



**DAC NETWORK ON
DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION**



DAC EVALUATION QUALITY STANDARDS WORKSHOP

Workshop Report

Millennium Copthorne Harbour City Hotel in central Auckland,

Auckland 9-10th February 2009

Facilitator: Rosalind David



Australian Government

AusAID

Contents

Introduction	3
Session 1. The value and Use of the Evaluation Quality Standards	4
Session 2. Learning from Joint Experience of using the EQS	5
Synthesis of key points from day one	9
Day 2: Improvements and Next Steps	10
The purpose and focus of the evaluation standards	10
The Task Teams on the current context for development evaluation	10
Changes needed to the current draft of the EQS	12
Synthesis of proposed changes to the draft EQS	17
Session 4. Next Steps	19
Appendices	
• List of participants	20
• Workshop agenda	28

“.. we have started with a good document.. What we have done here is to take it from good to great...” (workshop participant)

Introduction

In early February 2009 a two day workshop was held in Auckland on the DAC draft Evaluation Quality Standards. The purpose of the workshop was to review experience of using the draft DAC Evaluation Quality Standards, (EQS) discuss any modifications needed and agree on a process for reaching final agreement on the standards. The workshop was attended by DAC evaluation network members, development country partners and members of civil society groups with experience of using the standards.

This report provides a brief summary of this EQS workshop. It is not intended to be a verbatim record. The main body of the report provides a synthesis of key points from each session, a summary of group feedback and an outline of conclusions from each session. The report is written for those who attended the workshop as well as other interested parties.

Welcome and introductions

- Peter Adams, Executive Director of NZAID formally opened the workshop and welcomed everyone to New Zealand. Mr Adams stressed the importance of evaluation, the value of shared standards and NZAID’s commitment to improving the quality of its evaluations. He also posed some questions for the workshop to consider, e.g. Are the EQS mandatory? Is the quality of evaluators practice a relevant issue to consider?
- Penny Hawkins, Vice Chair of the Evaluation Network, then sought agreement on the purpose, the content and the process of the workshop and adoption of the agenda. Ms Hawkins welcomed everyone to New Zealand and outlined the significance of the Powhiri (Maori welcome) taking place in the afternoon of the first day and then introduced Rosalind David (Facilitator).
- Hans Lundgren, Evaluation Network Secretariat, formally welcomed everyone to the workshop on behalf of the OECD DAC Evaluation Network. Mr Lundgren provided an overview of the origins of the draft EQS. He underlined the importance of reviewing the content of the EQS while being aware that the standards should be read in conjunction with the DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance, the Summary of Key Norms and Standards and the Guidance for Managing Joint Evaluations.
- The workshop facilitator, Rosalind David, then conducted a workshop introductory session. This included participant introductions, ground rules for the workshop, and the support of volunteers to keep the ground rules.

Session 1: The Value and Use of Evaluation Quality Standards: Experience so far

During session 1, three donor countries – the Netherlands, Spain and New Zealand - shared their experience of using the EQS within their respective government departments. The following provides an overview of key points from these presentations.

Each of the donor countries had found the DAC EQS a very helpful document. In particular, the document was found to be clear, concise and enabled flexibility so that each donor country was able to use the document to improve standards of evaluation within their departments and within their respective agencies. The EQS was found to have

- helped each of the donor countries to develop their own respective evaluation guidelines
- proved a useful background document for donor staff unfamiliar with evaluation or evaluation processes
- provided a benchmark to assess the standard of evaluations and reviews
- provided useful guidance for evaluation teams
- generally facilitated the development of common standards and raised the credibility and quality of evaluation.

Opportunities to develop the standards

Although each of the three presenters shared common reasons why they valued and appreciated the EQS, each had different suggestions about how the document could be improved.

The presentation from the Netherlands suggested that the EQS are not easily useable as an *ex-ante* or *ex-post* instrument to assess the quality of evaluation reports. This is because:

- Some sub-headings and/or explanatory texts contain assessment criteria - others do not
- Qualitative terms and/or concepts need definition (for those unfamiliar with evaluation)
- The list of criteria is very long for quality assessment which should focus on crucial elements
- If the Standards are to be used to assess evaluation quality (including meta-evaluation), they should ideally contain a set of indicators and rating criteria.

The presenter suggested there needed to be further operationalisation of standards as an *ex-ante* guiding instrument, and that an *ex-post* assessment tool was needed.

The presentation from Spain suggested that the EQS could be prioritised in order to make them more attainable. This presentation pointed out some of the difficulties that many evaluation departments face – the difficulties of contracting experienced evaluators, limited budgets, the difficulty of measuring impact, the

volume of materials to read etc. The presenter suggested that the EQS are currently ambitious and that it could put more emphasis on institutional learning. The presenter highlighted the need for strengthening a culture of evaluation within organisations.

The New Zealand presenters welcomed the opportunity to finalise the document and suggested only small changes. These included improving the methodology section, rearranging and enhancing the information about evidence, rearranging the logic of the EQS, including some guidance on appropriate evaluation management structures and increasing awareness of the document among stakeholders.

Session 2. Learning from joint experience of using the Evaluation Quality Standards

In session 2, workshop participants were invited to divide into groups to discuss their joint experience of using the EQS. Six mixed groups of donors and partners were created. Of these six groups, one group was francophone and one group worked in Spanish. Each group was invited to discuss:

- 1) To what extent have the standards had led to better quality evaluations, in particular
 - a) what have been the strengths and successes in using the EQS
 - b) what have been the limitations and expectations of the EQS.

A summary of the group feedback is given below.

Group 1 feedback

This group comprised a mix of donors and partners. Some countries were further ahead in using the EQS. This group recognised the importance of the EQS referencing other standards (for example the United Nations Evaluation Group work on standards and norms as well as other bilateral and International financial institutions work on evaluation standards).

Strengths of the EQS:

- The EQS provide common core items and help avoid multiplicity of requirements
- They facilitate donor/partner country efforts to improve evaluations
- Some Partner's EQS (tools, techniques, standards) must be developed, strengthened and sustained
- Current EQS form the basis of uniform EQS (which must be encouraged)
- Joint evaluations must be encouraged (harmonisation)
- Potential use at front end to encourage results management
- The EQS encourages increased professionalism.

Limitations and Expectations of the EQS:

- The EQS are long and can be both reduced and simplified
- The EQS are currently a mixture of guidance and quality criteria (the focus needs to be determined)
- Methodological aspects of the standards can be improved

- Cultural context and mechanism for feedback are not adequately covered
- Paris Declaration considerations are not fully covered
- Ethical aspects are not adequately covered
- The EQS provide challenges for smaller partner countries, in terms of capacity, data availability etc.
- The EQS are donor-focused – both in language and emphasis
- The standards are often not well known in partner governments

Group 2 feedback

Strengths of the EQS

- The EQS informs people of the standards to which they should work.
- It creates consistent standards across countries
- It can assist in the development of country standards
- The development of the standards by DAC has helped increase credibility
- The EQS improve the probability of higher quality evaluations.

Recommendations for improving the EQS:

- Stress and institutionalize the constructive nature of evaluation
- Emphasize partnership with partner country
- Evaluations should cover the role of both donor and partner
- The EQS should put more emphasis on building partners capacity
- The EQS needs a separate section on management and governance.
- Include (but do not specify) cross cutting issues
- Review methodology section for level of specificity and clarity
- Rearrange so as to link the sections on objectives to evaluation questions
- The EQS needs to be better disseminated so that more countries governments and other development practitioners are aware of it
- That partner countries should use the standards as a basis for developing local evaluation standards with which all donors could comply.

Group 3 feedback

This group pointed out that the successes of the EQS are not the same for donors as they are for partners. Many partners are not yet using the EQS. While the EQS has helped develop a common language and shared understanding of evaluation, this group also pointed out that implementation of these standards is occurring progressively.

Strengths and successes of the EQS:

- The EQS seems to be providing a basis for a common language and shared understanding and potential for better co-ordination on evaluation.
- The standards are a self-reflective tool which seem to be leading to clarity and improvement in some areas
- The EQS are flexible and therefore allow for the needs of individual partner and agency variation.

- Potential to develop better coordination
- Successes are different for donors and partners

What have been the limitations of the EQS?

- The EQS language is donor focused. It is written from a donor perspective (e.g. it refers to AID policy not development policy).
- The EQS are not well known in partner countries. Some partners have their own standards therefore the EQS come as an 'add on'. Local systems and processes should be recognized.
- The EQS are already too ambitious and could become too complex. They could be simplified to make them more principle based.
- Capacity building needs to be emphasized in the EQS.

Group 4 feedback

Strengths of the EQS:

- The standards are generic
- They are flexible
- They provide a good checklist
- They have been very useful in developing evaluation policy.

Limitations and expectations of the EQS:

- The standards need to recognise the bigger picture (the Paris Declaration, the Accra Agreement for Action, UNEG standards etc).
- The structure of the document is not logical. It could be reorganised to cover design; conduct; product.
- More work needs to be done on the dissemination of the EQS.

Francophone Group feedback

Strengths of the EQS:

The EQS is a good reference framework to be used with other standards (eg SEVAL). It helps in the selection of consultants and assessment of their work, it provides a good assessment tool when reading evaluation reports, it helps in comparing reports, it has built partners confidence in evaluation, it is a good reference document when carrying out meta evaluations and it has helped overcome internal desk's resistance to evaluation.

Weakness of the EQS:

- The EQS is not yet systematically incorporated into all TORs.
- The EQS is not always accessible to operational desks.
- Dissemination and training on ESQ is insufficient (both for evaluators and decision makers)
- Some partners are not aware of the standards
- The standards are not always kept – implementation is patchy
- How to use the standards, alongside other tools, is still confused.

Limitations of the EQS:

- The standards don't necessarily ensure that the evaluations are useful.
- Consultants have given little feedback on the standards.

- Partners do not necessarily `own` the standards.
- Some standards are difficult to adhere to in some cultural environments (e.g. the presentation of dissenting opinions)
- These are donor standards. It needs to be made clear who the users are.
- Not enough awareness - they require training and full dissemination.

Group 6 (Spanish speaking group)

Strengths of the EQS

- Issue of the culture of evaluation – the standards contribute to this.

Limitations of the EQS

- There has been limited country participation to date.
- Difference between technical and political considerations needs to be addressed.
- The language of evaluation is different and needs to be more accessible.
- The EQS need to reflect a multiplicity of interests in both donor and partner countries.

Suggestions to improve the EQS

- Consider which aspects of the PD & AAA apply to the EQS.
- Tie to a focus on mutually identified results.

Synthesis of key points from day One¹.

Successes of the EQS

The EQS has clearly proved to be a useful document. It has been particularly well used by donor countries. Its generic nature, flexibility and brevity has been appreciated. The document has been shown to have helped raise the standard of evaluations and enhance the credibility and profile of evaluation in many countries. The standards have been used as a basis for other evaluation guidance tailored to specific contexts.

Opportunities to improve the EQS

A consensus of key points on how to improve the EQS arose from the presentations, discussions and group work on day one. Key suggestions included:

- **Clarify the relationship with other standards.** The relationship between the DAC EQS and other standards (UNEG, IEG) needs to be clarified in the document.
- **Clarity of purpose.** The intended application and use of the document needs to be clearly stated in the EQS. Is this a document for donors or a document that is intended for donors and for use by others?
- **The structure of the document needs attention.** The document could be rearranged to be more logical (could follow the evaluation cycle). Some teams suggested the document should be redesigned to cover a) evaluation design; b) evaluation conduct and c) evaluation product.
- **Some elements of the paper need thoughtful revision:**
 - **Ethics and culture.** The EQS needs to include more on ethics and culture, taking into consideration cultural appropriateness etc.
 - **Methodology.** The methodology section could be more detailed.
 - **Evidence.** The section on evidence could be enhanced and rearranged.
 - **Capacity building.** The document should emphasise the importance as developing partners' capacity as part of the evaluation process.
 - **Partnership.** The document should emphasise the principle of partnership.
 - **Some qualitative and quantitative terms need better definition**
- **Importance of referencing the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agreement for Action.** Many groups suggested that the EQS should make reference to both the PD and the AAA in its introduction and that the principles of both agreements could be incorporated throughout the EQS.
- **Dissemination an issue.** The EQS needs better promotion particularly to partner countries. Some partners have not used the EQS and, in some cases, donor regional offices are not as informed of the EQS as head office. The importance of supporting the dissemination of the EQS with training was also advocated.

¹ NB. This synthesis is taken from the Chair's summary, Benoit Chevalier's presentation on day two and group feedback.

Day 2. Improvements and Next Steps

Day two began with a synthesis of key points from day one given by the Benoit Chevalier, vice-chair of the DAC Evaluation Network (see previous page of this report).

The purpose and the focus of the evaluation Standards

Ms Hawkins then chaired a plenary discussion on the 'purpose' and 'focus' of the evaluation standards. It was agreed at this workshop that:

Purpose: The purpose of the EQS is to improve the quality and credibility of evaluation in order to improve development cooperation.

The focus of the EQS:

- These are standards to inform good practice for evaluation process and product. They are not mandatory.
- They are generally applicable to DAC member countries, but can be used by partners and all parties.
- They are intended to be generic for wide application. Members are expected to adapt them to different contexts, operation mandates and types of evaluation.

Task team on the current context for development evaluation

The Task Team² on the current context of development evaluation then proposed changes to the EQS in the light of its agreed purpose and focus. The following is a summary of this presentation.

The Paris Declaration and the Accra Agreement for Action outline effective ways of donors and partners working together. The process of evaluation can improve mutual accountability for results and improve transparency. Therefore it is important that the EQS incorporates the spirit of these agreements. Proposed amendments and changes to the EQS could include:

1. Rationale, purpose and objectives of an evaluation

The document could outline the importance of donor harmonisation, alignment and a more inclusive partnership. To achieve this, the document ought to suggest the possibility of joint evaluations, with participation from the partner country fully documented. Evaluation reports should therefore document how (and if) the partner participated, when and how the partner was approached, the division of labour between evaluation partners etc.

² Members of the Task Team include Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Netherlands, Norway Sweden, UK, UNDP and the DAC Secretariat.

2.1 Scope of the evaluation

Coherence, coordination and complementarity. When describing the scope of the evaluation, it may be appropriate to consider the issues of coherence³ in particular with regard to donor country's policies, coordination and complementarity.

2.2 Intervention logic and findings

Given that partner country ownership over development is key it is important that this section should state the different donors' and partner countries' participation in, and contributions towards, the intervention and its results.

2.4 Evaluation Questions

While a joint evaluation can look at a broader set of issues than a single donor evaluation, this should not preclude addressing specific questions to individual evaluation partners.

4.1 Explanation of methodology used. It would be helpful if the evaluation report explained to what extent efforts have been undertaken to use (and strengthen) partner country's systems.

4.3 Relevant stakeholders consulted. In a joint evaluation, it is important that all parties of the evaluation are involved in the identification of relevant stakeholders. The report should indicate whether this has been done.

4.5 Evaluation team

In order to enhance partner country ownership of the evaluation and for capacity development purposes, the use of local and regional consultants should – to the extent possible - be promoted by ensuring transparent procurement procedures which allow local and regional consultants or firms to compete.

6. Independence, quality and inclusiveness should be ensured by evaluation governance. It appears that best practice on independence is that the governance structure for the evaluation includes and empowers independent voices, free of the control of those responsible for the intervention being evaluated.

In larger joint evaluations, membership on steering committees should reflect inclusiveness while the management group ensures an efficient and inclusive process, safeguarding independence and quality.

9.4 Use of Evaluation

In-country feedback on findings and reflections on recommendations by local management and/or policy makers should be described.

³ Coherence refers to the need to assess other policies and programmes which affect the intervention being evaluated (for example security, humanitarian, trade and military policies and programmes, as well as the intervention or policy itself).

Session 3: Changes needed to the current draft

During session 3, workshop participants were again invited to form six mixed groups of donors and partners. Again one group was francophone and one group worked in Spanish. Each group was asked to discuss what changes need to be made to the draft EQS's current:

- a) domains (or section headings)
- b) structure of the EQS
- c) content of each section.

The following is an outline of feedback from each group.

Group 1 feedback

1. Structure

No changes were suggested to the structure

2. Changes to the domains

- The Introduction should clarify the purpose of the document and make explicit reference to the Accra Agenda for Action and Paris Declaration.
- Establish an "indicative grid" of the final product
- Take away section 5 (Information sources):
 - add 5.1 under Ethics (also: add 8.1 under Ethics)
 - add 5.2 under Methodology

3. What changes need to be made to the content?

- Review of wording of the EQS so it better reflects the Paris Declaration particularly with regard to partnership.
- 2.3. Criteria: Some or all criteria could be used.
- 4.2 SMART indicators. The group suggested that not all indicators should be SMART. Some indicators – particularly of qualitative change are hard to measure.
- 9.4. Use of evaluation. This section should be split in two: one section covering 'management response'. One section (9.5) should cover 'dissemination and disclosure'. While dissemination and disclosure should be ensured, this should not necessarily be by management.
- Look at potential overlap between 9.1 and 10.2

Group 2 feedback

1) General comments

This group concluded that the document is generally good. It should however include specific reference to the Paris Declaration and to the Accra Agreement for Action and change the language of the document to reflect these two agreements.

The document needs reediting to ensure that the content of each section matches its title. It also requires editing so that the content is more generic and is applicable beyond DAC countries.

2) Structure of the EQS

The document should be restructured so that one section is related to the ***process of evaluation*** and the second to ***the product***.

3) What changes need to be made to the content?

- Attention needed to order (e.g.)
 - section 3 should come before 2.
 - section 2.4 (Evaluation Questions) should come after 1.3 (objectives).
 - Section 3.4 (Implementation) should be included in Section 2.9 (and refer to AAA in here).
 - Section 2.2 should it be in context.
 - There is an opportunity under context to refer to capacity building which must be country led and owned.
 - Section 4 (Methodology) needs more work. Suggestions for methodology should be put in an annex. The involvement of relevant stakeholders should be a principle and not a method. Why is the section on 'evaluation team' in this section?
- **Section 6.** Independence should be an explicit principle. The emphasis should be on independence. If independence is compromised it should be explained. Add in the comment from task team on joint evaluation (6.3). [*In larger joint evaluations, membership on steering committees should reflect inclusiveness while the management group ensures an efficient and inclusive process, safeguarding independence and quality*].
- **Section 7: Ethical Issues.** Add conflict of interest. Add in a sentence on disclose. Add in informing participants. Delete when requested (confidentiality)
- **Section 8:** Quality Assurance. Stakeholder involvement should be throughout the standard (not just quality assurance).
- **Section 10:** Completeness. There is no relationship between heading and text.

Group 3 feedback

1. Structure of the EQS

The structure of the EQS should change. It should reflect the process of evaluation. Headings would therefore be:

- a) Planning
- b) Design
- c) Conduct
- d) Product
- e) Use and dissemination

2. Introduction

The introduction should:

- Make explicit reference to the Accra Agreement for Action.

- Outline the purpose of the standards and the focus of the standards (as agreed at this workshop)
- should explain that the document was prepared for and approved by DAC members as guidance for DAC members; optional to others.
- Explain that the partners and donors were involved in a consultative process used to review the standards
- Emphasise the constructive nature of evaluations

Generally, the document should be well disseminated and, in the interests of transparency, made available to all partners.

Throughout the document emphasis should be placed on using evaluation to increase transparency and mutual accountability for results.

An annex could include hyperlinks to other evaluation documents or normative character, such as the Principles and glossary.

3. Changes to the content of the EQS

- **Planning** - Add point to emphasise partnership, limits of the scope. Use from standards: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.5, 6.1, 6.2 (carry throughout)
- **Design** - Use from standards: 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.4
- **Conduct** - Use from standards: 4.3, 7.1 and add more on methodology
- **Product** - Use from standards: 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 7.2, 8.1, 8.2, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4
- **Use and dissemination** - Use from standards: 9.4 and add more on dissemination.

Group 4 feedback

1. Introduction:

- The structure of the document needs to change. The document should focus on both *process* and *product*, but with a heavier emphasis on product.
- These EQS DAC standards should be inclusive and promote wider usage/ relevance (including referring to other relevant documents).
- Their purpose should be explicit (to improve quality).
- The introduction should refer to Accra Agenda for Action.
- DAC should take a more proactive role in the dissemination of the EQS.

2. Changes to the content of the EQS

- **Section 1 – Rationale, purpose etc.** The editing team should re-examine whether all 3 required – opportunities to refine.
 - A good evaluation will clearly articulate its rationale and purpose and/or objectives, will be guided by who the reader is and will produce a clear, targeted message.
 - Users to adapt to needs, context, operational mandates.
- **Section 2. Evaluation scope.** The title should be changed to evaluation scope *and focus*. The context should come before scope.
 - 2.2. Intervention and logic. Is this the right place for it?
 - Evaluation criteria

- avoid overlap with objectives
 - cross-cutting issues should be included (gender, environment, human rights)
 - criteria should address both the accountability dimension (the what) and the learning dimension (the why)
- **Section 3 Context.** Include background information about what you are evaluating (bring in 2.2 here, i.e. including logic framework)
 - **Section 4 methodology.** This should be called ‘Evaluation approach and methodology’.
Bring in PD/AAA elements here (i.e. around partnership, joint approaches) and in a preamble.
4.1 The contents need to be unpacked, resulting in a re-framed section 4 for example:
 1. Research design
 - attribution/plausibility
 - counter-factual
 2. Data collection strategies
 - recognize there are multiple lines of evidence
 - stakeholder consultation included here (inc partner countries)
 3. Sampling (retain)
 4. Analytical techniques for treating the data (assessment of results comes in here).
 5. Data/ information sources (currently section 5) should be included here.
 6. Limitations/ constraints.
 - **Sections 6, 7, 8** Section 6 could be re-titled ‘governance’. This should cover:
 - independence
 - Transparency and accountability
 - Management
 - includes quality assurance (section 8)
 - Includes 4.5 (evaluation team).
 - **Sections 9 and 10.** Reports must be structured and organised to make messages accessible. The structure of the document should reflect the life cycle of evaluation. The document should be a clear, logical product.

Group 5 feedback (Spanish)

1. Introduction

This group strongly support the work of the Task Team on the New Context for Development Evaluation as an important starting point for a reviewing the standards in light of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agreement for Action.

2. Changes to the structure of the EQS

- Explain the relationship between standards and the evaluation process (design, content and results)
- Change the order of the point between 3.3 and 3.2

3. Content of the EQS

- 1.2 Bullet #1. With the goal of improving development results
- 2.3 Inclusion of Paris Declaration Principles and Commitments made under the Accra Agreement for Action.
- 3.1 Considering the range of the development policies of both donors and partner countries in a broader sense than aid policy.

Group 6 feedback

1. Structure of the text: The group agrees with the existing structure of the document.

2. Changes to the content of the EQS

- **Introduction**
The introduction should mention the purpose of the document along the lines drafted in the morning.
The document is meant to be sufficiently flexible to be useful and general to be applicable.
Depending on the users, certain points will be highlighted more than other.
- **Rationale, purpose and objectives**
The rationale, purpose and objectives are important and should clearly state why and for whom we do this.
 - Leave examples and work with definitions
 - Use definitions in glossary
- **Scope.** Important to mention the 5 criteria.
- **Context**
 - A clear reference to *content of Paris Declaration and the Accra Agreement for Action.*
 - There should be a new 3.4. reference to the cultural context: evaluation should examine how the cultural context has been considered and also respect that context.
- **Methodology.** 4.3. Relevant stakeholders (partners) are not only involved: they are encouraged to fully join the evaluation process, from the very beginning
- **Relevance of results.** There should be a new 9.4 covering the involvement of stakeholders in the dissemination of the evaluation results.
- **Completeness.** The notion of lessons learned, as opposed to conclusion and/or recommendations, is unclear. The final document should be internally coherent. 10.4. In French, use “Synthèse” rather than “Résumé” and ensure it is a document that can be read independently from the report.

Synthesis of Proposed Changes to the EQS

The general consensus from the workshop was that the EQS document has been an extremely useful document in raising the profile and quality of evaluations. It's generic, concise nature and wide applicability is highly valued. Through discussion and group feedback (see above) general conclusions emerged about proposed changes to the current document. An outline of the main points is given below⁴.

General changes:

- The document should remain brief, concise and generic in nature. It should not substantially increase in length.
- The introduction should clearly explain the purpose and focus of the EQS (as documented at this workshop). The draft EQS is a mix of generic quality dimensions for the evaluation process and product with some of them specifically applicable to quality review ex post of evaluations. The revised focus should be clearly explained.
- The introduction should clarify the relationship between the DAC EQS and other standards (UNEG, IEG, SEVAL etc) and make clear how the EQS relates to the DAC's other evaluation products (e.g. evaluation principles and evaluation criteria etc).
- The document should refer to the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agreement for Action in the introduction and refer to the spirit of these agreements throughout (see task team's recommendations).
- With minor editing the language of the document could more clearly reflect donor - partner cooperation (.e.g. through referring to 'development policy' rather than 'aid policy' etc).
- The introduction could explain that partners and donors were involved in a consultative process to review the standards.

Structure:

Participants generally agreed that the document could be more logically structured. Two alternative structures were proposed:

A) The document could be structured along the lines of:

- a) Process of the evaluation
- b) Product – the content of evaluation report.

B) Or it could be structured along the lines of an evaluation:

- a) Planning
- b) Design
- c) Conduct
- d) Product
- e) Follow up/evaluation utilization
- f) Dissemination

⁴ This synthesis is drawn from the Chair's summary, plenary discussion and group feedback (see previous section).

Content:

On the whole only small changes were proposed to the content of the document (see group feedback above). It was pointed out several times that the document could be more logically arranged and that there could be greater consistency between the section headings and the content. Some key suggestions for broader changes emerged from the discussion:

- **Ethics.** The ethics section of the paper needs some revision, particularly referring to independence as a principle.
- **Methodology.** This section could be more detailed. It also needs to refer (or hyperlink) to more detailed information on methodology. (This section could be unpacked to briefly cover research design, data collection, sampling, handling of attribution issues/evidence lines, analytical techniques for data assessment, data sources and limitations etc. However, it is important that the methodology section is not too prescriptive or burdensome). Within this section the need for quantitative indicators should not necessarily be stressed, given the equal importance of qualitative change processes.
- **Cultural appropriateness.** This needs to be factored into the paper, as there is no mention of this at the moment.
- **Cross cutting issues** could be referred to (either cross-reference or include).
- **Capacity building.** The paper should emphasise the importance of developing partner's capacity as part of the evaluation process including use and strengthening of partner countries national systems for M&E and mutual accountability.
- **Making evaluations constructive.** Participants suggested that the EQS ought to stress the constructive nature of evaluation and emphasise the importance of 'learning' in order to improve development cooperation.
- **Partnership.** Again this ought to be factored in throughout the paper, particularly issues around partners being jointly involved from conception in the evaluation process. Participants suggested emphasising the importance of donor harmonisation in the area of joint evaluations to avoid duplication of resources and effort.
- **Governance.** A section could be added on evaluation governance which could cover independence, transparency and accountability, management etc).
- **Dissemination and use.** Participants suggested guidance is needed on the dissemination and use of the standards

Overall, the workshop counselled the editing team not to be too ambitious in their changes as the succinct, generic nature of the current draft is highly appreciated.

Session 4: Next steps for the EQS

In the final session Mr Lundgren and Ms Hawkins thanked all the participants for their constructive and detailed suggestions on how to improve the standards. Mr Lundgren and Ms Hawkins then went onto outline the next steps for revising the EQS. The conclusions to this session were:

- a) This workshop report will be produced by early March `09.
- b) The process for reworking the EQS document will be led by Mr Lundgren and Ms Hawkins. The revised version will be sent out to all workshop participants by mid April `09. Participants working for the same institution are invited to collate their comments.
- c) The revised EQS document will be presented by Ms Hawkins and Mr Lundgren to the DAC Evaluation Network in mid-June `09.

The dissemination of the EQS proved to be a recurrent theme throughout the workshop. All participants – donors, partners and members of civil society groups – have appreciated the added value of the current draft of the EQS. Mr Lundgren and Ms Hawkins assured participants that the revised document would be more widely circulated to development practitioners by the DAC Evaluation Network (including partner countries, professional evaluation associations, and CSOs)

**Appendix 1.
Participant list**

Australia

Ms. Virginia Sprague Program Evaluation Section Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) GPO Box 887 ACT 2601 Canberra, Australia	virginia.sprague@ausaid.gov.au
---	--

Bangladesh

Mr. Muhammad Musharraf Hossain Bhuiyan Secretary Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance, Govt. of Bangladesh Sher-e-Bangla Nagar Dhaka-1207 Bangladesh	secy_erd@bangla.net Tel+880-2-8112641 Fax.+880-2-8113088
Mr. Monowar Ahmed JCS Coordination Officer (Deputy Secretary) PRS-HAP Cell, Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance, Govt. of Bangladesh Sher-e-Bangla Nagar Dhaka-1207 Bangladesh	ahmedmonowar@hotmail.com Tel. +880-1-711522543 Fax. +880-2-8113088

Belgium

Mr. Dominique De Crombrugghe Special Evaluator Special Evaluation Office - S0.4 Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Coop.n Rue des Petits Carmes, 15 B - 1000 Brussels Belgium	dominique.decrombrugghe@diplobel.fed.be +32 (2) 501.36.06
---	---

Benin

Mme Justine Odjoubé Coordinatrice for Observatoire du Changement Social i Bénin, Ministère d'Etat Chargé de la Prospective, du Développement et de l'Evaluation de l'Action Publique Cotonou Bénin	ocsbenin@ymail.com Tel. (Bureau): +229 21 32 78 06 / +229 21 32 79 42 Tel. (mobil): +229 90 92 62 31
---	---

Bolivia

Ms. Corali Cusilayme Ramirez Manager Of The Financing Unit Vice ministry of Public Investment and External Financing Ministry of Planning and Development Mariscal Santa Cruz Avenue, Comunications	ccusilayme@vipfe.gov.bo cchochala@hotmail.com tel. +591 231 7424 (1134) +591 707 88 252
--	--

palace, 11 th. Floor La Paz Bolivia	
Ms. Ana Elizabeth Acarrunz Aarcon Muñoz Financial Analyst Vice ministry of Public Investment and External Financing Ministry of Planning and Development Mariscal Santa Cruz Avenue, Communications palace, 11 th. Floor La Paz, Bolivia	EAscarrunz@vipfe.gov.bo aascarrunz2005@yahoo.com Tel. +591 231 7472 (1138) +591 706 89 387

Cambodia	
Mr. Chhieng Yanara Secretary General Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board (CRDB) Council for the Development of Cambodia (CDC) Palais du Gouvernement, Sisowath Quay Phnom Penh Cambodia	chhieng.yanara@crdb.gov.kh + 855 12 812 301
Mr. Philip Courtnadge Senior Adviser Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board (CRDB) UNDP Council for the Development of Cambodia Government Palace Sisowath Quay Phnom Penh Cambodia	philip.courtnadge@undp.org Philip.courtnadge@crdb.gov.kh Tel.: +855 (0)16 818 507 Fax: +855 (0)23 981 161

Canada	
Mr. Goberdhan Singh Director of Evaluation, Evaluation Division Strategic Policy and Performance Branch (SPPB) Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) 200 Promenade du Portage (Québec) K1A 0G4 Canada	goberdhan.singh@acdi-cida.gc.ca Tel: + (1) 819 997 1176 Fax: + (1) 819 953 9130

Colombia	
Mr. Juan Sebastián Estrada Escobar Asesor Dirección de Cooperación Internacional Agencia Presidencial para la Acción Social la Cooperación Internacional Colombia	jestrada@accionsocial.gov.co

Cook Islands	
Mr. Jim Armistead Senior Research and Policy Officer, Aid Management Division, Ministry of Finance and Economic Management, PO Box 3195, Rarotonga COOK ISLANDS	jim.armistead@project-aid.gov.ck

Denmark	
Mr. Niels Dabelstein Danish Institute for International Studies 56, Strandgade DK-1401 Copenhagen K Denmark	nda@diis.dk +45 32 69 89 43 +45 25 37 56 62 Co-Chair of the Reference Group for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration

France	
M. Benoit Chervelier Chef, Unité Évaluation des activités de développement DGTPE Service des Affaires, multilaterales et development Direction Générale du Trésor et de la Politique Économique Télédoc 621 139 rue de Bercy 75572 Paris Cedex 12 France	benoit.chervelier@dgtpe.fr Tel.: + (33) 1 44 87 73 06 Fax: + (33) 1 44 87 71 70

Germany	
Dr. Frank Schwarzbeck Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development Dahlmannstr. 4 53113 Bonn Germany	Frank.Schwarzbeck@bmz.bund.de Tel. +49 228 99 53 53 643

Indonesia	
Mr. Widjanarko Soebadhi Director for Evaluation Accounting and Settlement Ministry of Finance 10710 Jakarta Indonesia	wdjnk@yahoo.com widjanarko@dmo.or.id + 62-21-3864778/62-21-3510711/62-21- 3510713/62-21-3449230 Int-5647 Fax +62-21-3843712 +62-81318027135

Japan	
Mr. Tatsuhiro MITAMURA Development Partnership Division Operations Strategy Department JICA Shinjuku Maynds Tower Bldg. 12F, 2-1-1 Yoyogi, Shibuya-ku	Mitamura.Tatsuhiro@jica.go.jp Telephone: 81-3-5323-5115

Tokyo 151-8558, JAPAN	
--------------------------	--

Mali	
Mr. Modibo M. MAKALOU Coördinateur/Mission de Développement et Coopération Development and Cooperation Initiative (DACI) Présidence de la République B.P.10 Koulouba Mali	mmakalou@mdc.pr.ml mmakalou@cefib.com

Mozambique	
Mr. Gamiliel Munguambe Director Studies, Planning and Information Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation Av 10 de Novembro no 620 Maputo Mozambique	gm.ddepi@minec.gov.mz

The Netherlands	
Mr. Bram van Ojik, Director, Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB), P.O. Box 20061, 2500 EB The Hague, The Netherlands.	bram-van.ojik@minbuza.nl
Mr. Ted Kliest Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs P.O. Box 20061 2500 EB The Hague The Netherlands	tj.kliest@minbuza.nl Phone: + 31 70 3486201 Fax: + 31 70 3486336

New Zealand	
Ms. Penny Hawkins Head of Evaluation Strategy, Advisory and Evaluation Group New Zealand Agency for International Development 195 Lambton Quay Private Bag 18-901 Wellington New Zealand	penny.hawkins@nzaid.govt.nz Tel: +6444398149 Fax: +6444398513
Mr. Andrew Kibblewhite Strategy, Advisory and Evaluation Group New Zealand Agency for International Development 195 Lambton Quay Private Bag 18-901 Wellington New Zealand	andrew.kibblewhite@nzaid.govt.nz
Ms. Miranda Cahn Strategy, Advisory and Evaluation Group	miranda.cahn@nzaid.govt.nz

New Zealand Agency for International Development 195 Lambton Quay Private Bag 18-901 Wellington New Zealand	
Ms. Ginny Chapman Strategy, Advisory and Evaluation Group New Zealand Agency for International Development 195 Lambton Quay Private Bag 18-901 Wellington New Zealand	ginny.chapman@nzaid.govt.nz

Norway

Mr. Hans Peter Melby Norwegian Agency for development Cooperation – NORAD PO Box 8034 Dep. NO-0030 Oslo0 Norway	hans.melby@norad.no +47 22 24 20 81
--	---

Papua New Guinea

Mr. Reichert Jonathan Thanda PNG Assistant Secretary (UN,EU), Foreign Aid Divison, PAPUA NEW GUINEA	reichert_thanda@planning.gov.pg
--	--

Samoa

Mr. Noumea Simi ACEO, Aid Coordination Unit Ministry of Finance SAMOA	noumea.simi@mof.gov.ws Ph 685 22042 Fax 685 21312
--	---

Senegal

Mr. Amadou Tidiane Dia Expert chargé de l'Absorption et de la Mobilisation des ressources et du suivi de la Déclaration de Paris Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances Immeuble Peytavin 1er étage porte D, Rue Carde Dakar, Senegal	atdia@yahoo.com 221 33 889 21 66 221 33 822 41 95 221 77 556 01 43
--	--

Spain

Mr. Carlos Rodríguez-Ariza Policy Analyst Evaluation Division Directorate General of Development Policy Planning and Evaluation Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation	colaboradores.cra@maec.es Tel: (34) 91.394. 87.74 Fax: (34) 91.431.17.85
--	---

Sweden

Mr. Joakim Molander Director	Joakim.Molander@sida.se
---------------------------------	--

Department for Evaluation Sida SE-105 25 Stockholm Sweden	Phone: +46-8-698 5440 Fax: +46-8-698 5643
Ms. Gunilla Törnqvist Director General Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation (SADEV) Box 1902, 651 19 Karlstad SWEDEN	gunilla.tornqvist@sadev.se +46 54 10 37 24 (phone) +46 54 10 37 01 (fax)
Ms. Viktoria Hildenwall Senior Evaluation Officer Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation (SADEV) Box 1902, 651 19 Karlstad SWEDEN	viktoria.hildenwall@sadev.se +46 54 10 37 28 (phone) +46 54 10 37 01 (fax)

Switzerland

Mr. Gerhard Siegfried Head, Evaluation & Controlling Unit Direction du Développement et de la Coopération Département fédéral des affaires étrangères Freiburgstr. 130 CH-3003 Berne Switzerland	Gerhard.Siegfried@deza.admin.ch Tel: + (41) 31 325 92 58 Fax: + (41) 31 323 08 49
--	--

Uganda

Mr. Pius Bigirimana Permanent Secretary Office of the Prime Minister 6th Floor, Postel Building Plots 67-75 Yusuf Lule Road P. O. Box 341, KAMPALA Uganda	piusbigman@yahoo.com
Mr. Timothy Lubanga Ag. Assistant Commissioner Monitoring and Evaluation National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (NIMES) Office of the Prime Minister P. O. Box 341, Kampala Uganda	tlubanga@opm.go.ug tklubanga@yahoo.co.uk Tel: 256 (0)312264517, (0)414233968 Mob. 256 (0) 772451852

UK

Ms. Helen Wedgwood Deputy Head, Evaluation Dept Department for International Development, DFID Abercrombie House Eaglesham Road, East Kilbride Glasgow G75 8EA UK	H-Wedgwood@dfid.gov.uk Tel: 00 44 (0)1355 84 3714
---	--

USA	
Mr. Peter B. Davis Coordinator, Planning, Performance Management, Monitoring and Evaluation Office of Director of US Foreign Assistance Department of State/USAID 2201 C Street NW, Washington DC 20520, USA	DavisPB@state.gov +1 202 647 2798 (phone) +1 202 647 2813 (fax)
Mr. Steven Piers Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Chief Operating Officer, USAID, 1300 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington DC 20523, USA	spierce@usaid.gov +1 202 712 1097 (phone) +1 301 646 6157 (mob)
Vietnam	
Mr. Cao Manh Cuong Deputy Director General Ministry of Planning and Investment 2 Hoang Van Thu St. Ba Dinh District Hanoi, Viet Nam	cmanhcuong@yahoo.com tel. +84 4 37 333 000
Civil society: Reality of Aid	
Ms. Margarita Gomez Reality of Aid/Ibon IBON Center 114 Timog Ave Quezon City 1103 Philippines Philippines	maita_gomez100@yahoo.com mgomez@ibon.org tel. +632 927 7060 – 61 – 62 Fax. +632 927 6981
Civil society: CONCORD/CDI	
Mr. David Culverhouse Executive Director Council for International Development Te Kaunihera mo te Whakapakari Ao Whanui o Aotearoa 2nd Floor, James Smith Building, cnr Cuba & Manners St. PO Box 24 228, Wellington 6142, New Zealand	david@cid.org.nz
Global Environment Facility	
Mr. Rob D. Van Den Berg Director, Evaluation Office, Global Environment Facility, Mail stop: G 7-7-4 – 1818 H Street NW – Washington DC 20433 USA	rvandenberg@thegef.org tel. +1 202 473 6078

OECD/DAC	
Mr. Hans Lundgren Head of section, Evaluation Peer Review and Evaluation Division Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD, 2 rue Andre-Pascal 75775 Paris Cedex 16 France	Hans.LUNDGREN@oecd.org Tel: +33 1 45 24 90 59
Ms. Anna Hellström Policy Analyst Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD, 2 rue Andre-Pascal 75775 Paris Cedex 16 France	Anna.HELLSTROM@oecd.org Tel: +33 1 45 24 96 68

Consultants	
Ms. Rosalind David 2 Waitapu Road, Greenlane, Auckland New Zealand	rosalinddavid@ihug.co.nz Tel: +64 9 529 4957 Mob: + 64 21 118 3113
Mr. Elliot Stern Courtyard Flat 41 Royal York Crescent Bristol BS8 4JS UK	crofters@clara.net

APPENDIX 2. REVISED WORKSHOP AGENDA

TIME	MONDAY 9 FEBRUARY ACTIVITIES	LOCATION	CHAIR/PRESENTERS/ FACILITATORS
8.30am	Session 1: Opening of workshop	Copthorne 1	Peter Adams, Executive Director, NZAID
8.40am	Introduction, overview and adoption of agenda	Copthorne 1	Network Vice-Chair & Secretariat & Rosalind David
9.30am	The value and use of evaluation quality standards: What is the experience so far? Standards in DAC member agency headquarters and in the field	Copthorne 1	<i>Netherlands</i> <i>New Zealand</i> <i>Spain</i>
10.45am	Refreshment break	Hotel bar	
10.50am	Session 2: Small group discussions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have the standards led to better quality evaluations? • Strengths and success in using the standards • Challenges and constraints, and ways to overcome these. 	Copthorne 1 Copthorne 2 (Level 1) Copthorne 3 & 4 (Level 12)	
12.45pm	Lunch	Copthorne 2	
1.30pm	Plenary discussion: Summary of Sessions 1 & 2	Copthorne 1	Facilitators
3.00pm	Briefing for Powhiri / Welcome ceremony – cultural protocols, etc.	Copthorne 1	Martin Wikaira/NZAID
3.30pm	Refreshment break	Hotel bar	
4.00pm	Transfer by bus to Waipapa Marae for Welcome Ceremony (Powhiri) followed by dinner (kai) and cultural performance (Kapa haka)	Assemble in hotel reception area	NZAID
7.30pm	<i>Return to Copthorne Harbour City Hotel</i>		

TIME	TUESDAY 10 FEBRUARY ACTIVITIES	LOCATION	CHAIR/PRESENTERS/ FACILITATORS
9.00am	Session 3: Reflections on day 1 – key points What improvements to the EQS are needed?	Copthorne 1	Chair & Facilitators
10.30am	<i>Refreshment break</i>	Hotel bar (Level 1)	
11.00am	Small group discussions Plenary discussion	Copthorne 1, 2 , 3 & 4	Facilitators & Chair
12.30pm	<i>Lunch</i>	Copthorne 2	
1.30pm	Session 4: Concluding discussion on changes needed to the standards Strategy for dissemination and how to communicate the final product to reach a broad audience. Agreement on next steps	Copthorne 1 Copthorne 2 (Level 1) Copthorne 3 & 4 (Level 12)	Facilitators - small groups / plenary
3.30pm	<i>Refreshment break</i>	Hotel Bar (Level 1)	
4.00pm	Summary of workshop Closing session	Copthorne 1	Facilitators & Network Vice-Chair
5.00pm	Finish		