

Evaluation of Aid Effectiveness in Cambodia (June - November 2008)

Concept Note FINAL (June 2008)¹

1. Background

In October 2006 the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) and its development partners signed the Cambodia Declaration on Enhancing Aid Effectiveness. This Declaration represented the formalization of the activities included in the RGC Harmonisation, Alignment and Results (H-A-R) Action Plan that had been approved in February 2006.² Together, these two documents comprise a single framework of commitments for joint government and development action directed at promoting aid effectiveness in Cambodia. In addition, the Declaration and the H-A-R Action Plan represent a national application of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, which was signed in March 2005 by partner countries and the development partner community.³

The Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board (CRDB) of the Council for the Development of Cambodia (CDC), in its capacity as secretariat to the Government-Development Partner Coordination Committee (GDCC), assumes overall responsibility for coordinating H-A-R Action Plan implementation and for monitoring the Declaration. These activities are closely associated with the monitoring of global aid effectiveness commitments, including the Paris Declaration, and related national monitoring frameworks such as the Joint Monitoring Indicators (JMIs).

The Cambodia Declaration and its associated H-A-R Action Plan are now mid-way through their implementation period and it has been agreed that an evaluation is important to take stock of progress and to guide future actions. The timing of this Review has been scheduled to take place after the 2008 Paris Declaration monitoring exercise and will be concluded after the self-assessment report of the Royal Government performance for 2003-2008 and following the pronouncement of the Royal Government Political Platform for the 4th term of the National Assembly. The major part of the evaluation activities will also take place after the 3rd High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Accra so that the lessons and priorities from the government platform and the Accra meeting can be incorporated into the in-country Evaluation of Aid Effectiveness. It is expected that the Evaluation will provide an opportunity to reflect on the achievements and challenges in implementation to date, to identify emerging issues to be considered in the second half of the implementation period, and to allow for any further prioritisation or reorientation of the H-A-R Action Plan that would increase the relevance and impact of the combined aid effectiveness effort.

This note sets out options for discussion and, based on the views of Government, development partners and civil society stakeholders, will guide the evaluation process.

2. Purpose and Objectives

Why is the Evaluation on Aid Effectiveness necessary?

The purpose of the Evaluation on Aid Effectiveness is to review and evaluate accumulated experience (in Cambodia and emerging from Accra) to inform the implementation of the H-A-R Action Plan in the period 2009-2010 (and possibly thereafter). The evaluation also goes some way toward strengthening the mutual accountability component of Cambodia's aid effectiveness work and to assessing capacity-related progress and challenges in aid management.

1 This Concept Note is informed by the Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration, a global initiative supported by the OECD/DAC Working Party on Aid Effectiveness.

2 The H-A-R Action Plan, and all other documents referenced in this document are available on <http://www.cdc-crdb.gov.kh/aid-management-documents.html>

3 These national frameworks replaced the 2004 Declaration and Harmonisation and Alignment Action Plan that were modelled on the Rome Declaration.

What will the Evaluation on Aid Effectiveness do?

The objective of the Evaluation on Aid Effectiveness is to undertake an independent review of the implementation of the commitments that are included in the Cambodia Declaration and in the H-A-R Action Plan. The Evaluation will go beyond simply recording what has happened and will ask why certain commitments and activities have (or have not) been successful and what further actions may be required. This will inform future activities and capacity development priorities.

The Evaluation will comprise of two key focus areas of analysis, which in each case will consider two guiding principles, to evaluate how the Cambodia Declaration and H-A-R Action Plan implementation has contributed to: (i) linking aid effectiveness with development results (in terms of NSDP and CMDGs); and (ii) the development of national capacity and the strengthening of national systems. These focus areas for the analysis can be summarised as follows:

(i) Notable achievements and challenges

Identify and assess relevant trends and practices in aid delivery and management since 2006 that explain the major achievements and remaining challenges in implementing the Cambodia Declaration and the H-A-R Action Plan.

(ii) Key activities / changes that will make a difference

Identify good practices that are emerging, both nationally and globally, and evaluate conditions for their successful adaptation. Conversely, evaluate obstacles and risks that have (or might) constrained the implementation of the Cambodia Declaration and the H-A-R Action Plan.

The Evaluation will place emphasis on showing how activities:

- (i) supported the achievement of development results; and
- (ii) contributed to the development of national capacity and the strengthening of national systems.

3. Scope of Work

Based on the two focus areas of analysis and the two guiding principles identified above, the Evaluation of Aid Effectiveness will be based on the commitments included in the Cambodia Declaration and the activities identified in the H-A-R Action Plan. The evaluation exercise will make use of existing analytical work (global and national sources), including data on ODA delivery and Government reports and other analytical documents (see Annex One for list of sources). Additional self-assessments and desk reviews will also inform the main independent evaluation exercise which will comprise interviews with representatives of RGC, development partner and civil society (see Methodology, below).

It should be noted in particular that the conduct of this exercise has been scheduled to allow for lessons to be drawn from: (i) the Accra Agenda for Action; (ii) the global evaluation of the Paris Declaration; and (iii) the combined global and Cambodia findings of the Paris Declaration monitoring survey (see Annex Two for results of the 2006 and 2008 Paris Declaration monitoring surveys), to guide the Evaluation team in the conduct of their work.

The Cambodia Declaration contains commitments of both government and development partners which have been developed around 5 principles of the Paris Declaration. Based on the questions identified below, a more quantitative approach can complement the analysis on implementation to consider how aid provided at both aggregate and sector levels conforms to the aspirations of the Cambodia Declaration and the H-A-R Action Plan. Data sources include analysis presented in the 2007 Aid Effectiveness Report (updated as necessary) and the 2008 Paris Declaration survey. Using the Cambodia Declaration and the H-A-R Action Plan as their point of departure, each focus area of analysis may be evaluated and assessed using the following questions as a guideline:

I) Identify and assess relevant trends and practices in aid delivery and management since 2006 that explain the major achievements and remaining challenges in implementing the Cambodia Declaration and the H-A-R Action Plan

Relevance of the current aid effectiveness framework

- a) What are perceived to be the critical aid effectiveness issues in Cambodia? Are these mainly common to all sectors? Have these been sufficiently prioritised during the implementation of the commitments of the Cambodia Declaration and the activities of the H-A-R Action Plan?
- b) At which level do the Cambodia Declaration commitments most resonate (political, technical, bureaucratic, individual, central ministry, sectoral, donor, civil society)? Where does the motivation, and requirement for accountability, come from?
- c) To which aid effectiveness principles and activities is there more demonstrated commitment? Can any H-A-R priority be considered as an orphan? If so, why?
- d) What other priorities and considerations influence aid delivery and management in Cambodia? Are these priorities supportive of the aid effectiveness agenda?
- e) Are all of the Paris Declaration commitments and indicators relevant to sector and national challenges and what action has been taken to address related challenges across sectors?
- f) Where there has been progress in: (i) making the NSDP a robust national development plan; and (ii) linking the NSDP to a credible budget framework, what has been the influence of the H-A-R principles in facilitating this progress?
- g) Is there any evidence to support the assumption that implementation of the Cambodia Declaration, the H-A-R Action Plan (and its global equivalents) has made (or will make) a demonstrated contribution to: (i) the achievement of development results; and (ii) the development of national capacity and systems?
- h) Which of the global or national aid effectiveness frameworks has provided most motivation and commitment from development partners? Has implementation been a result of corporate development partner policy (as a result of the Paris Declaration) or a response to the policies of the RGC?

Ownership

RGC commits to strengthening NSDP monitoring and review, developing sector and provincial plans, aligning the NSDP and budget, and working with national stakeholders. Development partners commit to respect RGC ownership and coordinate support for capacity development related to NSDP implementation.

- a) Whose ownership has been strengthened? Is there evidence to support the suggestions that ownership is either: (i) a truly authentic and national articulation of leadership; or (ii) the transfer of responsibility for an external set of interests?
- b) What has been the respective contribution of: (i) institutional mandate; (ii) organisational commitment and capacity; (iii) individual champions, in both the RGC and development partners implementing the commitments included in the Declaration;
- c) Where new sector strategies and programme-based approaches have been established, what has been the experience in developing coherent government-led policy and financing frameworks?
- d) What has been the experience in implementing the commitments of the Cambodia Declaration and the activities of H-A-R Action Plan as: (i) a sector-led process based on relevant priorities; and (ii) a comprehensive and centrally-coordinated exercise that guides national priorities and facilitates lesson learning and knowledge sharing?
- e) What do the JMI process and other monitoring/review initiatives tell us about RGC and development partner perspectives on ownership? How has conditionality evolved in Cambodia and with what consequences?

- f) How has the executive worked with the legislative arm of government? How have decentralisation issues been taken into account with regard to aid delivery? Have the central ministries worked closely with line ministries, and what have been the results?
- g) What has been the experience of civil society in engaging with aid effectiveness work with Government and development partners, both as an advocate and also in implementing the aid effectiveness principles directly?
- h) What kind of training and support has been provided to RGC staff at central and line ministry level to implement the commitments of the Cambodia Declaration and the activities of H-A-R Action Plan? For individual development partners, is there any evidence of internal contradictions between corporate commitments to implementing the Paris Declaration and management requirements that make this difficult or impossible?

Alignment

RGC commits to strengthening national systems, implementing PFM reform and leading efforts to articulate capacity needs. Development partners base their support on the NSDP, use national systems that comply with global standards and avoid creating parallel PIUs.

- a) What evidence is there of alignment to national priorities being explicitly taken into account during the formulation of country strategies, in project design and in disbursement profiles? Is there any pattern or trend emerging toward favoured and less-favoured sectors?
- b) What have been the main opportunities and constraints for making increased use of national structures and systems (planning, budgeting, implementation and use of PIUs, reporting, audit, monitoring & evaluation, procurement, performance based incentive schemes)?
- c) Where new sector strategies and programme-based approaches have been established, what has been the experience in developing coherent frameworks to support capacity development?
- d) How has commitment to coordinated TC, strengthening and increased use of government systems, reduced numbers of PIUs, division of labour, increased use of PBAs manifested itself?
- e) To what extent have the core government reforms and the H-A-R Action Plan been mutually reinforcing? Do the H-A-R principles guide the support to, and implementation of, the reforms (e.g. coordinated capacity support) or has the pace and direction of reform informed the ability to adhere to the H-A-R principles (e.g. using national systems, reduced PIU use).
- f) What changes in RGC, development partner or CS behaviour, modalities and/or systems can be attributed to the H-A-R? What have been the capacity development implications? Has there been any experience, for example, of development partners re-profiling their staffing complement to adapt to the requirements of the Paris Declaration, the H-A-R Action Plan or to become better providers of capacity development support?
- g) What has been the experience amongst development partners of working together to develop harmonised financial and implementation arrangements (e.g. pools and trust funds)? Has there been any interest in the global Legal Harmonisation Initiative?
- h) Have development partners trained or raised awareness of staff in the Cambodia Declaration and H-A-R principles, commitments and responsibilities?
- i) To what extent does implementation of the Cambodia Declaration commitments feature in a development partner staff member's performance appraisal? Is there evidence of development partner decentralisation making a beneficial difference; if so, where are the benefits greatest?
- j) What have been the development partner incentives and motivators for increased harmonisation? Has, for example: (i) excessive pressures to disburse; (ii) lack of flexibility on staff time or (iii) the need for visibility and influence, at times taken precedence over the commitment to harmonized approaches?

- k) To what extent are issues such as trust and visibility a constraint to harmonisation between development partners? What drives the seemingly continued requirements for 'everyone to do everything' and what has been the experience of the EU efforts to address this?
- l) What have been the transaction costs of aid fragmentation and to what extent, if any, does fragmentation undermine coherent and effective aid management?
- m) What have been the transaction costs of implementing the global and national aid effectiveness priorities? If total transaction costs have increased, has this been across-the-board or have they been re-distributed?
- n) Is there any emerging evidence that transaction costs associated with the aid effectiveness agenda are likely to be permanent (e.g. making increased use of TWG modalities while still requiring individual project management arrangements)? Or is there evidence that more mature arrangements have witnessed declining transaction costs (consider health and education as more mature examples)?
- o) Where programme-based approaches have been developed, has there been any coherent approach taken to capacity development (e.g. on the RGC side to articulate a strategy, or on the development partner side to pool resources for technical cooperation or to make other efforts to ensure that capacity support is coordinated and effective)?

Harmonisation

Development partners will work to establish common procedures for programme management, reporting and monitoring, and will reduce the number of separate missions and reviews. Development partners will increase aid through PBAs (with due respect to complementarity of aid modalities) while Government will continue to strengthen reforms that permit harmonisation around (and alignment with) national systems.

- a) To what extent are aid modalities considered by RGC and development partners to be an important part of the Cambodia Declaration and the H-A-R agenda? How has 'complementarity' been used in practice to ensure diversity and use of modalities but without resulting in fragmentation and 'business as usual'?
- b) To what extent have PBAs represented a reduction in the transaction costs of managing aid? Where complementary modalities are provided, is there evidence to support the notion of permanently higher transactions costs in PBAs? Which conventional elements of a PBA (common strategy, budget framework, implementation modalities, joint review and reporting etc) are more (and less) prevalent in Cambodia and what potential innovations may be considered as progressive?
- c) Is there evidence of division of labour work being conducted? What was the role of Government in leading or facilitating this exercise? What have been the results?
- d) Is there evidence of emerging coherent and systematic coordination of missions and analytical work? Or to work through TWGs to establish a mission/study programme that might ensure coordinated approaches? Retrospectively, has any development partner reflected on its mission/study programme and taken action that might be considered as a good practice?
- e) Is the burden imposed by missions and studies considered to be excessively burdensome and does this burden impact disproportionately on some sectors?
- f) How has the commissioning of pilots, case studies, assessments and analytical work (e.g. on technical cooperation, health, gender and aid, roadmaps, etc) supported (or distracted from) efforts to implement the commitments of the Cambodia Declaration? What is the evidence to suggest that these pilots and studies might: a) inform policy so that recommendations are adopted and implemented; and/or b) have a beneficial impact once this implementation is complete?
- g) What progress has been made on harmonising and implementing EIAs (Activity 2a of the H-A-R Action Plan)? Is there any evidence to support the increased use of harmonised approaches

to environmental and natural resource management in the future (see proposed reference in AAA)?

Managing for Results

Government will strengthen the NSDP M&E framework which development partners will then use to realign their support. Common reviews at national and sector/thematic level will then assess the impact of NSDP implementation.

- a) Has the effort to link resources with results at national and sector level led to more strategic government-development partner dialogue that has informed joint programming and review?
- b) To the extent that PBAs have been developed, is there any evidence to suggest that they support the achievement of development results? Have new aid modalities supported the effort to strengthen the link between resources and results at sector level?
- c) In which cases have joint reviews been successfully used to monitor progress? Have they replaced bilateral reviews or are they additional?
- d) Has the H-A-R Action Plan been a relevant tool for promoting overall development effectiveness? Are there any clear examples of how implementing the aid effectiveness agenda actually led to differences that impact on the lives of ordinary people?

Mutual accountability

Government and development partners will work to strengthen the role of all stakeholders in the planning and implementation of the NSDP. Development partners will provide timely and comprehensive information on aid flows to RGC and this information will be transparently shared with all stakeholders.

- a) Is the concept of mutual accountability, and its practical ramifications, fully understood by RGC and development partners?
- b) To what extent does the existing aid architecture (TWG-GDCC-CDCF) provide an effective forum for dialogue and mutual accountability?
- c) Where programme-based approaches have been developed, has there been any notable improvement in mutual accountability relationships (e.g. performance of the TWG, use of joint review, provision of data on aid delivery)?
- d) How has the provision of information on aid flows supported evidence-based dialogue? Is the management of this information conducted efficiently and effectively by both RGC and development partners? What improvements may lead to better quality, greater efficiency, or improved use of information on aid and for assessing alignment?
- e) What has been the role of civil society in promoting mutual accountability? Conversely, has the mutual accountability concept resulted in any new role of partnership for/with civil society?

II. Recommendations: Identify good practices that are emerging, both nationally and globally, and evaluate conditions for their successful adaptation

The implementation of the Cambodia Declaration and H-A-R Action Plan since 2006 (and the H&A Action Plan before that) is likely to have led to a number of innovative and beneficial practices being developed; these are expected to be identified and evaluated in the first part of this exercise (described above). Similarly, at a global level, the High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (Accra, September 2008) is expected to identify good practices on the government and development partner sides that may be replicable in Cambodia (e.g. on technical cooperation and capacity development).

To provide momentum to the Cambodia Declaration and the H-A-R Action Plan, it will be beneficial to identify these innovative approaches and to consider the conditions and relevance for their (wider) application in Cambodia. Conversely, to better understand the nature of global and national obstacles that have constrained the implementation of the Cambodia Declaration commitments and the H-A-R Action Plan, particular bottlenecks and emerging risks may be identified.

Much of this section may be derived from the analysis undertaken in the previous focus area (above). Existing sources that may support the identification of both innovative approaches and constraints to implementation of the H-A-R Action Plan include analysis presented in the 2007 Aid Effectiveness Report (red and green text boxes) and the independent studies on the provision of technical cooperation commissioned by RGC in October 2007 and in March 2008.⁴ Additional recommendations may be based on the global evidence presented and discussed at the High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (Accra, September 2008).

Relevance

- a) Is the Paris Declaration, and by extension the Cambodia Declaration and H-A-R Action Plan, still of the same order of priority to RGC and development partners as it may have been in 2005-06? What other factors and considerations, both global and national, now influence the aid agenda and how might these reinforce or undermine the national aid effectiveness work?
- b) The Cambodia Declaration and the H-A-R Action Plan may be seen as culturally-neutral and value-free frameworks, negotiated at a political level (but implemented at the technical level). But are there cultural or value-based constraints that limit the relevance of aid effectiveness frameworks in Cambodia?

Ownership

- a) In the final analysis, what are the key factors that have made (and will make) a difference to RGC implementation of the Cambodia Declaration commitments and the H-A-R Action Plan? Are these of a political, technical, bureaucratic or individual nature?
- b) What good practices have emerged in: (i) leading the development of a sector strategy; (ii) exercising leadership and facilitating a successful TWG; (iii) building partnerships across Government, with and between development partners, and with civil society?
- c) What has been the experience of integrating cross-cutting issues, especially gender and environment/natural resource management in to the aid effectiveness work?
- d) Particularly with regard to capacity development, the Paris Declaration represents a rational/functional assertion of what is feasible/desirable (e.g. through the promotion of normative capacity frameworks and associated performance management initiatives). Is there some risk that it might overlook the cultural context and related factors that underlie the implementation of aid effectiveness work?

⁴ See 'Technical Cooperation in Cambodia: Making the System Work Better' (November 2007).

Alignment

- a) Are there any examples of where RGC has led, or development partners have implemented, an approach to jointly review a sector portfolio to ensure an appropriate alignment to NSDP priorities and to making increased use of national systems?
- b) In light of the small decline in coordinated technical cooperation (TC - Indicator 4) between the 2006 and 2008 Paris Declaration monitoring exercises (possibly for methodological reasons) are there any examples of where RGC has led, or development partners have implemented, an approach that is explicitly intended to coordinate the use of TC (as opposed to 'incidental coordination' through the use of PBAs)?
- c) Given that PIU figures increased between the 2006 and 2008 Paris Declaration monitoring exercises (possibly for methodological reasons) are there any examples of where RGC has led, or development partners have implemented, an approach to integrate or rationalize the use of PIUs?

Harmonisation

- a) What have been the most notable incentives and motivating factors behind development partner harmonisation? What is the relative role of: (i) institutional mandates or imperatives to harmonise; (ii) organisational capacity; (ii) individual champions, in promoting harmonised approaches?
- b) Where and how might increased use of complementarity principles (and division of labour) work better?
- c) How might development partners harmonise in the context of a PBA so that capacity is placed centre-stage and transaction costs are minimised?

Managing for Results

- a) Recent concern regarding the onset of 'aid effectiveness fatigue', and the related observation that aid effectiveness represents an end rather than a means (to results) may be countered by identifying a small number of instances of where this agenda really made a difference in contributing to development results. What might Cambodia offer to energise the process, accelerate implementation and link aid effectiveness to development results?

Mutual accountability

- a) What marks the distinction between: a) establishing mechanisms for dialogue and review; and b) developing these mechanisms so that they become useful partnership-based fora that are valued and appreciated by both RGC and development partners (and CS, where applicable)?

It is emphasised that the above questions are intended only as a guide and the respondents to the surveys and members of the evaluation team are encouraged to research and explore their own findings related to the promotion of aid effectiveness in Cambodia. Additional lines of enquiry, for example, may also include reference to commitment, motivation and incentive. Recent global research has identified, for example, that successful implementation of aid effectiveness policies has often been dependent on the professionalism of government and development partner staff more than on any financial incentive or the pursuit of attribution. Anecdotal evidence may also point to the role of individual champions, as opposed to broader 'political will' or bureaucratic implementation, as the driving force behind national and sub-national aid effectiveness activities.

4. Methodology and Structure of Work

The Evaluation will be conducted in five phases:

- a) In-country Development Partner self-assessments (on a voluntary and/or anonymous basis) of their experience in implementing the Cambodia Declaration and the H-A-R Action Plan. (Timing: before mid-June)

In the past, one development partner focal point from each agency has often dedicated significant time/effort to attending to aid effectiveness work; this might be termed a 'deep and narrow' approach. This self-evaluation will attempt to extract value using a broad-based but sharply-focused approach modelled on the 'Most Significant Change' evaluation tool.⁵ To implement this approach the head of development cooperation at each development partner agency is asked to convene a meeting with all programme staff to answer three questions:

Making appropriate reference to the Paris Declaration survey results for your agency and the guideline questions included (above) in this Concept Note:

- (i) **Internal reflection:** What has been the most significant achievement and/or challenge within your agency in implementing the Cambodia Declaration aid effectiveness commitments?
 - (ii) **External stocktaking:** At a sector or national level, what have been the significant activities or initiatives that have served to advance and/or constrain the implementation of the Cambodia Declaration aid effectiveness commitments?
 - (iii) **Looking forward:** What are the most significant Cambodia Declaration commitments (or new initiatives) that require further attention in order to strengthen the link between aid effectiveness and the achievement of development results?
- b) An internal RGC and TWG review and self-assessment. This will enable RGC ministries and agencies and their respective TWG to reflect on the same issues as for development partners and will apply the same methodology as described above. This will comprise a reflection on the findings of the Most Significant Change exercise. It will attempt to identify consensus or diversity. (Timing: mid-June);
 - c) Desk reviews and consolidation by CRDB/CDC of ODA Database information on aid flows, the Paris Declaration monitoring survey results, development partner and TWG feedback.⁶ (Timing: June/July);
 - d) An independent evaluation exercise, led by a team of respected and impartial experts (with combined skills and experience in: (i) aid management; (ii) evaluation; and (iii) the Cambodia development context).⁷ (Timing: start mid September – mid October);
 - e) Consultation and finalization. Evaluation findings will be discussed at country level and will be reflected in reports prepared for CDCF, potential H-A-R revision (priority and feasibility), Multi-Donor Support Programme (MDSP) capacity development review and 2009 workplan, CRDB 2009 workplan. (Timing: October/November);

As previously observed, the independent evaluation phase has been timed to take place after the meeting in Accra and will make use of existing analytical work (global and national sources) and data on ODA delivery. These will be supplemented with the self-assessments, interviews and any remaining interviews that are required during the independent evaluation period.

5. Outputs

Based on the scope of work (section three) the outputs will be structured and presented in a manner that is best suited to support the subsequent implementation of the Cambodia Declaration and the H-A-R Action Plan.

⁵ The Most Significant Change approach is described in the toolbook available at www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf

⁶ Desk review to include Paris Declaration survey/Country Chapter, AER (and up-dated analysis), sector studies (quantitative and qualitative, e.g. EC education study), TC studies, data presentations prepared for this MTR, development partner self-evaluation of H-A-R/Declaration, review of TWG Block Grants?

⁷ This will be modelled on the Tanzania Independent Monitoring Group and the Terms of Reference will be based on this Concept Note.

Intermediate outputs will include:

- a) development partner self-assessments;
- b) Ministries and agencies and TWG self-assessments; and
- c) Desk reviews and consolidated discussion papers by CRDB/CDC.

These will provide inputs to the independent evaluation phase and the major output: the independent report and recommendations. The structure of this report cannot be prescribed at this stage but will be developed by the evaluation team (conceivably it may be organised by Paris Declaration pillar, by area of analysis, by issues relating to results and capacity, or by some more strategic theme that comes to light), possibly in consultation with CRDB/CDC and a P+H TWG core group. It will address the key areas of analytical focus discussed in this note and make recommendations for implementation.

6. Skills and competencies of MTR Team (to be extracted to ToR)

The evaluation team of 3 persons will reflect diversity as well as expertise. The following key skills must be present:

- Expertise in evaluation methodology including process and participatory evaluation.
- Advanced knowledge, breadth and experience of aid effectiveness and development policies including that of the Paris Declaration.
- Advanced knowledge and experience of programme approaches (General Budget Support and Sector Wide Approaches).
- Knowledge and experience of Cambodia.

7. Timing and Conduct of Work (to be extracted to ToR)

The timetable for the evaluation is as follows:

2008	
May - June	Negotiate and agree Concept Note
June	Undertake survey/questionnaires and validation
June – August	Prepare background documents
August	Contract evaluation team
September - October	Conduct evaluation exercise
November	Discuss findings and agree actions required
December	Present to CDCF. Integrate agreed findings and actions into 2009 workplan of CRDB/CDC and other agencies as appropriate

8. Management Arrangements

The evaluation will be managed by CRDB/CDC on behalf of RGC and in consultation with the Partnership and Harmonisation TWG. A sub-group of the TWG will be established to provide technical inputs and peer oversight. Support to TWGs will be provided by CRDB/CDC in its capacity as the national aid coordination focal point and secretariat of the GDCC.

List of reports/analysis (to be augmented)

Policy framework

National Operational Guidelines, 2006, CRDB/CDC
Strategic Framework for Development Cooperation Management, 2006, CRDB/CDC
Cambodia Declaration (October 2006)
RGC Action Plan on Harmonisation, Alignment and Results (Feb 2006)
Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (Mach 2005)
NSDP (including Annual Progress Reports and Mid-Term Review)

Analytical report

Cambodia Aid Effectiveness Report, 2007, CRDB/CDC
Paris Declaration surveys (2006 and 2008) and country chapters

Technical Cooperation, Capacity and Incentives

TC in Cambodia – Making the system work better (Nov 2007) & health case study (May 2008)
Capacity Building Practices of Cambodia's Development Partners, 2004, CRDB/CDC
Technical Assistance and Capacity Development in an Aid Dependent Economy: The Experience of Cambodia, Godfrey et al, 2002, World Development Vol 30
Joint Government-Donor Strategy for Phasing Out Salary Supplementation Practices in Cambodia, January 2006, TWG-PAR
The Implementation of a Merit Based Pay Supplement Incentive, Sub-Decree 95 of 2005, Government of Cambodia (and new sub-decree 29 of 2008)

Technical Working Groups and dialogue mechanisms

Guideline on the Role and Functioning of the TWGs, 2007, CRDB/CDC
National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP), 2006-2010, Government of Cambodia
The GDCC and TWGs: A Review, 2006, CRDB/CDC
Mutual Accountability – an imperative for capacity development (Nov 2006), CRDB/CDC
What structures and processes are emerging at country level to support a more effective and accountable development partnership? (Marcus Cox/Agulhas, September 2006)
GDCC reports on TWGs

Sector Reviews and reports

Health HSP Review, Scaling-up for MDGs, SWiM review, TWG Review (end-2007)
Education congress report, Preparatory report for the ESP Mid-tem review, Donors performance report
Gender report for Dublin (May 2007)

Paris Declaration survey –development partner survey data

DONOR	AID DISBURSED		AID ON BUDGET	TECHNICAL COOPERATION		USE OF PFM SYSTEMS				PROCT	PREDICTABILITY	PBAs		
	Donor Q ^{d1}	Donor Q ^{d3}	Gov. Q ^{d1}	Donor Q ^{d5}	Donor Q ^{d6}	Donor Q ^{d7}	Donor Q ^{d8}	Donor Q ^{d9}	Donor Q ^{d10}	Donor Q ^{d11}	Donor Q ^{d13}	Gov. Q ^{d2 3/7}	Donor Q ^{d14}	Donor Q ^{d15}
United Nations Agencies														
FAO	6,114,362	6,049,255	653,007	2,953,195	1,609,521	0	0	65,107	0	0	773,981	4,577,902	0	3,818,815
IFAD	5,532,694	5,532,694	3,847,266	0	0	5,532,694	5,532,694	0	0	5,532,694	4,560,000	5,532,694	0	0
ILO	4,542,219	120,000	723,050	1,927,649	52,798	0	0	0	0	0	857,000	120,000	0	52,798
UNAIDS	427,601	427,601	712,082	427,601	423,744	0	0	0	0	0	844,000	423,744	0	423,744
UNCOHCHR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UNDP	34,275,623	33,866,346	5,540,654	29,745,818	18,953,222	6,875,615	6,875,615	6,647,095	6,647,095	10,061,328	6,567,101	9,165,708	0	22,078,415
UNESCO	1,888,622	1,867,294	1,012,101	1,888,622	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,199,600	1,867,294	0	0
UNFPA	3,762,357	3,419,660	3,410,770	2,943,803	1,923,436	1,626,659	1,626,659	1,626,659	1,626,659	1,626,659	3,728,092	2,601,106	0	1,923,436
UNICEF	22,769,019	22,769,019	10,097,367	21,398,925	14,563,292	1,268,102	0	0	0	0	10,179,998	12,084,135	0	14,563,292
UNODC	870,700	870,700	223,362	870,700	870,700	0	0	0	0	0	264,742	874,557	0	870,700
WFP	15,912,639	0	22,474,504	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,390,924
WHO	574,114	574,114	4,049,753	574,114	574,114	0	0	0	0	0	7,800,000	574,114	0	574,114
sub-total UN	96,669,950	75,496,683	52,743,916	62,730,427	38,970,826	15,303,070	14,034,968	8,338,861	8,273,754	17,220,681	36,774,514	37,821,254	0	45,696,237
Int'l Financial Institutions														
World Bank	66,972,760	60,878,328	52,815,534	16,055,090	6,521,153	16,327,517	16,327,517	16,327,517	16,327,517	16,327,517	62,500,000	48,542,238	15,494,878	29,213,603
IMF	918,693	918,693	0	918,693	918,693	0	0	0	0	0	0	918,693	0	918,693
ADB	69,828,605	69,828,605	63,091,783	14,236,299	1,520,922	1,064,120	1,064,120	1,064,120	1,064,120	1,064,120	74,780,000	68,171,179	0	21,398,922
Others														
Global Fund	21,067,345	21,067,345	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,816,415	21,067,345	0	0
GAVI	3,119,397	3,119,397	0	0	0	0	0	3,119,397	0	0	2,760,565	3,119,397	0	1,850,000
European Union														
Belgium	7,987,975	7,987,975	5,488,260	7,050,742	7,050,742	0	0	0	0	7,987,975	6,505,000	7,987,975	0	7,987,975
Denmark	25,117,103	25,117,103	10,967,637	5,881,142	5,881,142	25,117,103	25,117,103	23,107,103	20,906,076	25,117,103	9,895,416	17,410,000	0	23,107,103
Finland	3,418,607	2,078,165	1,492,402	3,418,607	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,768,881	3,864,697	0	0
France	20,093,387	14,186,469	21,197,511	1,287,809	54,570	3,672,518	3,672,518	2,237,083	299,671	7,466,982	23,533,383	14,779,775	0	2,022,359
Germany	33,808,283	26,204,146	18,358,228	15,293,302	3,662,280	5,819	5,819	0	0	6,271,783	21,759,225	28,864,446	0	7,298,510
Netherlands	100,007	0	0	95,406	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	1,496,700	394,739	1,743,459	1,496,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	211,700	1,452,038	0	0
Sweden	4,777,754	1,159,522	16,655,434	4,777,754	0	0	0	0	0	0	19,740,976	14,267,732	0	0
UK	4,827,454	4,319,236	20,840,737	2,986,249	687,947	0	0	0	0	0	23,150,735	22,553,016	0	973,606
EC	25,130,872	11,996,512	32,921,345	18,183,046	490,834	5,581,232	5,581,232	5,581,232	5,581,232	0	39,020,266	23,552,664	5,604,168	490,834
Other Bilateral Development Partners														
Australia	22,844,125	18,456,618	31,458,838	22,476,700	3,442,100	0	0	0	0	0	21,782,946	23,602,330	0	3,442,100
Canada	4,262,246	2,445,129	7,931,267	4,262,246	1,114,603	0	0	0	0	0	9,872,773	5,485,795	0	1,114,603
China	92,446,184	92,446,184	77,234,371	19,659	0	0	0	0	0	0	91,542,606	92,446,184	0	0
Japan	111,733,660	104,156,655	94,738,919	35,889,307	6,647,746	19,526,351	19,526,351	19,526,351	19,526,351	19,526,351	112,290,000	104,156,655	18,750,314	15,599,474
New Zealand	1,305,817	1,025,586	2,090,323	1,305,817	695,746	0	0	0	0	0	1,623,414	3,593,451	0	695,746
Rep of Korea	31,422,868	31,404,103	10,384,749	5,730,753	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,913,900	31,404,103	0	526,046
Switzerland	3,641,702	0	0	909,917	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	58,469,474	37,518,774	0	30,211	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37,145,000	0	0
TOTAL	711,460,967	612,205,969	522,154,713	225,035,874	77,659,304	86,597,731	85,329,629	79,301,665	71,978,722	100,982,514	586,242,715	612,205,969	39,849,360	162,335,811

Paris Declaration survey – Indicators by development partner

DONOR	AID DISBURSED		AID ON BUDGET	Coordinated TC	PFM Use	PROC'T	PIUs	Predictable aid	PBA's	MISSIONS			ANALYTICAL WORK		
	Total	To Government	Indicator 3	Indicator 4	Indicator 5a	Indicator 5b	Indicator 6	Indicator 7	Indicator 9	No.	Coord.	Indicator 10a	No.	Coord.	Indicator 10b
UN Agencies															
IAO	6,114,362	6,049,255	11%	55%	0%	0%	17	591%	62%	14	4	29%	0	0	
IAD	5,532,694	5,532,694	70%		0%	100%	0	121%	0%	3	3	100%	0	0	
ILO	4,542,219	120,000	603%	3%	0%	0%	1	14%	1%	0	0		0	0	
UNAIDS	427,601	427,601	167%	99%	0%	0%	1	50%	99%	3	3	100%	1	1	100%
UNCOHCHR	0	0					0			0	0		0	0	
UNDP	34,275,623	33,866,346	16%	64%	20%	30%	14	140%	64%	7	1	14%	10	2	20%
UNESCO	1,888,622	1,867,294	54%	0%	0%	0%	0	156%	0%	0	0		0	0	
UNFPA	3,762,357	3,419,660	100%	65%	48%	48%	1	70%	51%	1	1	100%	0	0	
UNICEF	22,769,019	22,769,019	44%	68%	0%	0%	0	119%	64%	7	6	86%	10	6	60%
UNODC	870,700	870,700	26%	100%	0%	0%	0	330%	100%	0	0		0	0	
UNVFP	15,912,639	0					3		9%	0	0		0	0	
UNVHO	574,114	574,114	705%	100%	0%	0%	0	7%	100%	3	0	0%	0	0	
Sub-total UN	96,669,950	75,496,683	70%	62%	11%	23%	37	103%	47%	38	18	47%	21	9	43%
World Bank															
World Bank	66,972,760	60,878,328	87%	41%	27%	27%	0	78%	67%	27	9	33%	4	4	100%
IMF	918,693	918,693	0%	100%	0%	0%	0		100%	20	16	80%	1	0	0%
IMDB	69,828,605	69,828,605	90%	11%	2%	2%	28	91%	31%	105	9	9%	41	2	5%
Others															
Global Fund	21,067,345	21,067,345	0%		0%	0%	1	142%	0%	1	0	0%	4	0	0%
SAVI	3,119,397	3,119,397	0%		0%	0%	0	113%	59%	1	1	100%	0	0	
European Union															
Belgium	7,987,975	7,987,975	69%	100%	0%	100%	1	123%	100%	0	0		0	0	
Denmark	25,117,103	25,117,103	44%	100%	83%	100%	0	176%	92%	2	1	50%	0	0	
Finland	3,418,607	2,078,165	72%	0%	0%	0%	0	218%	0%	0	0		0	0	
France	20,093,387	14,186,469	149%	4%	2%	53%	15	63%	10%	12	0	0%	2	0	0%
Germany	33,808,283	26,204,146	70%	24%	0%	24%	2	133%	22%	10	0	0%	0	0	
Netherlands	100,007	0		0%			0		0%	0	0		0	0	
Spain	1,496,700	394,739	442%	0%	0%	0%	11	686%	0%	0	0		0	0	
Sweden	4,777,754	1,159,522	1436%	0%	0%	0%	0	72%	0%	2	0	0%	0	0	
United Kingdom	4,827,454	4,319,236	483%	23%	0%	0%	1	97%	20%	17	10	59%	9	4	44%
US	25,130,872	11,996,512	274%	3%	47%	0%	2	60%	24%	4	0	0%	1	0	0%
Other Bilateral															
Australia	22,844,125	18,456,618	170%	15%	0%	0%	9	108%	15%	14	0	0%	9	5	56%
Canada	4,262,246	2,445,129	324%	26%	0%	0%	2	56%	26%	13	1	8%	2	2	100%
China	92,446,184	92,446,184	84%	0%	0%	0%	0	101%	0%	0	0		0	0	
Japan	111,733,660	104,156,655	91%	19%	19%	19%	0	93%	31%	53	0	0%	0	0	
New Zealand	1,305,817	1,025,586	204%	53%	0%	0%	0	221%	53%	2	2	100%	5	0	0%
Republic of Korea	31,422,868	31,404,103	33%	0%	0%	0%	11	264%	2%	25	0	0%	12	0	0%
Switzerland	3,641,702	0		0%			1		0%	0	0		0	0	
United States	58,469,474	37,518,774	0%	0%	0%	0%	0		0%	12	0	0%	7	0	0%
GRAND TOTAL	711,460,967	612,205,969	85%	35%	12%	16%	121	104%	28%	358	67	19%	118	26	22%