suggest a focus on those that provide significant amounts of aid.

80. The 2008 post-survey report will play a crucial role in suggesting actions to be taken to achieve the targets set for 2010. To this end, we suggest that it should include a chapter providing an overview of the measures undertaken at country level. The 2008 survey will provide an essential basis for the discussions at the Third High Level Forum, and hence **special care needs to be taken to start and conclude the survey in good time.**

81. **The Third High Level Forum in Accra in 2008 will be an opportune moment for an initial reflection on the aid effectiveness agenda beyond 2010.** The results from the monitoring, and the debates generated by the two survey rounds will provide a fertile basis for this reflection. At the same time, stakeholders of the Paris Declaration may want to keep an open mind about the emergence of new directions on the agenda.

*The 2011 survey based on 2010 data*

82. For the 2010 round, the second monitoring survey, we envisage the following key features:

- It will measure whether the overall goals of the Paris Declaration have been met;

- it will involve similar survey mechanisms and processes as in 2008;

- some deepening of the survey regarding specific issues identified as challenges in the 2008 survey round (this could be some more detailed questions on moving ahead with aligning procurement practices, or with coordinated capacity building, etc.); and

- post-survey reporting to address overall experience with implementing the Paris Declaration, report what has been achieved and what remains to be done, and set out an agenda for the future.
83. The Paris Declaration calls for a final round of monitoring of the 2010 commitments. This in effect means to measure 2010 performance will imply organising a survey in 2010 on 2010 data. This is indicated in the Summary Timeline at the end of the report.

**National monitoring efforts**

84. In the proposed approach to medium-term monitoring of the Paris Declaration, the internationally guided and the voluntary additional country-level monitoring are complementary and are intended to generate synergies. National monitoring efforts are expected to have multiple components of which the key ones are:

- The internationally guided Paris Declaration ‘minimum’ (as outlined above);
- closely linked national monitoring efforts (e.g. use of locally expanded Paris Declaration questionnaires);
- other national recording and monitoring based on Harmonisation Action Plans or Aid Policies, and/or on the recent initiatives to build more substantive joint reviews on the basis of the Consultative Group concept; and
- other internationally or regionally agreed monitoring efforts (which countries may want to increasingly align with the Paris Declaration effort to reduce any duplication).

85. National monitoring efforts are expected to be more multi-faceted and more directly action-oriented than the international agreed minimum, based on the principle of ‘subsidiarity’. The *primary level at which any additional monitoring efforts should be agreed is the country level*. This includes decisions about which of the 56 commitments contained in the Paris Declaration could be monitored in greater detail than is permitted by the survey. It may also include other dimensions of aid effectiveness that are not included in the Paris Declaration.

**The Paris Declaration survey process in country**

86. In the medium term, it would be expected that all or the overwhelming majority of recipient countries that are signatories to the Paris Declaration will undertake the survey in country. *This implies that in 2008, 20+ further countries could be involved for the first time.*

87. As guidance is further strengthened, and as donors and country authorities improve their record-keeping in response to the gaps revealed by the 2006 survey, undertaking a survey based on the 12 internationally agreed indicators should require less effort in subsequent rounds. National Coordinators should have a substantial voice in shaping ways of conducting the survey that progressively improve the quality of the data and its ability to influence behaviour, while limiting the burdens imposed by the process.

**Closely linked national monitoring processes**

88. As is emerging from the current survey round, some nationally initiated monitoring efforts are already closely linked to the Paris Declaration survey process. Rwanda and Vietnam have used an enhanced version of the Paris survey to capture additional information, for example, about the reasons why harmonisation and alignment are limited thus far. Many countries are currently in the process of establishing Harmonisation Action Plans and/or Aid Policies (e.g. Kyrgyzstan, Peru, Zambia). The monitoring efforts built into these may be expected to be linked to the Paris Declaration survey (for
example, in terms of the specifications of data requirements), while not being limited to the 12 Indicators.

Other national recording and monitoring efforts

89. At the same time, some countries have already established HAPs and Aid Policies, and – more importantly – have established institutional practices which do not mesh easily with the Paris Declaration. One issue is the division of responsibilities with respect to loans and grant assistance and/or technical assistance. Record keeping and practices for reflecting these different categories of ODA in the national budget appear to differ frequently.

90. These divisions are not necessarily seen as satisfactory in countries. Hence, the Paris Declaration monitoring may provide a welcome impulse for change. However, there are also some good reasons why such divisions exist, e.g. reluctance to give overall responsibilities for aid to one ministry and/or reluctance on the part of Ministries of Finance to deal with the often more complex and piecemeal management of grants and technical assistance. In such cases, Aid Coordination Units or their equivalents which have been established in a number of countries in recent years would be well placed to take on the role for monitoring aid effectiveness – in close collaboration with Ministries of Finance and other relevant ministries.

91. Country governments may want to pursue specific issues – for example, donor alignment with national procurement procedures, or coordinated capacity building – in more detail than is possible in the Paris survey context. This should be encouraged. It is possible that to yield truly ‘actionable’ results, such monitoring needs to be initiated and designed at country level. National governments and/or local donor groups may also decide they want to include non-OECD assistance more fully in monitoring efforts (non-OECD bilaterals, aid provided by foundations and INGOs).

Other regionally or internationally agreed monitoring efforts at country level

92. A number of countries are already involved in regional or other internationally agreed monitoring efforts, as detailed in Part 1. These include the SPA for many African countries, the GHD initiative and the Fragile States Initiative, as well as the three questions relating to aid practices in the PEFA assessments, and others. The alignment of these surveys with each other needs to be managed at the international or regional level. This issue should be addressed in 2007.

93. Some surveys will want to capture more detail than others; but those questions seeking to capture macro-level information should be aligned in terms of specification of the data format (i.e. the formats should be the same or easily convertible), so as not to require multiple record keeping or record generation at country level. As already noted, our recommendations include a high-level initiative by the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness to avoid any wasteful duplication of activities between the UN-led Development Cooperation Forum and the Paris Declaration surveys.

11 In most countries, established monitoring structures are geared towards recording the receipt of aid, and especially towards recording any debt incurred; as well as monitoring sectoral allocations of aid; but in most cases are currently not geared towards monitoring aid effectiveness.

12 Loans tend to be more consistently reflected in national budgets than grants, since there are strong incentives to keep track of all loans that have to be repaid (also in the context of an increasingly strong emphasis on better debt management in many countries). However, the division between loans and grants is not matched by the difference between different aid modalities which the Paris Declaration emphasises. For example, direct budget support provided by the UK or the Nordics may be given as grant aid.
Other monitoring efforts

The role of the regional level

94. Key other monitoring efforts include regional events to stimulate and support country processes. Regional activities seem to play a useful role in supporting national monitoring efforts and in linking the national and the international level. Meetings on aid effectiveness and the Paris Declaration took place in 2006 in all the main regions. These provided valuable platforms for exchanging experiences and developing further orientation on good practices. It is to be expected and hoped that they will continue. Regional platforms and networks can also play a role in assisting countries which will undertake the survey for the first time in 2008.

Donor monitoring

95. Another dimension of follow-up to the 2006 process that must not be neglected is the donor dimension. There is a need for monitoring of the commitments within and among donor agencies that is not going to be met by analysis of country-level results across donors.

96. Peer Reviews are an existing mechanism that will help to monitor implementation of the Paris declaration by providing a qualitative approach complementing the data measured through the twelve indicators of progress. A systematic review of DAC member’s efforts to implement the Paris declaration commitments will be included in a chapter of the report dedicated to aid effectiveness. Five Peer Reviews are completed each year. As agreed by the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness, a synthesis report on progress towards aid effectiveness will be prepared for the 2008 third High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness. It will draw on findings and lessons learnt from the 14 Peer reviews which will have been conducted since the Paris Declaration was adopted.

97. Just as country-level monitoring will be most actionable if it is based on a locally generated HAPs, so donor monitoring needs to be based on donor-focused harmonisation action plans (or similar internal policies). Donor-focused monitoring serves primarily as an implementation tool for senior management to ensure organisation-wide implementation of Paris Declaration commitments, spanning HQ and country levels. This includes the dimension of record keeping that supports the generation of data relevant for the Paris Declaration commitments on the one hand, and the dimension of effectively promoting harmonisation and alignment at country level on the other hand.

98. Some limited and agreed-upon external discussion of such monitoring results may be desirable. However, we propose that the primary focus of this dimension of Paris monitoring effort should remain internal, because this is more likely to make it rigorous and action-oriented. The senior management of donor agencies is the most important recipient of monitoring information on alignment and harmonisation, and the key to whether or not action takes place on the basis of such information. For the management of donor agencies, there is a need for both internationally generated monitoring results (based primarily on country-level surveys) and internal monitoring of progress.

Summary timeline

99. As noted at the beginning, the proposals in this report are intended as the basis for a more detailed action plan to be prepared by the Co-chairs of the Joint Venture on Monitoring the Paris with the support of the OECD DAC Secretariat. Several difficult questions of timing will need to be decided in
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the preparation of this more detailed plan. However, we conclude with an overview of the schedule of events and processes that seems to be required.

100. **Table 2.1 outlines the principal international-level components of the proposed monitoring plan by year.** It is not comprehensive but brings together the main activities proposed in the text above. It assumes that the possibility of uncoordinated and duplicative international-level activities has been averted by high-level decisions between the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness, the World Bank and the UN system, so that it is realistic to focus exclusively on the activities in which the WP-EFF is the principal coordinating body. No attempt is made to summarise the suggested scope and timing of regional or country-level monitoring activities, because these should be determined at the appropriate level.

101. **The timeline of the proposed plan will require refinement and more detailed scheduling.** This will need to take account the confirmed dates for the Third High Level Forum in Accra and subsequent events at which monitoring reports will be required. This may pose a substantial challenge. The precise timings will be affected by time-lags concerning the availability of quantitative aid data, meaning that a survey designed to capture complete data on the previous year cannot begin before May. Donors prepare and submit their data on aid disbursements to the OECD DAC by May of the subsequent year. The momentum generated by the PD monitoring effort in terms of record keeping may contribute to the submission of indicative data for the purposes of the survey to somewhat earlier in the year. These factors considerably narrow the ‘window’ for undertaking the survey in any given year.

102. Box 2.1 draws together the proposals and recommendations in Part 2 of this report.
Table 2.1: Summary timeline for the Medium-Term Monitoring Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008/9</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination and</td>
<td>Second monitoring survey</td>
<td>Identification of emerging issues requiring</td>
<td>Final monitoring survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion of Baseline</td>
<td>Dissemination and discussion of second</td>
<td>additional coverage in 2011 survey</td>
<td>Dissemination and discussion on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey report</td>
<td>monitoring report</td>
<td></td>
<td>discussion on achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of guidelines</td>
<td>HLF discussions on (i) progress to date;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiation of future activities on aid management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on voluntary local</td>
<td>(ii) process to 2010/11;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitoring of Paris</td>
<td>(iii) possible future efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration commitments</td>
<td>and directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson-learning on survey</td>
<td>Further support for local initiatives, with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>method and process, and</td>
<td>a focus on countries undertaking the survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advance preparation for</td>
<td>for the first time in 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 round, including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of a new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechanism for Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firmer questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidelines to maximise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly expanded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questionnaire to assist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actionable conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Box 2.1: Summary of recommendations

1. Keep the internationally mandated monitoring effort (surveys) to a minimum, centred on the 12 agreed indicators, but encourage more comprehensive follow-up of the Paris Declaration commitments in countries and donor groups where there is a will to do so (§§ 6-7).

2. Observe a principle of subsidiarity in regard to medium-term monitoring of the Paris Declaration: country-level initiatives are the core, and activities which require country inputs are initiated at regional or international levels only when this is essential (§63).

3. A high-level initiative by the WP-EFF to ensure that the Development Cooperation Forum does not duplicate the medium-term monitoring plan of the Paris Declaration (§62).

4. In preparation for 2008, urgent steps to:
   - i. promote discussion of the baseline findings;
   - ii. encourage wider adoption of country HAPs or Aid Policies;
   - iii. ‘market’ the benefits to countries from participation in the survey, and encourage other major aid providers to become involved;
   - iv. firm-up the guidance on indicators;
   - v. agree a new data collection and assessment mechanism and division of labour for Indicators 1 and 11;
   - vi. liaise with JV Procurement on assessment of 2b and develop targets for Indicator 5 (use of country procurement systems);
   - vii. Improve the Country Worksheets by adding some additional questions around the same indicators, so that the survey generates more action-oriented findings (including on untying aid);
   - viii. agree a time schedule that permits at least indicative data on 2007 to be included in the 2008 exercise, and reporting to be completed in time for the September 2008 HLF; and
   - ix. undertake preliminary thinking on the reference year for the planned 2010 exercise, and how to include post-2010 activities in the agenda of the 2008 HLF. (§§ 69, 72-85)

5. Strengthen the capacity of the DAC Secretariat in such a way as to ensure timely completion of the above steps. (§ 70)

6. Persist with efforts to secure mutual learning and stimulus between the international survey effort and country-level monitoring of aid effectiveness, so that both types of process continue to meet real needs and generate actionable findings with minimum duplication. In this spirit, involve National Coordinators in the above design choices, and make further use of regional platforms. (§§ 86-96)

7. Promote further monitoring of donor commitments, including those not covered by the 12 agreed indicators, both through the Peer Review mechanism and by means of additional initiatives within organisations and donor networks. (§§ 97-100)

8. The Co-chairs of the Joint Venture on Monitoring the Paris Declaration to prepare a more detailed action plan and timeline on the basis of the above. (§§ 101-103)
Annex 1: Interviews undertaken in connection with proposed medium term monitoring plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raundi Halvorsen-Quevedo</td>
<td>OECD - Deputy Director, Africa Partnerships Forum Support Unit</td>
<td>29.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Dearden</td>
<td>Senior Economic Adviser, Africa Division, Department for International Development (DFID) (SPA co-chair)</td>
<td>31.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Bassett</td>
<td>Policy Analyst, Development Policy and Partnerships Team, Development Effectiveness Group, Policy Division, DFID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucretia Ciure</td>
<td>National Coordinator, Moldova</td>
<td>20.09.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Erdembileg</td>
<td>Head, Aid Coordination Unit, Mongolia</td>
<td>22.09.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Howard</td>
<td>Policy Advisor, Country-Led Approaches and Results Team Policy Division DFID</td>
<td>22.09.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinara Djoldosheva</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan: World Bank National Coordinator, Ministry of Finance, head of the public investment department</td>
<td>27.09.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanjar Mukanbetov</td>
<td>Zambia National Coordinator Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>29.09.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Entwistle, Chris Hall, Soe Lin, Bee Ean Gooi</td>
<td>World Bank, AER team, and World Bank helpdesk staff</td>
<td>28.09.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Lupunga</td>
<td>Zambia National Coordinator Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>29.09.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Ogilvy</td>
<td>Directorate Assistant (ODI Fellow) Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, External Finance Unit, Rwanda</td>
<td>3.10.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roddy Rivas Llosa-Martinez</td>
<td>Peru National Coordinator</td>
<td>3.10.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modibo MAKALOU</td>
<td>National Coordinator Advisor to the President of Mali</td>
<td>6.10.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustafa Aria</td>
<td>Afghanistan National Aid Coordinator Budget Department MoF</td>
<td>9.10.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Livings</td>
<td>DFID Kabul Prog. Strategy co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Butler</td>
<td>DFID Kabul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamid Dohala</td>
<td>MoF, Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellen Allotey</td>
<td>Ghana, National Coordinator, Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>13.10.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talaat Abdel-Malek</td>
<td>Egypt, National Coordinator Economic Adviser to the Minister Ministry of Development Cooperation</td>
<td>6.11.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasa Silovic, Christoph Merdes</td>
<td>UNDP, Capacity Development Group</td>
<td>9.11.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauricio Gomez</td>
<td>Nicaragua, National Coordinator Vice Minister for Economic Relations &amp; Cooperation Ministry of Foreign Relations</td>
<td>10.11.2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 Other interviews were held informally, for example, during the meeting of the Joint Venture on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, Paris, 30-31 Oct 2006.