

Evaluation Of the Paris Declaration Phase II

IDEAS

Johannesburg, March 2009

Niels Dabelstein

The Paris Declaration (2005)

130+ countries', donors' and agencies' commitments to:

- Ownership
- Alignment
- Harmonisation
- Managing for Results
- Mutual Accountability

Why Evaluate the Paris Declaration?

- Evaluation is contained in the declaration (paragraph 11).
- Add value to the monitoring of the commitments and feed into the High Level Forums in 2008 and 2011.
- Requested by AAA (paragraph 30, footnote)
- An evaluation is part of mutual accountability.

Key elements

- A common evaluation framework
- Country - led country level evaluations
- Development Partners – led HQ level evaluations
- Thematic studies to supplement evaluations
- Intermediate results (Phase I) fed into the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in 2008
- Outcome evaluation (Phase II) to feed into HLF 2011

A joint evaluation

- Partner Countries and Development Partners develop evaluation framework/approach jointly
- Country level evaluations led by partner countries and managed in-country
- Joint Reference Group and overall management

Country-led evaluations

- Designed within a common evaluation framework to ensure comparability and aggregation of findings, but with sufficient flexibility to allow for country specificities and interests.
- Each evaluation managed in-country, led by the government, or an independent body, supported by a reference group comprising interested Development Partners.

Phase I Synthesis Report

Drawing together findings and lessons from the country and development partners level evaluations.

Focus was on change of behaviour or input.

Phase I report was presented to the 2008 HLF in Accra

Main findings of Phase I

Ownership

- Gained greater prominence
- Meaning of country ownership/leadership difficult to define
- Strengthening of national development policies and strategies since 2005 provide a basis for ownership
- Largely restricted to central government rather than provincial/local authorities (and wider society)
- Donors take ownership more serious, but their political and administrative systems limit actual support to country ownership

Main findings of Phase I

Alignment with strategies and procedures

- Uneven implementation of components of alignment
- Progress most visible regarding policies and strategies
- Less progress regarding use of country systems
- Real and perceived weaknesses of country systems are obstacle to alignment
- But ... donors are ready to support capacity building
- Limited improvement in aid predictability and (actual) untying of aid

Main findings of Phase I

Harmonisation of donors' actions

- Overall progress is weak, but no general backsliding
- EU Code of Conduct provides a strong potential
- Harmonisation responsibility of donors, but leadership of partner countries is needed to realise progress
- Confidence in each other's systems is a precondition for harmonisation

Main findings of Phase I

Managing for development results

- Received relatively little attention thus far
- Progress is slow
- Differing results frameworks (donors versus partner countries) considered to be a constraint to progress
- Examples found of better management of aid for (development) results due to existing national structures

Main findings of Phase I

Mutual accountability

- Mechanisms to jointly track aid (and development) effectiveness are being developed
- But ... mechanisms still relatively weak and there is unclarity about 'who is accountable to whom'
- Obstacles limiting progress in this area are largely of a political nature

Main findings of Phase I

Overall conclusions:

- It is a political agenda, not a technical arrangement
- A shared agenda with divergences and differing expectations: 'statement of intent' or 'non-negotiable decree'?
- Not a blue print, but to be adapted to specific contexts
- Synergies and tensions between the commitments
- donors / countries have different priorities regarding individual commitments

Main findings of Phase I

Overall conclusions:

- Perceived as prescriptive on countries, less on donors
- Mainly clear to 'inner circles' (ministries of Finance and Planning): broad engagement needed
- Sufficient capacities and incentives in place?
- Different perceptions on transaction costs and benefits in the short/long run
- Is not the answer to pressing substantive development issues: pressing policy themes not covered
- Faster movement from rhetoric to action needed to retain PD's credibility

Phase II "Architecture"

Based on the principles of the Paris Declaration:
A JOINT evaluation comprising:

- Country level evaluations assessing results/outcomes
- "Supplementary" donor/agency HQ studies
- Thematic/cross cutting studies with focus on results
- Synthesis report to be presented to 4th HLF

Overseeing the evaluation

Phase II International Reference Group:

- Members of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation (who actively support),
- Partner countries who conduct country level evaluations,
- Multilaterals and CSOs

Co-chaired by Sri Lanka and The Netherlands

Tasks:

- Endorse the evaluation framework and Terms of Reference for component studies
- Review draft reports for quality, credibility and clarity

Reference Group Phase II

- Australia
- Austria
- Belgium
- Denmark
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Ireland
- Japan
- The Netherlands
- New Zealand
- Norway
- Spain
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- United Kingdom
- USA
- UNDP
- OECD/DAC
- CONCORD
- Bangladesh
- Benin
- Bolivia
- Cambodia
- Cameroun
- Columbia
- Indonesia
- Kyrgyz Republic
- Malawi
- Mali
- Mozambique
- Papua New Guinea
- Samoa
- Senegal
- South Africa
- Sri Lanka
- Uganda
- Viet Nam
- Zambia
- Reality of Aid

Managing the evaluation

Management Group:

Responsible for:

- Developing the overall evaluation framework and ToR
- Coordinating and managing the joint evaluation process
- Guiding the component studies,
- Developing and managing the thematic Studies and the synthesis of findings and recommendations.

Phase II Secretariat at DIIS (financed by NL)

Managing the evaluation

National Reference Groups

Established in-country with key government, development partners and non-government stakeholders

- Approve detailed design of country study
- Serve as resource for country evaluation teams
- Review draft evaluation products for quality, credibility and clarity

Phase II Evaluation Model

Two complementary foci:

1) Implementation focus (expanded Phase I)

- Larger, diverse set of countries
- Wider range of stakeholder groups
- More attention to capacity building
- Assess donor aid to analytic & advisory activities
- Self-evaluation of PD implementation at HQ level by a few additional donors not covered in Phase 1

Phase 2 Evaluation Model

Two complementary foci (continued):

2) Results focus:

- Identify PD influence on development effectiveness (outcomes & results)

Challenges:

- Brief time span since PD endorsed (March 05)
- External influences make attribution difficult
- Demanding data requirements
- Complementary methodologies required

Phase 2 Evaluation Model

2) Results focus (continued)

Dealing with the challenges:

- More feasible to identify PD-related policy changes that “point” to likely changes in development effectiveness
- Focus on only 1 or 2 sectors and a few MDGs
- “Backward-track” from current results to “PD-like” actions in previous years
- Identify “control” entities or areas

Methodological Issues

The evaluation should have the following qualities:

- A balanced & sufficient sample of countries
- Sufficient coverage of sectors and themes
- Information of good quality
- Offering the possibility of explanation and attribution

Methods to be applied

- Synthesis reviews of existing evaluations, research and indicator systems
- Comparative in-depth case studies (of country partnerships) which are chosen to contain a good cross-section of common themes/sectors
- Longitudinal studies – either forward looking ('theory-based' mapping of plausible directions of travel) or backward looking tracking back to PD-like, longer established policies
- Targeted comparative studies to 'supplement' country based case comparisons

Evaluation Of the Paris Declaration Phase II

THANK YOU

To John Eriksson, Ted Kliest, Elliot Stern and Helen Wedgwood
whose PowerPoints I have shamelessly cut and pasted

And please do visit:

www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork