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Introduction

1. This paper brings together the comments on the work plan made by JV members. It does not record the more general points made in some of the communications such as expressions of support for particular areas. However, some of these may be important. For example what is the role of the JV in respect of boosting capacity in M&E and statistics?

2. The comments of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness on the JV work plan need also to be taken into account:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C - Managing for Development Results (JV-MfDR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Co-Chair of the Joint Venture on Managing for Development Results (Bruce Purdue) reported on the Third Roundtable on MfDR (Hanoi, February 2007) which all concurred was a highly successful and participatory meeting focused on actions at country level. As a follow-up, the Joint Venture will put forward a clearly prioritised work plan and budget before end-May which will identify useful outputs for the Accra High Level Forum. Keeping the political momentum particularly in bilateral agencies will be a challenge as signalled in the Co-Chairs letter 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Members looked forward to the JV’s help in documenting good practice and evidence that could be fed into the Monitoring Survey indicator 11 on results-oriented frameworks and indicator 12 on mutual accountability. More broadly, they encouraged the JV to take up the issue of accountability, a rising issue on the Accra agenda, looking beyond government at the role of parliament and civil society. It was also suggested to explore the implications of results-based approaches for aid conditionality, and to provide clear directions on addressing capacity development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Chair summarised the points above and concluded that the implementation of the Paris Declaration strongly hinged on the results agenda but that the issue was still relatively new for both donors and partner countries. It was encouraging to see in Hanoi that demand for results-based management did not arise only from taxpayers’ concerns in donor countries but was increasingly generated from within partner countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The comments are categorised as follows:

I. Comments on Draft Work Plan

4. Comments received on the first draft of the work plan.

II. Comments on the Development of the Work Plan

5. Comments received in response to requests from co-chairs.

a) Further Development of Communities of Practice for Results

b) Promoting Mutual Accountability for Results

c) Improving Agency Effectiveness for Results

d) Building Country Capacity for Results

e) Development of a Results Glossary

1 See DCD/DAC/EFF/(2007)10
I. Comments on First Draft Work Plan

General

European Commission

6. EuropeAid is interested in active participation in the JV and would like to focus on strengthening partner country capacity to monitor results (i.e., progress on the MDGs) through (i) learning from the Community of Practice (CoP) initiative at the regional level and through (2) improved country statistical systems (bureau of statistics, etc). These fall under activities one and four of the work programme. We look forward to working with members of the JV already leading in these 2 activity areas.

Germany

7. We strongly support the statement in the Draft Work Plan (para 9) that we should well distinguish between (i) the subject areas to work on and (ii) the communication channels and instruments that we would use as part of the JV’s working process. To our understanding one of the key subject areas that came out of our discussions is accountability for development results, whereas e.g. the COPs are the fora that we may consider involving in the upcoming work processes. Similarly, we would propose to differentiate between the subject areas and particular products of the JV, such as the sourcebook, which could be fed from various work streams of the JV. Currently, we feel that the Work Plan is putting a very high emphasis on the COPs and exchange of experiences aspects, while more work on some basic conceptual questions and more prioritization is needed.

8. In order to avoid a too broad and fragmented agenda and to define an organizing rationale for the work plan, the JV should in our view relate its work more explicitly to supporting the implementation of the Paris Declaration (PD) commitment for MiDR, and more specifically indicator 11 of the PD ("countries with transparent and monitorable performance assessment frameworks"). In light of the very poor results of the PD baseline survey for this indicator (only 7% of partner countries are rated satisfactory), the JV should have a clear focus on providing policy and operational guidance for partner countries and donors on how to make significant improvements in this area.

9. We therefore propose to introduce a new work plan area A 'Conceptual Clarity and Technical Guidance for MiDR', which should encompass

   (i) further conceptual clarification related to results frameworks and its monitoring (here, the proposed glossary work could be integrated),

   (ii) the synthesizing of experience, elaboration of good practice standards and provision of technical guidance of direct relevance to the implementation of the PD MiDR commitments and indicator 11, and,

   (iii) a JV contribution to the assessment methodology for indicator 11 (and 1) of the PD, which is currently on-going in the sister-JV ‘Monitoring the PD’ without a major input from the JV MiDR.

10. The work plan should also spell out more clearly how the different work plan items would (i) make use of the communication platforms and COPs and (ii) come up with distinct products and contribute to cross-cutting products, such as the sourcebook. Ideally, the different workstreams should lead to one highly visible composite product (e.g. a MiDR policy paper).

United States

11. We are pleased to inform you that we wish to offer in-kind support to all four of the major elements of the Work Program. USAID will provide support to the further development of the African Community
of Practice and to work on promoting mutual accountability for results and improving agency effectiveness for results. USAID has contracted with Management Systems International, a leading firm in results-based management both within the U.S. and internationally to provide this assistance. [……] Both George Carner, the U.S. Representative to the DAC and Hap Carr, Millennium Challenge Account, plan to attend the May 22, 2007 meeting of the Joint Venture. The question that we hope you can address with them is: once the work plan is accepted by the JV and finalized, how will detailed planning on each of the sub-elements of the work plan proceed? For our support through MSI to become operational we must work with them to develop a more detailed work plan showing how the level of effort that we have planned will be allocated among their tasks and personnel.

**Further Development of Communities of Practice**

**AfDB**

12. The African Development Bank is committed to supporting the Community of Practice on MfDR for Africa (CoP-MfDR for Africa) that was launched during the Third International Roundtable for MfDR in Hanoi. The Bank has in fact initiated dialogue with the CoP-MfDR for Africa's Interim Management Team (IMT) to define the scope and modality of this initiative including the roles of development partners in moving forward this initiative. We are working on this together with the World Bank.

13. Our current efforts are therefore focused on supporting the IMT to articulate its vision, and we hope that by the next JV meeting the IMT will be able to share with us their own program and agenda in moving forward the African CoP.

14. Based on the IMT's vision and partners' endorsement, we will develop a proposal for supporting CoP-MfDR for our Management consideration. We believe that this initiative should be countries driven with full support of development partners.

**Netherlands**

15. A2 African CoP - As we expressed in Hanoi, we would like to support this activity as a follow up to the East African MLI workshop that we co-organized. This could be through support to the set of activities already set up by the Worldbank and/or possible support/participation at decentralized level through our embassies. We would certainly recommend the involvement of the African Development Bank in this activity. We consider the deadline of September 2008 rather late and would hope that the African CoP could become operational in 2007.

16. A4 Donor CoP - It is not fully clear to us what shape the donor CoP would get and what its relation would be with the JV which in itself is already a forum for exchange of information and experiences. It would be helpful to clarify this a little more.

17. A6 MLI Meetings - We consider it a good proposal to have a new series of MLI workshops. We suppose that they will be organized in the context of the local CoPs. The initiative and organization should be at the local level with the support of an international consultant (like Herman Snelder) to be contracted for this task. The role of the JV should be at more distance than during the MLI initiative last year. We recommend to establish a JV task team that looks at the overall coordination rather than being responsible for co-organizing the workshops directly as was the case for the first series of workshops in 2006.

**United Kingdom**

18. We suggest aligning the Mutual Learning Initiative meetings (A6) with the Communities of Practice face-to-face meetings to reduce financial and individual transaction costs. This worked well last year for Asia. The estimated cost of €1m for the African CoP seems considerable.
19. We also wonder if the Sourcebook should be focussed more clearly on the Paris Declaration commitments on MiDR and Mutual Accountability and what these mean in practice for partner countries and donor agencies to support.

Promoting Mutual Accountability for Results

Germany

20. With regard to the proposed work plan area B (Promoting Mutual Accountability for Results) we would strongly argue for a "Accountability for Development Results" perspective with two distinct, but highly interrelated components, namely domestic accountability and mutual accountability (with "agency effectiveness" being discussed in this context). The Draft WP points out well the importance of domestic accountability (referring also to the DAC Development Co-operation Report 2006), but somehow this important dimension has not been taken on board in the current draft of the work plan. As both subjects are broader than the mandate of the JV, we will need on the one hand a clear delimitation; on the other hand, both issues are quite new and would need further conceptual consideration, experience sharing and good practice development. If felt appropriate, Germany together with other interested parties would volunteer to further operationalize this work plan item.

Netherlands

21. B1 Mutual Accountability (country level) - We consider this an interesting new task, that should be linked to all the activities under A. We agree that the main role of the JV in this area would be to ensure the inclusion of interesting cases in the Sourcebook. Mutual accountability formats and processes (in line with the Paris Declaration indicators) are already in place in certain partner countries like Mozambique. Here we also would suggest to contract one of the consultants involved in these monitoring exercises in order to present an inventory of the processes already in place. In addition, we could ask the representatives of the partner countries in the JV to assume a direct role in this task.

22. B2 Mutual Accountability (international level)/ C1 Assessing Donor Effectiveness - We also see a close relation between tasks B2 and C1 and support the idea of assessing multilateral and bilateral donor effectiveness in the context of mutual accountability. We would be interested to participate in this task together with DFID and other members.

United States

23. We agree with many of the comments made by other JV members. First and foremost, managing for development results is critical to the whole aid effectiveness enterprise. We also agree with several of the comments on domestic accountability and the engagement of parliaments and civil society. For the present, this topic is being addressed at the level of the WP-EFF, but we do think that the JV should follow the discussions with the Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness and be prepared to incorporate the outcomes of the Accra HLF into its 2009-2010 work program, as appropriate.

Improving Agency Effectiveness for Results

Netherlands

24. C3 Incentives and Procedures in Agencies - We suggest that the output of this task will be an advisory document on leadership and incentives on MiDR to be discussed at the SLM in december 2007 (further to the suggestion of the DAC chair and the WP EFF chair to put this on the agenda for the next SLM)
Building Country Capacity for Results

Germany

25. Furthermore, we propose that the work plan item "D Building Country Capacity for Results" should have close links to the "Accountability for Development Results", as well as to the "Conceptual and Technical Guidance" work stream.

Netherlands

26. D1 Development of an Capacity Assessment Tool - We confirm our interest to participate in this task. We consider the deadline of June 2008 for having the tool ready rather late and would propose to have at least some experiences in applying the tool at that time.

United Kingdom

27. We support the proposal to enlist the help of an external results and development consultant for the development of the common assessment tool (D1), working to an advisory committee from the JV.

Development of a Results Glossary

Germany

28. We therefore propose to introduce a new work plan area A 'Conceptual Clarity and Technical Guidance for MfDR', which should encompass

(i) further conceptual clarification related to results frameworks and its monitoring (here, the proposed glossary work could be integrated),

(ii) the synthesizing of experience, elaboration of good practice standards and provision of technical guidance of direct relevance to the implementation of the PD MfDR commitments and indicator 11, and,

(iii) a JV contribution to the assessment methodology for indicator 11 (and 1) of the PD, which is currently on-going in the sister-JV 'Monitoring the PD' without a major input from the JV MfDR.

United Kingdom

29. We would see the development of a glossary as forming a definitional section in the Sourcebook. There are already some references to definitions and meanings within the Sourcebook and this would augment those.

United States

30. The Millennium Challenge Corporation will provide in-kind support to the work on the development of the capacity assessment tool, principally in partnership with the World Bank, with whom extensive consultations have been held. This could be complemented by some support at partner country level through our bilateral programs when it comes to enabling countries to join the COP, or pilot test tools, etc. […] In the proposed Work Program, we think that priority should be given to enabling the same kind of south-south exchange in sub-Saharan Africa that is already going on in Asia and Latin America. Equal priority should be given to building partner country capacity. One additional consideration at minimal additional cost would be to do a stock-taking on capacity development for MfDR that is occurring with donor assistance at sector level. For example, we have a long-standing effort in the health sector, through the development of the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) and subsequent assistance to strengthen partner country capacity to use DHS results to shape policy and program.
II.  COMMENTS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORK PLAN

A.  Further Development of Communities of Practice for Results

*Canada*

31.  CIDA will continue to actively participate, as a member of the panel review, in, and/or organize, future meetings aimed at periodic up-dates of the Sourcebook.  CIDA will support the development of a community of practice (CoP) in Africa.  The development of such a community should include a plan to support an African institution that will take ownership of the CoP.

*IDB*

32.  As indicated at the Third International Roundtable on Managing for Development Results in Hanoi, the IDB will take it upon itself to translate the second edition of the Sourcebook on Emerging Good Practices.  The IDB will also continue to actively participate in, and/or organize, future meetings aimed at periodic up-dates of the Sourcebook.

33.  We are in the process of taking stock of the different networks that have been launched in the Region as a result of our work in PRODEV (we currently have networks dealing with the role of civil society and a second one with parliaments in the region, another one started in 2005 with the World Bank on monitoring and evaluation, and a third, the Regional Dialogue on Budget Management for Results that brings together Directors and Deputy Ministers for Finance and Budget).  We want to ensure that (a) the demand for a formal community of practice similar to what the AsianDB has launched exists, and (b) that the necessary resources are identified and allotted to allow for such an initiative to succeed in the short-term and be sustainable in the long term.

34.  We feel that for the May 22 meeting, we will be ready to bring the results of this assessment, including a a technical as well as a financial proposal, and share with the JV members how the IDB plans to proceed on this topic in the Region.

35.  There is merit in having a donor Community of Practice sponsored by the JV, which would be open to all multilateral and bilateral donors.  In this regard, the JV may find it useful to familiarize itself with the experience of the MDB Working Group on Managing for Development Results, which has provided a very useful forum for exchange of experience, and is now considering the pros and cons of welcoming other multilateral financial institutions.  We look forward to a fruitful discussion to better understand its scope of work and how the IDB might be able to participate.

*Ireland*

36.  Ireland is of the opinion that both regional COP’s and national stakeholders should be supported.  It is not a mutually exclusive issue at this stage.  We need to have further discussions on the proposed Donor COP at the May 22nd meeting and agree how best we can achieve this without duplicating the work of other fora or overburdening ourselves.

*Norway*

37.  We consider the Sourcebook to be an important task of the JV and would be willing to contribute to the process of updating it e.g. by providing good examples for upcoming editions.

38.  Furthermore we support the idea of establishing Communities of Practice in Africa and Latin America based on experiences and lessons learned from Asia.  Regional banks should be encouraged to take leadership of the process including Mutual Learning Initiatives, as required.  The role of the JV in this exercise will have to be further discussed.
39. Donor CoP should be further explored, as a first step through a concept note.

**Sweden**

40. We support the notion of sustaining existing and developing new regional CoPs. We find the suggestion of establishing a donor CoP particularly interesting. We propose the donor CoP to centre around some key MfDR themes, such as particular aspects of agency effectiveness, incentive structures to develop and sustain results management practices, experience from working with results frameworks, etc. Synergies could be identified through mutual thematical workshops.

**UNDP**

41. We consider the sourcebook to be an important product of the JV, and UNDP, on behalf of the UN system, participated actively in the review panel and in editing the second edition of the sourcebook. The UN system, through UNDP, will continue to provide any further substantive support required for its finalization. In addition, as we indicated in the JV meeting, UNDP also will continue to participate in future meetings to update the sourcebook and related materials, including contributing cases from the wider UN system to demonstrate approaches and progress in improving agency effectiveness.

42. UNDP is prepared to share its experiences gained through its global knowledge networks and communities of practice to help anchor the regional COPs on MfDR that emanate from the MLIs. In addition, UNDP is prepared to assist the various communities in customizing toolkits and providing training on how to do active community facilitation and maintain active participation, development of knowledge products, and needs assessments to determine the community products and services that need to be developed. UNDP also will participate in the donor COP sponsored by the JV. We believe that the donor COP would be a cost-effective way to advance the work of the JV in between meetings.

**B. Promoting Mutual Accountability for Results**

**Austria**

43. Austria also would welcome a focus on the mutual accountability issue, and in particular ideas /formats for participation of parliaments in the whole accountability processes (ind 1/12).

**Canada**

44. This proposed area of focus is seen as a principle to integrate in the approach instead of an "activity" as such.

**Germany**

45. Mutual and domestic accountability should be linked and not be treated separately.

**IDB**

46. We take note of the statement that "hitherto JV activities have largely been about (...) the supply side of MfDR," that "in the absence of a genuine demand for MfDR, improving the supply side will be difficult," and that "an important outcome of the Hanoi Roundtable was to focus on this neglected area and to emphasize the importance of accountability, both to domestic constituencies and between country partners and donors." We also note the 2006 Development Cooperation Report's discussion on "promoting domestic accountability" dealing with, among other things, support for evidence-based policy making, representative government, an independent judiciary, independent media, and civil society in its challenge function. (IADB)
Norway

47. We fully agree that the issue of accountability is significant both to domestic constituencies in partner countries as well as donor countries, and in terms of mutual accountability between partner and donor countries. Possible approaches will have to be elaborated, be it as a separate agenda or as an integral part of other tasks or activities.

Sweden

48. The meaning of mutual accountability needs to be broken down into its various components. An additional issue that needs to be solved for work planning is how best the theme mutual accountability could be dealt with.

C. Improving Agency Effectiveness for Results

Canada

49. CIDA fully support the objective of being able to demonstrate the effectiveness of agencies. However, we are not certain that it should be part of the JV MfDR workplan. Agency effectiveness is broader than MfDR. In addition, there are various exercises aimed at assessing MDB effectiveness such as the Common Performance Assessment System (COMPAS). MOPAN is also addressing this issue. To avoid duplication, we are not certain that the JV MfDR would have an added value to these exercises.

Germany

50. Issues of agency effectiveness should be discussed in the context of mutual accountability.

IDB

51. In the context of various exercises aimed at assessing MDB effectiveness, the five members of the MDB Working Group on MfDR established a couple of years ago a Common Performance Assessment System (COMPAS), a mechanism that allows them to jointly report on their performance. The 2006 COMPAS, whose preparation was coordinated by the IDB, was presented in Hanoi and was well received. The MDBs are now gearing up to the preparation of the 2007 report under the leadership of the AfDB, which will likely include a chapter on the lessons they have learned that contribute to greater MDB performance. The 2007 COMPAS report could be presented at a contribution of the MDBs to the High-Level Forum in Accra.

52. In addition, the five members of the MDB Working Group on MfDR would consider helping the JV establish a donor agency performance reporting mechanism similar to the COMPAS but focused exclusively on the performance of bilateral organizations. The establishment of such a mechanism to report on the performance of all actors in the international development community, would constitute an important input to the discussion of mutual accountability between donor agencies and countries, and would help strengthen ongoing efforts towards greater harmonization among donor agencies. If requested by the JV and, if agreed with the other MDBs, the IDB could coordinate the MDBs' support to the JV in this regard. Needless to say, the establishment of a bilateral organization performance assessment report would be a major input to the 2008 High-Level Forum in Accra.

53. With regard to support for evidence-based policy, we suggest a discussion about the fact that, according to the Evaluation Gap Initiative, "each year, donors spend more than $30 billion and developing countries spend hundreds of billions more on programs to improve health, education and other social outcomes. But few programs are evaluated to learn whether they make a difference in people's lives. This shortfall in evaluation wastes money and means that many decisions about social sector spending are made on political grounds." (http://www.cgdev.org/content/opinion/detail/6351/). A discussion of this sort
would hopefully lead to greater awareness on the part of donors that their interventions must be designed so as to learn lessons from successes and failures, and that those lessons should inform future interventions.

_Ireland_

54. When we speak of agency effectiveness it should be in relation to the results agenda and in a very focussed way as has been suggested by CIDA. We should not duplicate other mechanisms.

_Norway_

55. The recent discussions at the WP-EFF showed that there is a broad consensus about the importance of improving agency effectiveness. The work undertaken by Dfid and the World Bank is a very useful platform which could be further elaborated by the JV MfDR. The elaboration of the Good Practice paper should be widened to include the whole MfDR agenda while also taking into account that there are various types of donor agencies, ranging from Foreign Affair Ministries to TA agencies.

_UNDP_

56. The UN agrees on the importance of demonstrating the effectiveness of agencies. It is important, though, that we harmonise the various exercises aimed at assessing agency effectiveness such as the COMPAS, MOPAN, MEFF, to avoid duplication and the effort burden of multiple exercises. The UN is prepared to contribute substantively to the work in this area.

_D. Building Country Capacity for Results_

_Canada_

57. CIDA would like to be actively involved in the development, including piloting of a country capacity self-assessment tool. Building on the experience of public finance management and procurement, this tool should be an harmonized tool which would be endorsed by country partners and all donors. As a framework, we suggest to use the lessons learned from the MLI exercises and at the Third International Roundtable on Managing for Development Results in Hanoi. We also suggest to consult on this tool through the communities of practices and pilot it in the different geographical regions. Piloting this tool would provide with the information to develop plans of action to implement MfDR at the country level and it will also supply a baseline of the assessment of country capacities related to MfDR. The tool and the baseline would be concrete outputs that could be presented by the JV MfDR in Accra.

_IDB_

58. The IDB will be pleased to take a major responsibility in this area. As you know, our PRODEV initiative is currently completing the development of a country capacity assessment tool. We expect to start piloting this tool in the near term and we will be pleased to share the tool with other members of the JV, as well as any fine-tuning thereof that might be required as a result of the pilot phase.

_Norway_

59. Norway supports the plan of developing a country capacity assessment framework, in a manner that involves partner countries in the process of developing the tool (e.g through the Communities of Practice). This could be a concrete product to be presented by the partner countries in Accra, supported by the JV MfDR. The tool should be based on international experience from using similar assessment tools and it should be properly tested prior to the Accra meeting.
Sweden

60. The JV should continue to serve as a source on practical tools for results practitioners. The sourcebook has been suggested to be kept as a principle output of the JV. Some improvements have been made to make the sourcebook more user friendly and target group oriented for added practical merit. Nevertheless, the format of the sourcebook delimits it to case study stories. Considering the growing need for the exchange of practical tools within the JV, the format of the sourcebook should be reconsidered to be integrated into a website and/or a CD to include various tools and reference material.

UNDP

61. We agree that the JV should aim to present a country capacity assessment framework, methodology, and tool in Ghana. UNDP has done considerable work in developing a capacity assessment methodology and tools and is interested in supporting the work of the JV in this area.

E. Development of a Results Glossary

Germany

62. A general remark that we made at the meeting with regard to the future work of the JV concerns the need to develop a clear and shared understanding of the definitions, key terms and topics we are dealing with in the JV. Taking into consideration the great number and heterogeneity of members and partners of the DAC JV we consider this as very important to facilitate the joint efforts.

63. As a basis for future cooperation with partner countries, the Joint Venture should develop a common understanding of the key elements of MfDR, such as mutual and domestic accountability, results-oriented frameworks and agency performance. Clear definitions and criteria would also facilitate the mainstreaming of the approach in donor and partner organisations.