

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration

*Presentation to European Evaluation Society
October 2008*



The Team/The Task

- Bernard Wood, Canada
 - Dorte Kabell, Denmark
 - Francisco Sagasti, Peru
 - Nansozie Muwanga, Uganda
- Together: Diversity provided strong mix of backgrounds, disciplines, gender, knowledge, skills, experience, languages, world view ...and a great chemistry
- Synthesis of some 20 formative evaluations, 50/50 donor and partner, focussing on "the hows and whys of the implementation of the Paris Declaration"
 - Emphasis on input/output level capturing incremental and incidental behaviour changes associated with the Paris Declaration
 - A wealth of information – but evidence of what?



Working processes

- Virtual team working through skype, e-mail and sharepoint to ensure common platform and uniform document access
- Met only once, during the South Africa Workshop
- Distribution of work taking advantage of each team members' particular strengths
- Each team member responsible for one or two commitments cutting across all the evaluation reports, and four to five evaluation reports treating all the commitments
- All team members read all executive summaries

Working method:

- Mined reports and organized evidence with help of structured templates that also included assessment of strength of evidence
- Structure based on five Paris Declaration commitments and three "input" – leadership/commitment, capacity and incentives and for partner reports an assessment of Paris Declaration as a tool
- Reports supported this organization to a greater or lesser extent



The Approach

Three phases:

- *Inception:* outline, workplan, preliminary assessment of available information
- *Drafting:* Review of available evaluations and discussion of preliminary findings based on 11 (mainly donor) reports) in workshop with steering committee and evaluation teams in South Africa. Second workshop in Paris with only team leader to review first draft of final report
- *Finalization and dissemination:* Four drafts, dissemination papers, and presentation in Accra by Team Leader



The Workshop in South Africa

Critical for:

- Taking stock and ensuring ownership of all stakeholders
- Dialogue between Management Group/Steering Committee/Synthethis Team and within the different structures
- Testing of evidence against preliminary findings
- Nuancing emerging findings and identifying possible lacunae and useful lessons for unfinished reports
- Accelerating finalization of remaining evaluations
- Guidance to synthethis team
- Adjusting governance structure by adding advisory panel



Recognized Limitations

- *Sampling*: self selection, major countries and institutions absent, very small sample
- *Methodology*: complexity of different TOR, openness to interpretation, variation of evaluation instruments, effects of indicators, attribution to Paris Declaration
- *Evidence*: varied strength of analysis and evidence in reports



Evaluation Questions

- Are the "political support, peer pressure and coordinated action" of donors and partners changing? How/why, or why not?
- Is this fact leading to **actions and changes in behaviour** towards greater ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results and mutual accountability? How and why is this working, or not working?
- What important trends or events are emerging in early implementation of the Paris Declaration?



Organizing evidence

Level 1 (input): What is happening or not happening with respect to inputs provided by donors and partners and how/why?

Level 2 (relationships): What are the relationships between these inputs and the expected and actual outputs (in relationship to ownership, alignment, harmonisation, MfDR, and mutual accountability)? How and why do these relationships operate as they do?

Level 3 (outcomes): to what degree are things changing in the direction of the programme logic and to what extent is that logic complementary/conflicting over time?

Looking at three evaluation questions through the lens of "enabling conditions" understood as:

- Commitment/Leadership
- Capacity
- Incentives
- And for partner countries, the PD as a tool of effectiveness and in country behaviours in implementation



The Challenges

Process – challenges

- Timely delivery of input
- Quality and comparability of evidence
- Quality control (peer reviewers)
- Governance structure
- Using the evaluation process to reinforce the message
- No alignment with monitoring survey
- Dissemination... to ensure impact?

Methodological challenges:

- Trade off between uniform TOR facilitating synthesis and tailored TOR giving ownership and additional information
- Strength of underlying evidence – different approaches, methods and depth
- Both TOR and PD principles open to interpretation



The (Missed) Opportunities

Missed the mark:

- Timing with monitoring survey
- Unimpressive coverage
- Using process to reinforce message beyond bureaucrats ?

Made its mark:

- Evidencebased contribution to discussion on progress
- Raise key issues
- Basis for Phase two
- Wider audience in and post Accra ?

