

**Paris Declaration Phase 2 Evaluation  
Cambodia country evaluation  
Terms of Reference  
11 December 2009**

**1. Background and Rationale: the Phase 2 Evaluation**

1. The Paris Declaration expresses a broad international consensus developed in the 15 years up to 2005, stipulating that new partnership relationships and ways of working between developed countries and partner countries are essential if development results are to be assured, aid well spent and aid volumes maintained.

2. The Paris Declaration<sup>1</sup> was endorsed at the 2<sup>nd</sup> High Level Forum held in Paris in 2005 by 52 development partners/agencies and partner countries and 30 other actors in the development cooperation field (UN and other multilateral agencies & NGOs). The Declaration consists of 56 “Partnership Commitments,” and aims to strengthen “partnerships” between donor countries and countries receiving aid in order to make aid more effective and to maximise development results.

3. The requirement for independent evaluation was built into the original Declaration and re-confirmed in the Accra Agenda for Action in 2008.<sup>2</sup> The first phase of the Evaluation<sup>3</sup> ran from March 2007 to September 2008 and aimed at providing information on the “HOWs and WHYS” of the early implementation process of the Paris Declaration, looking at **inputs and early outputs**. It was designed and used to deliver practical lessons and help take stock of implementation performance at the 3<sup>rd</sup> High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness held in Accra, Ghana in September 2008.

4. The second phase of the Evaluation will run from the 3<sup>rd</sup> High Level Forum in 2008 up to the 4<sup>th</sup> High Level Forum in Korea in 2011. This phase will emphasize **outcomes and results** and offer answers to the critical policy question of whether the intended long-term effects of the Paris Declaration are being achieved or advanced. The evaluation – of which Cambodia is one of 24 participating partner countries - is expected to analyze results in context, taking into account preconditions or enabling conditions that may lead to or inhibit positive development results supported by aid.

**2. Cambodia Evaluation: purpose, objectives, uses and approach**

5. **Purpose:** The evaluation’s primary focus will be to examine the effects of the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness and development results, including poverty reduction. The evaluation will therefore also represent an assessment of the effectiveness of development partners/agencies in Cambodia, alongside that of the country stakeholders, and of the partnerships between them.

6. **Objectives:** The aim of the evaluation is to document, analyze and assess the relevance and effectiveness of the Paris Declaration in Cambodia and its contribution to aid effectiveness and ultimately to development results, including poverty reduction.

---

<sup>1</sup> The full Declaration can be found at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf> and the Accra Agenda for Action at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/58/16/41202012.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> The Evaluations complement the monitoring of the implementation of the Paris Declaration, undertaken through the Cluster D of the OECD DAC Working Party on Aid Effectiveness “Assessing Progress on Implementing the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.”

<sup>3</sup> Wood, B; D. Kabell; F. Sagasti; N. Muwanga; Synthesis Report on the First Phase of the Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration, Copenhagen, July 2008. The report can be found at: [http://www.diis.dk/graphics/Subweb/paris\\_evaluation\\_web/index.htm](http://www.diis.dk/graphics/Subweb/paris_evaluation_web/index.htm)

7. Specific objectives include:

- To document the results achieved in Cambodia through implementing the Paris Declaration.
- To enable partner country stakeholders and development partners/agencies active in Cambodia to clarify, improve and strengthen policies and practice consistent with the Paris Declaration in pursuit of aid effectiveness and development effectiveness.<sup>4</sup>
- To highlight barriers and difficulties that may have limited the effectiveness of the Paris Declaration and its effects and impacts – and ways that these barriers and difficulties may be overcome.
- To enable sharing and exchange of experience among stakeholders, countries and partnerships so as to facilitate reflection, lesson-learning and policy improvement.

8. The Accra Agenda for Action further specified some of the Paris Declaration's commitments with the aim in particular of strengthening country ownership; building more inclusive partnerships; and sharpening the focus on development results. The Phase 2 evaluation will therefore pay particular attention to assessing implementation of these Accra commitments, which address the current concerns of many stakeholders. These Accra commitments are reflected in these ToR.

9. **Audiences, Stakeholders and Usefulness of the Evaluation:** The focus of Phase 2 is on a results oriented evaluation (a synthesis report will be presented to the High Level Forum 4 in 2011 based on all country evaluations and complementary studies). It is equally intended that the evaluation process will promote further effort to manage aid effectively.

10. Key constituencies include the executive and legislative branches of government in Cambodia, those of its bilateral development partners, and governing authorities and senior managements of development agencies. Also crucial are those tasked with implementing the Paris Declaration: government, development partners, civil society and private sector stakeholders in the partner countries as well as development partner agencies at capital/HQ level. The findings are also expected to be of direct interest to many citizens of Cambodia and of countries providing international development assistance.

11. The goal of ensuring wide dissemination and use of the evaluation by its intended audiences should influence the process and products at every stage of the evaluation, by:

- a. Keeping the central questions and key audiences constantly in sight;
- b. Using straightforward language: minimizing acronyms, jargon and unnecessary technical language in all products;
- c. Open internal communications – as in the planned knowledge-sharing system within and among teams;
- d. Building in the time required for peer exchanges, edits, strong summaries;
- e. Meeting the required deadlines for submission of draft and final reports and dissemination summaries.

National communications plans should be directly linked to key points in the national and international dialogue on aid effectiveness and MDG trends over the coming two years to build policy engagement with the study and ensure its timely contribution to the debates.

---

<sup>4</sup> In a number of participating countries, clear links are already being forged between this evaluation and other, related monitoring and evaluation activities in order to maximise the synergies, guard against duplicative work, and strengthen the usefulness of the evaluation in the country.

12. **Approach for the Cambodia Evaluation:** An approach for the overall Evaluation has been set out in the “Evaluation Framework, Work-plan and Timetable for Phase 2.” It takes account of the distinctive methodological challenges of evaluating the Paris Declaration.

13. The Phase 2 evaluation will focus on effects at the level of partner countries and their partnerships, i.e. the joint arrangements between development partners and the recipients of aid that have been put in place to support the implementation of the Declaration.

14. The Cambodia evaluation team will address:

- Implementation or “process” – assessing changes of behaviour around aid and development, both individually (Government and development partners) and within the aid partnership itself. A strong focus on the context for implementation (including one major block of evaluation questions) is designed to ensure that the evaluation remains realistic and relevant; and
- Results or outcomes in terms of aid effectiveness and development results (with “core” questions, scope and methodologies for all country evaluations, to allow meaningful aggregation and global synthesis, together with supplementary questions specific to Cambodia).

### **3. Evaluation Methodology: evaluation questions and methods**

15. **Evaluation Questions:** The evaluation draws on global preparatory work which took into account the many complex factors and relationships at work in the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the special challenges involved for evaluation methodology<sup>5</sup>.

16. The Evaluation Matrix for the Cambodia Evaluation set out in [Appendix B](#) is the principal instrument for guiding and conducting this evaluation.

17. The evaluation will: a) evaluate to what extent the Paris Declaration has been implemented; and b) in so far it has been implemented, evaluate what the results have been in terms of aid effectiveness and development results. The core questions are set out below and in Appendix B, where they are elaborated with sub-questions, together with indications of the sources of evidence

18. The order and content of the three main evaluation questions, and the framework for conclusions, successively emphasise the accepted guiding evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. This is based on 2 logic/result chain diagrams developed during the global preparatory stage and referenced as Appendix C.

#### **The Core Questions.**

**1. What are the important factors that have affected the relevance and implementation of the Paris Declaration and its potential effects on aid effectiveness and development results? (The Paris Declaration in context)**

**2. To what extent, and how, has the implementation of the Paris Declaration led to an improvement in the efficiency of aid delivery, the management and use of aid and better partnerships? (Process and intermediate outcomes)**

---

<sup>5</sup> This work, summarized in the “Approach Paper for the Phase 2 Evaluation” (May 2009) included a major workshop of the International Reference Group in Auckland, New Zealand in February 2009 and a commissioned study on “The Paris Declaration, Aid Effectiveness and Development Effectiveness” in November, 2008 (the “Linkages Study”).

**3. Has the implementation of Paris Declaration strengthened the contribution of aid to sustainable development results? How? (Development outcomes)**

**The Framework for Conclusions:**

- i. What has been the relevance of the Paris Declaration and the ways it has been implemented to the challenges of aid effectiveness?**
- ii. To what extent has each of the five principles of the Paris Declaration been observed and implemented, and the Accra Agenda priorities reflected? Why? Have there been conflicts or trade-offs between them?**
- iii. What has the Paris Declaration achieved for aid effectiveness and development results? How significant are these contributions? How sustainable? Is there evidence of better ways to make aid more effective and contribute more to development results?**
- iv. What effects has the implementation of the Declaration had on the respective burdens of aid management falling on partner countries and donors, relative to the changing volume and quality of aid and of the aid relationship itself? Are these effects likely to be transitional or long term?**
- v. What has been the added value of Paris Declaration-style development cooperation compared with the pre-Paris Declaration situation, and seen alongside other drivers of development in the country, other sources of development finance and development cooperation partners beyond those so far endorsing the Declaration?**
- vi. What are the key messages for a) national stakeholders, b) donor countries and agencies, and c) strengthening mutual accountability between them?**
- vii. What are the key implications for aid effectiveness in the future taking account of new challenges and opportunities (e.g. climate change) and new actors and relationships?**

19. **Special Challenges:** In addressing these core evaluation questions it is clear that the challenges of attributing results to a set of commitments like the Paris Declaration are especially complex. **One vital starting point is to recognize that the 2005 Declaration itself brought together a variety of reform efforts and initiatives that had been underway for some years (e.g. Strengthened national planning processes, public financial management reforms, public administration reform, Decentralisation and Deconcentration, sector reforms and programme-based/SWAp-type approaches designed to complement commitment to the Cambodia Millennium Development Goals). The evaluation should explicitly include assessment of these “upstream” or precursor steps as an integral part of its scope.**

20. Paris Declaration implementation is a multi-dimensional, multi-level process, affected by many factors which can change its direction, emphasis, and pace at different times and in response to different influences. One way of making these factors more explicit and prominent throughout the evaluation is the emphasis placed through the first question on an in-depth and dynamic analysis of the **context** for the implementation of the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda.

21. The main evaluation questions will be operationalised through a set of sub-questions including descriptive, analytical, normative and evaluative questions. Responses will be supported and/or qualified by:

- i. the types of evidence and, where applicable, indicators to be used;
- ii. the anticipated availability and (probable) reliability of data sources; and
- iii. proposed sources, methods & techniques for data collection, analysis, triangulation and validation.

22. **Key elements:** The key elements of the evaluation methodology can be summarized as follows:

- a. A “*theory based*” approach – which recognises that outcomes / results from Paris Declaration implementation may not be fully visible by the time of the Evaluation – so focuses instead on identifying the chains, directions, causes and trends of causality and the linkages involved (see points below);
- b. A “theory of change” which anticipates and explores *complexity* rather than expecting to apply simple or one-dimensional models of attribution;
- c. Seeking out and exploring the *causal mechanisms and key actors* driving or inhibiting change, their roles, inter-relations, and relative weightings in influencing outcomes (especially through Core question 1);
- d. Focused on *causality in context*: searching for common trends – “plausible contribution” - rather than (necessarily) generalised truths, but recognising that the shape, nature and pace of change is heavily determined by locally specific factors and influences;
- e. Focused on *comparability*, ensuring robust analysis at aggregate level (through e.g. the development of common standards for analytical frameworks and data collection) while giving full weight to contextual factors;
- f. A *summative and formative* model – allowing judgments around outcomes and results whilst supporting forward-looking policy development and improvement.

23. **Specific methods:** for pursuing the evaluations include:

- a. Literature and documentation review
- b. The analysis of *the most relevant existing statistical data* such as human development and poverty indicators, NSDP reports, sector strategies/reports, CMDG reports etc.;
- c. *Syntheses and meta-analyses* of existing evidence (i.e. secondary sources such as policy, evaluations and research).;
- d. *Structured surveys and questionnaires* (key informant groups) deepened by *semi-structured interviews* and *focus groups* (key stakeholders including government (different branches and levels) development partner agencies, civil society and the private sector.) Any possibilities for drawing on participative approaches will be pursued;
- e. A sectoral focus to be placed on health (which will be a common sector to be studied in all 24 partner country evaluations) and on aspects of rural development;
- f. *Backward tracking*, retrospective or inductive studies of sector, site or theme; using methodologies such as the analysis of time-series data; statistical trends; synthesis studies to assess “distance travelled” etc.;
- g. *Forward looking* analysis; which anticipates development results that are in formation but have not become fully evident, and *backward-tracking studies* as a basis for seeking plausible links in the causal chain - from Paris Declaration-style aid inputs to development results - to assess and predict the likely direction of further travel.

24. **Rigour and Comparability.** In addition to the use of the evaluation questions and methods (Appendix B), the robustness of the approach and methodology for the evaluation and its results will be further ensured by:

- a. A consistent stance in the evaluation that does not assume attribution of results to the Paris Declaration, but rather takes a critical approach and examines alternative explanations;
- b. A set of support mechanisms made available by the Core Evaluation Team, both directly and through research resources and interactive internet facilities [See Section “External Support to Country Evaluations” for detail]
- c. Verification of evidence emerging through ongoing triangulation between the multiple data sources and methods employed;
- d. Step-by-step validation of evaluation results by the evaluation team (with peer review among them encouraged), the country reference group, the Evaluation Secretariat and Management Group, possibly high level external reviewers, and the International Reference Group;
- e. Quality assurance processes that are built in to each component of the evaluation (as well as the preparation of the final synthesis report) – all are required to meet the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards, UNEG Standards, or the comparable national or regional standards where these have been adopted;
- f. Prioritizing the use of country systems to capitalize on existing data/literature including academia, universities, and civil society;
- g. Wherever possible, seeking the engagement and coverage of providers of development resources not yet formally endorsing the Paris Declaration in the capacity of development partners, and
- h. Using a set of agreed working definitions for key terms [see forthcoming Glossary] and a common style guide to ensure consistent treatment.

#### 4. Management of the Evaluation: responsibilities and accountabilities

25. **Management considerations:** The key management considerations are;

- In-country management arrangements that are operational
- Clarity on roles, responsibilities and accountabilities
- Communication with stakeholders
- Progress reporting

26. **In-country management arrangements:** The **National Evaluation Coordinator**, is the Secretary General CRDB/CDC. He is responsible for managing all aspects of the Cambodia Evaluation process including, most importantly:

- a. Selecting, setting up and then scheduling and convening meetings of the in-country National Reference Group, expected to include major stakeholders from governments, development partners, civil society and possibly academia;
- b. The recruitment and contracting of the consultants for the evaluation (with selection where possible by the National Reference Group);
- c. Bi-monthly reporting on the progress of the evaluation in line with a manageable agreed common format;
- d. Quality control; assuring that the evaluation is of acceptable quality in reference to identified relevant national, regional and/or international (DAC) standards and

drawing on the pro-active and responsive services of the Core Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Secretariat.

27. The **National Reference Group** will be responsible for the following functions:

- a. Approving the design of the pertinent evaluation that comprises a common set of evaluation questions applicable to all country level evaluations and where desired a module with supplementary, country-specific evaluation questions.
- b. Deciding on selection criteria for the evaluation consultants
- c. Serving as a resource and to provide advice and feedback to the National Coordinator
- d. Helping to ensure the independence, integrity and quality of the evaluation;
- e. Reviewing and commenting on (but not approving) the draft products of the respective country study

28. National reference groups should also have important roles to play in accessing information; exerting quality control; linking to government and engaging civil society; facilitating the necessary wider consultation; and encouraging the use and usefulness of the evaluations findings.

29. These roles will require a Group with sufficient representation from among key stakeholders, good credibility and access together with the necessary measure of independence. The tasks will imply the need for a series of dedicated inputs of time from the individual members of the National Reference Group. The National Reference Group will therefore comprise members of Government (CRDB, MoP, MEF, MoH, MAFF, MRD), development partners (JICA, Sweden, ADB, UNDP, UN Resident Coordinator's Office, World Bank and others that participate on a voluntary basis), and representatives of civil society (CCC).

30. Management will be supported by self-monitoring of progress and reflection at periodic National Reference Group meetings.

31. **Clarity on roles, responsibilities and accountabilities.** Key accountabilities in the process are:

- i. **Competent independent Country Evaluation Team selected, contracted and resourced by end-December 2009:** The National Evaluation Coordinator is accountable for this milestone being reached with the support of the National Reference Group, and for the independence of the evaluation being maintained throughout the process.
- ii. **Country Evaluation Report delivered in-country on time:** The Team Leader of the Evaluation Team is accountable for the organisation and co-ordination of the work of the evaluation team (and through this ensuring the quality and relevance of team member contributions) and assuring the delivery of emerging findings and a comprehensive final report which meets evaluation standards, within the contracted timeframe/ specifications (see Workplan schedule table below).
- iii. **Country Evaluation Report of an acceptable quality submitted to the Core Evaluation Team for use in preparing the synthesis report and publishing;** The National Evaluation Coordinator through successive processes of quality control is accountable for delivery of a report of acceptable quality for the Synthesis stage.

32. **Communication with stakeholders:** The National Reference Group is expected to develop and implement a ‘Communication Plan’ through which stakeholders for the evaluation within Cambodia will be kept informed and engaged. A variety of channels and activities should be used and opportunities maximised to link to key points in national strategic and decision-making cycles. Links should also be forged with key milestones in the international dialogue on aid effectiveness and MDGs over the coming two years to build policy engagement with the study and ensure its timely contribution to the debates.

33. Ensuring this communication and engagement takes place in a form that fosters stakeholder interest, civil society involvement, and ‘buy-in’ to the evaluation process is the responsibility of the National Reference Group.

34. **Progress reporting:** The National Evaluation Coordinator, in his role as in-country focal point for the Phase 2 Evaluation will provide the International Secretariat with bi-monthly updates (copied to the Core Evaluation Team) – starting end of December 2009 - on the status of the Cambodia evaluation process.

35. **Evaluation Timeline:** The overall Evaluation Workplan and Schedule below incorporates the sequence of key milestones for the evaluation, alongside other elements and processes at the international level.

#### **Anticipated Schedule of Work; Key Milestones**

Period/Date	Activity
Mid-December 2009	1. Finalise ToR (based on WP-EFF approved generic ToR) 2. Negotiate ToR and contract evaluation team
2 <sup>nd</sup> half Jan– mid-March 2010	Country Evaluation Team begin literature review and evaluation
Inception Report presentation (1 month into exercise)	Country Evaluation Team presentation to National Reference Group (possible mission option for core team)
Feb - April 2010 (tbc)	Regional workshop for National Coordinator and Team Leader
March 2010	Validation period of initial direction/findings Production of "first draft" by end-March
April – June 2010	Use of draft report to inform CDCF preparation (and AER)
August - October 2010	Opportunity to "fill gaps", incorporate information from global studies, data from AER 2010 and CDCF dialogue, and ensure compliance with global exercise standards
Sept 15 2010	Draft to International Management Group
Nov 1-4 2010	International meeting to discuss emerging findings
November 2010	Finalisation of country case study for global exercise
31 Dec 2010	Final study to be submitted to International Management Group

### **5. Support Arrangements for the Cambodia Evaluation**

36. **The Core Evaluation Team:** The Core Team contributes to the Phase 2 evaluation across all components at all stages: at planning and set-up; on an ongoing basis to ensure consistency and solve problems that may arise; and in the final stages when it will be expected to bring together all evaluation findings (from Cambodia and elsewhere) in a free-standing Synthesis Report. The Core Team reports and is responsible to the Evaluation Management Group through the Evaluation Secretariat.

37. **Services to Country Evaluations.** The Core Team has been in place since September 2009. With a view to ensuring the quality and integrity of all Country Evaluations and complementary studies within the overall Phase 2 Evaluation it is charged with providing the following set of support services to the Cambodia evaluation process:

- After intensive regional consultations, design for the approval of the Evaluation Management Group and the International Reference Group a “Generic Terms of Reference” for Country Evaluations that will guide data gathering and fieldwork in a way that will ensure quality and enable comparison and the synthesis of findings.

(N.B. This ToR has been adapted from the Generic ToR approved by the International Reference Group in December 2009).

- Provide professional advice on request to the National Evaluation Coordinator and members of the National Reference Group on the basis for selection, contracting and briefing of Country Evaluation Teams
- Review and collate relevant existing research and evaluations, including through a series of initial ‘Country Dossiers,’ providing the Cambodia Evaluation Team with some key references relevant to the common methodology and core questions. The Cambodia Evaluation Team themselves will then add further secondary information to the Dossier and to the wider literature review being conducted for the Phase 2 Evaluation.
- Provide ongoing advice and support to the Cambodia Evaluation Team to ensure the coherence of the evaluation and the comparability of its different elements.

38. To make best use of its support resources, the Core Evaluation Team will work both pro-actively and responsively to engage with and support the Cambodia evaluation. In addition to important arrangements for indirect support, planned/potential face to face opportunities for all country evaluations have been identified (see Table below) to help lay solid foundations and clear directions for all Country Evaluations, to support continuing adherence to evaluation standards, provide guidance if/ where evaluation teams run into problems, and facilitate sharing and learning among country teams.

**Planned/Potential face to face meetings by members of the Core Evaluation Team with Country Evaluation Processes**

Activity/ Event	Persons involved (from countries undertaking evaluation)	Face to face) with country processes
Regional Workshop II (March/April 2010)	Team Leaders of Country Evaluation Teams, National Evaluation Coordinators – and possibly other team members	All countries
Evaluation Workplan presentation (event)	Country Evaluation Team presentation to National Reference Group	Mission option for a limited number of countries
Inception Report Presentation (event) – 1 month in	Country Evaluation Team presentation to NEC and the National Reference Group	Mission option for a limited number of countries
Team analysis ‘stage’ – August	Country Evaluation Team	Mission option for the majority of countries
Draft report to National Reference Group (event)	Country Evaluation Team presentation to National Evaluation Coordinator and the National Reference Group	Mission option for a limited number of countries
International “Emerging Findings” workshop	Country Evaluation Team and National Evaluation Coordinators	All countries
Final Report to NRG	Country Evaluation Team presentation to National Evaluation Coordinator and the National Reference Group	Remote – all countries

39. The Core Evaluation Team is developing a web based knowledge management system – an “Extranet” – for the Phase 2 Evaluation. The National Evaluation Coordinator, Country Evaluation Team and National Reference Group members will have access to this facility and it will provide the channel for the sharing of guidance and progress updates between the

Core Team and the country processes. The structure of the Extranet provides a shared space and also a part of the site that can be dedicated to a particular country process.

## Appendix A

### Draft Outline for Cambodia Evaluation Report

Preface

Acknowledgement

Acronyms

Executive Summary (Max. 5 pp.)

- Purpose and background
- Overall conclusions (on common and country-specific questions)
- Key lessons (on common and country-specific questions)
- Key recommendations if applicable (on common and country-specific questions)

A. Introduction (Max. 4 pp.)

- The Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action: Engagement of Cambodia
- Purpose and scope of the Phase Two Evaluation
- Approach, methodology and limitations

B. Country Findings on the Common Evaluation Questions

1. What are the important factors that have affected the relevance and implementation of the Paris Declaration and its potential effects on aid effectiveness and development results? (The Paris Declaration in context) (10 pp. max.)

2. To what extent and how has the implementation of the Paris Declaration led to an improvement in the efficiency of aid delivery, the management and use of aid and better partnerships? (Process and intermediate outcomes) (10 pp. max.)

3. Has the implementation of Paris Declaration strengthened the contribution of aid to sustainable development results? How? (Development outcomes) (10 pp. max)

4. Framework for Conclusions (10 pp. max):

i. What has been the relevance of the Paris Declaration and the ways it has been implemented to the challenges of aid effectiveness?

ii. To what extent has each of the five principles of the Paris Declaration been observed and implemented, and the Accra Agenda priorities reflected? Why? Have there been conflicts or trade-offs between them?

iii. What has the Paris Declaration achieved for aid effectiveness and development results? How significant are these contributions? How sustainable? Is there evidence of better ways to make aid more effective and contribute more to development results?

iv. What effects has the implementation of the Declaration had on the respective burdens of aid management falling on partner countries and donors, relative to the changing volumes and quality of aid and of the aid partnership itself? Are these effects likely to be transitional or long term?

v. What has been the added value of Paris Declaration-style development cooperation compared with the pre-Paris Declaration situation, and seen alongside other drivers of development in the country, other sources of development finance and development cooperation partners beyond those so far endorsing the Declaration?

vi. What are the key messages for: a) national stakeholders, b) donor countries and agencies, and c) strengthening mutual accountability between them?

vii. What are the key implications for aid effectiveness in the future taking account of new challenges and opportunities (e.g. climate change) and new actors and relationships?

- C. Key Lessons and Recommendations (if applicable) around the Common Evaluation Questions (Max. 5 pp.)
- D. Findings on Cambodia-Specific Evaluation Questions (if adopted) (Max. 15 pp.)  
[Possible sub-headings]
- E. Key Conclusions, Lessons and Recommendations (if applicable) around Cambodia-Specific Evaluation Questions (if adopted) (Breaking out conclusions, lessons & recommendations) (Max. 5 pp.)
- F. Possible Key Implications beyond the Planned Term of the Paris Declaration. (Max. 3 pp.)

Annex 1: Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness

Annex 2: The Accra Agenda for Action

Annex 3: Generic Terms of Reference for Country Level Evaluations

Annex 4: Specific Terms of Reference for the Cambodia Evaluation

Annex 4: Selected Additional References.

## Appendix B

### Evaluation Matrix for Cambodia Evaluation

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Suggested types of evidence & where possible, indicators	Likely sources of data	Methods & techniques for data collection, analysis and validation
<b>1. “What are the important factors that have affected the relevance and implementation of the Paris Declaration and its potential effects on aid effectiveness and development results?” (The Paris Declaration in context)</b>			
<p>a) What are the key characteristics of the country that have been most relevant to the implementation of the PD?</p> <p>(Ensuring analytical not descriptive treatment)</p>	<p>i. Human development, social and poverty indicators</p> <p>ii. Key economic features, issues and trends</p> <p>iii. External and domestic resource mobilization patterns, place of aid</p> <p>iv. Indicators of governance and fragility. (The rule of law and a functioning legislature, and respect of human rights are likely to be key conditions)</p> <p>v. Social indicators (health, education, gender, vulnerability)</p> <p>vi. National development strategies and national aid strategy, outcome based M&amp;E</p> <p>vii. Recent political factors, changes and developments that affect the aid arena</p> <p>viii. Capacity development needs/priorities</p>	<p>NSDP reports / Census/survey data Donor docs (WB studies, UNDP NHDRs)</p> <p>MEF reports</p> <p>AER (2007 &amp; 2008) CG/CDCF &amp; Partnership work/initiative Studies/evaluations/speeches</p> <p>CG/CDCF reports (governance) Independent surveys/reports</p> <p>Sector reports/studies NSDP APRs</p> <p>NSDP</p> <p>RS and RS-II SFDCM, NOG/SOPs, CDRI studies? Emerging donor work</p> <p>TC Guideline Sector analysis</p>	<p>Review, compilation and processing of statistical data</p> <p>Review, analysis and summary of documents, including policies, strategies and plans, reviews, evaluations and other reports (national, international)</p> <p>Preparation of focused briefing reviews</p>
<p>b) What is the place of aid subject to PD principles among all sources of development finance and resources? What have been the trends from early roots to 2005 and since?”</p>	<p>i. Pre and post PD trends in Official Development Assistance shares and components of external and overall development finance and national resource mobilisation, (incl. private</p>	<p>AER (CG docs) MEF, MoC, CIB data</p>	<p>What have been the trends from early roots to 2005 and since? Review, compilation and processing of statistical data, evaluative and monitoring materials.</p>

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Suggested types of evidence & where possible, indicators	Likely sources of data	Methods & techniques for data collection, analysis and validation
	<p>investment trade receipts, remittances, etc.) Scale and importance of relationships with different donors.</p> <p>ii. What shares and types of ODA flows in turn are in practice subject to PD principles? Why?</p> <p>iii. Ensure appropriate coverage of technical cooperation, South-South and triangular cooperation, and sources of development cooperation not covered by the PD.</p>	<p>AER</p> <p>TC study (2008) AER</p>	<p>Review and summary of documents (national, international, independent). Preparation of tables, briefing notes</p> <p>Survey of the economic activities, sectors, regions, programs, projects, issues and drivers that fall outside the purview of the Paris Declaration.</p> <p>Semi structured interviews &amp; focus groups with informed respondents</p> <p>Possible use of adapted 'sphere of influence' (outcome mapping) model for analysis.</p>
<p>c) Which are the key actors, in the country and among its development partners, who can take major decisions on aid?</p> <p>What influence do the Paris Declaration and AAA commitments have on them, in relation to their other priorities and incentives?</p> <p>As a result of PD/AAA, how have civil society organisations in particular: a) developed their own individual and collective capacity to participate in (and contribute to) national development efforts; b) identified and exploited opportunities for doing so; and, c) been able to meet obligations of accountability, transparency and results-focus that is implied for them in PD/AAA?</p>	<p>i. Maps of the relevant major decisions (annually, over the period since 2005)?</p> <p>ii. Identification of the relevant key decision-makers. Maps of the key objectives, interests, capacities, priorities and motivations of key actors on both sides of the aid relationships in this country, relative to the commitments of the PD and AAA. (This evidence is related to, but goes beyond, the "commitment, capacities and incentives" surveyed in Phase 1.) Taking account of changing relations with key donors, parliament, local government, civil society, private sector and media actors.</p> <p>iii. Coherence between donor/agency HQs and field actors should be assessed.</p> <p>iv. Possible supplementary study</p>	<p>CG/CDCF/GDCC minutes RS and RS-II</p> <p>CDCF/GDCC statements PD survey, 2008 evaluation RGC/DP papers/reviews Global policies &amp; donor HQ work</p> <p>PD survey, 2008 evaluation Global policies &amp; donor HQ work New DP self-assessment?</p>	<p>Document analysis, decision mapping, stats., meta-analysis &amp; semi structured interviews &amp; focus groups with a wide range of informed respondents e.g. including current and former officials, at different levels of government, donor representatives and observers, legislators, civil society, media, scholars</p>
<p>d. What are the most important national and international events that have affected the implementation of the Paris Declaration and Accra priorities, and how?</p>	<p>I. Identification of key issues affecting the aid arena in Cambodia: e.g. Changing political priorities, governance reforms, economic conditions, civil unrest, natural &amp; man-made disasters, new resources (internal or external), decentralization,</p>	<p>Drawn from above</p>	<p>Literature and document review, meta analysis, semi structured interviews, focus groups with key stakeholders to include government, civil society and parliamentarians, or possibly surveys with informed respondents</p>

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Suggested types of evidence & where possible, indicators	Likely sources of data	Methods & techniques for data collection, analysis and validation
How have the core reforms (PAR, PFM, D&D) been influenced by the PD, especially with regard to supporting capacity development through improved technical cooperation and by strengthening/using national systems?	changing relations with key donors, new entrants.  ii. Assessments of PD influence on them, if any?		
e. To what extent and where have the PD principles been implemented? Why and how?	i. Evidence (documentary, institutional, and other) of how the different PD principles have been interpreted, weighted and implemented in the country? Why? ii. Since when? (e.g., pre-2005, later?) ii. Evidence of any tensions or tradeoffs emerging between the different principles.	AER PD survey Evaluation 2008  CG papers (inputs to Rome HLF-1)	Document & literature review, meta analysis, questionnaires & semi structured interviews & focus groups with informed respondents. Phase 1 type analysis needed to supplement Monitoring Survey results on other commitments.
<b>2. “To what extent and how has the implementation of the Paris Declaration led to an improvement in the efficiency of aid delivery, the management and use of aid and better partnerships?” (Process and intermediate outcomes)</b>			
Note: It is proposed that the interest in assessing progress related to inefficiencies in aid processes, the weight of the resulting burdens, and who bears them, will mainly be treated under the respective intended outcomes below (e.g., numbers ii., iv., v., and viii.) as well as in a summative question (see “Framework for Conclusions”)			
<p><b>Sub-questions: The main means to provide answers to Core question 2 will be to assess the progress achieved in realizing each of the 11 following intended outcomes that were directly specified in the opening Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Declaration itself, reflecting as well the further political emphases and priorities brought out in the Accra Agenda for Action.</b></p> <p><b>Note 1:</b> While there are serious challenges in assessing and measuring achievement in some of these areas, this list, <b>if taken as a whole</b>, has an incontestable standing as the principal base for evaluation the effects of the Declaration.</p>	<p>Assessments against each of these intended outcomes could be focused on changed activities, behaviour, and relationships.</p> <p>In providing answers to these sub-questions, the only feasible across-the-board source is likely to be a standard survey of informed respondents as a key element in each country evaluation. (Finding a good, balanced, and adequately informed range of respondents will be a challenge in most cases.)</p> <p>Since in Phase 2 the country evaluations are designed to provide the most important means of assessing donor implementation of the PD commitments, it will be important to get beyond aggregate</p>	<p>As above:</p> <p>Berlin speech (June 2009)</p>	<p>Other:</p> <p>Monitoring Survey sheds some light on some expected outcomes, but unevenly. Qualitative analysis of consultation and decisions taken in Dialogues/ Coordination Processes.</p> <p>Analysis of information from country reports and donor reports with specific reference to policy changes and decisions making processes arising out of PD. Quantitative analysis of changes in Budget allocations over the years with plausible links to harmonization and alignment moves.</p> <p>Evidence of trends in the span and distribution of national management/ donor management of aid.</p> <p>Key informant interviews on inputs into policy and supporting structures</p> <p>Focus group discussions on supporting structures that allows civil society and the</p>

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Suggested types of evidence & where possible, indicators	Likely sources of data	Methods & techniques for data collection, analysis and validation
<p><b>Note 2:</b> The 11 intended outcomes are clustered below under the main action headings of the AAA, and the Accra emphases can be drawn out further in pursuing individual questions.</p>	<p>assessments of implementation by “the donors” as an undifferentiated group. Responses may also be quite different on different commitments by the same donor/agency. Thus it will be important to design ways of assessing at least the range of different donor records of implementation and examples of greater and lesser advances, if not actual ratings or rankings.</p> <p>It is very likely that some issues will be found more applicable than others, depending on different country situations. If so, this too will be a finding.</p> <p>Survey responses would then be elaborated through structured and semi-structured interviews, analyses of context under Question 1, and findings triangulated against the most recent monitoring survey results and trends where relevant (see individual points below), and other monitoring, evaluative and research findings (e.g., the EU Code of Conduct on Division of Labour and Complementarity or the Monterrey Consensus.)</p>		<p>private sector a voice in policy making and a “watchdog” role.</p>
<p><b>A. Country ownership over development</b>  In addition to assessing progress against the sub-questions below, with their specific and sometimes technical aspects, a broader assessment of progress is needed against this central principle, highlighted again at Accra, with its critical political and behavioural dimensions. The proposed survey instruments and related methods should seek specific assessments of progress against this overarching objective - specifically focused on changed activities, behaviour, and relationships. The Accra commitments may point to some further sub-questions. All this will contribute to the aggregate assessment against the principles in the Conclusions.</p>			
<p>i. <u>Stronger</u> national strategies and frameworks?</p>	<p>e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 1 provide a partial source and cross-check. Phase 1 reports relevant</p>		
<p>ii. <u>Increased</u> alignment of aid with partner countries’ priorities, systems and procedures, help to strengthen capacities?</p>	<p>e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 3, 5a, 5b and 6 provide a partial source and cross-check. Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant.</p>		

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Suggested types of evidence & where possible, indicators	Likely sources of data	Methods & techniques for data collection, analysis and validation
How has the PD influenced the integration of planning/budgeting/aid? With what results?	Note: Need to test against AAA priority on increased and appropriate support for capacity development.		
iii. <u>Defined</u> measures and standards of performance and accountability of partner country systems in public financial management, procurement, fiduciary standards and environmental assessments, in line with broadly accepted good practices and their quick and widespread application?	e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 2 provide a partial source and cross-check. Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant		
<p><b>B. Building more inclusive and effective partnerships for development</b></p> <p>In addition to assessing progress against the sub-questions below, with their specific and sometimes technical aspects, a broader assessment of progress is needed against this central political objective, highlighted again at Accra. The proposed survey instruments and related methods should seek assessments on this - specifically focused on changed activities, behaviour, and relationships. The Accra commitments may point to some further sub-questions.</p>			
iv. <u>Less</u> duplication of efforts and rationalized, more cost-effective donor activities	e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicators 4, 9, and 10 provide a partial source and cross-check. Phase 1 reports relevant. Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant		
v. <u>Reformed</u> and <u>simplified</u> donor policies and procedures, more collaborative behaviour	Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant  Evidence that the "Making Partnerships Effective" initiative has facilitated improved partnership dynamics (and remaining challenges ahead)		
vi. <u>More</u> predictable and multi-year commitments on aid flows to committed partner countries. [Has the nature of conditionalities been changed to support ownership in line with the AAA commitment (para. 25)]	e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 7 provide a partial source and cross-check. Progress on untying, an Accra Agenda priority, could be treated here, with reference to Monitoring Survey Indicator 8. Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant		
vii. <u>Sufficient</u> delegation of authority to donors' field staff, and adequate attention to incentives for effective partnerships between donors and partner countries	Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant		

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Suggested types of evidence & where possible, indicators	Likely sources of data	Methods & techniques for data collection, analysis and validation
viii. <u>Sufficient</u> integration of global programmes and initiatives into partner countries' broader development agendas.	Note: This question has taken on more precise elements since this phrasing in 2005. Evidence existing evaluations: e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicators 3, 6, and 9 provide a partial source and cross-check. Possible supplementary study		
<b>C. Delivering and accounting for development results</b> In addition to assessing progress against the sub-questions below, with their specific and sometimes technical aspects, a broader assessment of progress is needed against this central principle, highlighted again at Accra in its political context. The proposed survey instruments and related methods should seek assessments on this - specifically focused on changed activities, behaviour, and relationships – and contribute to the aggregate assessments under question 3 and in the Conclusions. The Accra commitments may point to some further sub-questions.			
ix. <u>Stronger</u> partner countries' capacities to develop and implement results-driven national strategies	e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 11 provide a partial source and cross-check. Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports relevant		
x. <u>Enhanced</u> respective accountability of countries and donors to citizens and parliaments <u>Enhanced</u> respective accountability of countries and donors to citizens and parliaments	Phase 1 suggested that achieving this original expected outcome of the Declaration appeared to be the most important concrete way of advancing the central principle of mutual accountability, highlighted again at Accra. The proposed survey instruments and related methods should seek assessments on this - specifically focused on changed activities, behaviour, and relationships. e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 12 provide a (very) partial additional source and cross-check. Phase 1 and donor/agency HQ reports will be relevant. The Accra commitment on access to the requisite information is key.		
xi. <u>Less</u> corruption and more transparency, strengthening public support and supporting effective resource mobilisation and allocation.	e.g. Monitoring survey results on Indicator 2 provide a (very) partial source and cross-check		
xii. Implementation of the general commitment in para. 50 of the Declaration	Many of these AAA commitments are specific and time-bound enough to be	Evidence that the "Making Partnerships Effective" initiative has facilitated	

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Suggested types of evidence & where possible, indicators	Likely sources of data	Methods & techniques for data collection, analysis and validation
and the specific mutual commitments in the Accra Agenda for Action (Para. 24) on transparency and accountability for development results, including its detailed points on transparency, mutual assessment reviews, strengthening international accountability mechanisms, and measures to fight corruption on both sides.	directly assessed in individual country evaluations, and thus contribute to the Synthesis, alongside the general results on Monitoring Survey Indicator 12.	improved partnership dynamics (and remaining challenges ahead)	
<b>D. Have there been unintended consequences of the Paris Declaration for aid effectiveness? Is there evidence of better ways to make aid more effective?</b>			
<b>3. “Has the implementation of Paris Declaration strengthened the contribution of aid to sustainable development results? How?” (Development outcomes)</b>  <b>[Note: the Paris Declaration’s own statement of intended effects (Paragraph. 2) to:</b> <b>“Increase the impact of aid in:</b> <b>1. Reducing poverty</b> <b>2. Reducing inequality</b> <b>3. Increasing growth</b> <b>4. Building capacity</b> <b>5. Accelerating achievement of MDGs”</b>			
a) Were results in specific sectors enhanced through the application of the PD principles?  (Health to be used as a “tracer sector across all country evaluations, combined with the theme of rural development selected by Cambodia)	i. Evidence of distance and trajectories of change in relation to PD principles.  ii. Sectoral performance pre and post PD type actions. Categorization of PD-type influence (see context sections above).  iii. Evidence of prevalence of PD type approaches by sector. Relevant evidence of results and performance by sector and plausible contributions.	Existing official and independent literature including government, donor and civil society reports, existing evaluations and monitoring reports, annual reports of line ministries & sector reports parliamentary decisions and reports, informed assessments  Existing evaluations and monitoring reports, annual reports of line ministries & sector reports.  Parliamentary Reports. Independent studies  Grey literature (internal reports, working documents, electronic newsletters, blogs)	Existing evaluations and monitoring reports, annual reports of line ministries & sector reports. Parliamentary Reports. Independent studies Grey literature (internal reports, working documents, electronic newsletters, blogs)  Mapping and weighting of possible contributory factors; Meta analyses;  Comparative study of sectors; possible surveys.
b) Did the implementation of the PD help countries to improve the prioritisation of	i. Evidence of: explicit exclusion analysis and policy / strategy / programmatic &	NSDP MTR AER (for alignment)	Mapping and weighting of possible contributory factors. Document & budget

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Suggested types of evidence & where possible, indicators	Likely sources of data	Methods & techniques for data collection, analysis and validation
the needs of the poorest people, including women and girls, and reduce social exclusion?"	and sector responses; relevant institutional mechanisms; gender and exclusion-related budgetary allocations and expenditure flows; pro-poor, gender responsive priorities in national strategies, budgets; expenditure flows and other measures to/for social inclusion. ii. National data disaggregation by region, sex, excluded group etc. iii. Evidence on distance and trajectories of change.	Sector work (health, rural development)	analyses;  Correlations, historical & statistical analyses & select case studies where preliminary data/information show powerful correlations; Meta analysis of national development outcomes, strategies and budgets  [Note: possible supplementary study required]
c) How and why has the mix of aid modalities (including general or sector-specific budget support) evolved, what effect has the Paris Declaration had on different modalities, and what have been the development results?"	There is evidence of increased use of co-financing and/or delegated cooperation arrangements by some development partners. Have these been influenced by aid effectiveness or operational factors? What has been the effect on aid delivery and management?  Have trends towards PBAs represented an effective effort to 'manage diversity' as an alternative to implementing a 'Division of Labour'-style arrangement?		
d) Has PD implementation led to sustainable increases in institutional capacities and social capital at all levels to deliver services and to respond to development challenges? Why, how and where, and what are the effects?  Have networks (e.g. TWGs, TWG Network, informal donor lunch) provided additional value to formal mechanisms in building effective partnerships (and built complementary capacities)? Why? With what lessons?	Check against 3 commitments in AAA on capacity development and 5 on use of country systems: i. Evidence of changes in: administrative capacities among all development actors, including CSOs; ii. ability to consult with and account to stakeholders; iii. partnership working and network formation; iv. learning by doing; v. decentralisation; vi. effective regulation; vii. policy and strategic monitoring; viii. evaluation and reporting.	Existing evaluations, assessments on technical cooperation. Relevant Progress  Reports of Country Implementation Agencies  "Making Partnerships Effective" initiative  Minutes of meetings of the Co-ordination Mechanisms.  Informed assessments / survey data	Trends/assessments of PD-driven capacity development support. Major assessments on technical cooperation.  Survey, appreciative inquiry, Most significant change. Key informant interviews.
e) Has the implementation of the PD had			

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Suggested types of evidence & where possible, indicators	Likely sources of data	Methods & techniques for data collection, analysis and validation
unintended consequences for development results, negative or positive? Is there evidence of better ways to make aid contribute more to development results?			
<p>f) Has the PD enhanced ODA's impact on achieving the goals of the national development strategy and the MDGs?</p> <p>What, in particular, is the role of (and link between) ownership, capacity and motivation/incentive/accountability in securing outcome-level results?</p>	<p>i. Distance and trajectories of change, pre-and post PD-type changes. ii. Mapping and weighting of possible contributory factors.</p>	<p>Existing evaluations and monitoring reports. National reports on development strategies</p> <p>AER</p> <p>MDG reports and statistics (on-track / off-track)</p> <p>Statistical data (WB indicators, WB Development Finance report, IMF, OECD Secretariat, national statistical offices, ministries of finance, WB governance indicators, UNDP etc.</p> <p>Economist Intelligence Unit, UNDP reports, press reports, etc.</p>	<p>Correlations, historical &amp; statistical analyses &amp; possibly select case studies where preliminary data/information suggest correlations</p>
<b>4. Framework for Conclusions</b>			
<p>i. What has been the relevance of the Paris Declaration and the ways it has been implemented to the challenges of aid effectiveness?</p> <p>ii. To what extent has each of the five principles of the Paris Declaration been observed and implemented, and the Accra Agenda priorities reflected? Why? Have there been conflicts or trade-offs between them?</p> <p>iii. What has the Paris Declaration achieved for aid effectiveness and development results? How significant are these contributions? How sustainable? Is there evidence of better ways to make aid</p>			

Proposed Core Evaluation Questions & Sub-questions	Suggested types of evidence & where possible, indicators	Likely sources of data	Methods & techniques for data collection, analysis and validation
<p>more effective and contribute more to development results?</p> <p>iv. What effects has the implementation of the Declaration had on the respective burdens of aid management falling on partner countries and donors, relative to the changing volumes and quality of aid and of the aid partnership itself? Are these effects likely to be transitional or long term?</p> <p>v. What has been the added value of Paris Declaration-style development cooperation compared with the pre-PD situation, and seen alongside other drivers of development in the country, other sources of development finance and development cooperation partners beyond those so far endorsing the Declaration?</p> <p>vi. What are the key messages for a) national stakeholders, b) donor countries and agencies, and c) strengthening mutual accountability between them?</p> <p>vii. What are the key implications for aid effectiveness in the future taking account of new challenges and opportunities (e.g. climate change) and new actors and relationships?</p>	<p>The burdens and benefits involved might be analysed in relation to the transactional functions of “search,” “bargaining and decision” and “policing and enforcement” following the suggestions of the commissioned concept paper by A. Lawson on “Transaction Costs”. The metaphor from Economics needs to be adapted in light of the distinctive stakes in aid relationships, and the aspiration for “partnership.”</p>		

## Appendix C

### Logical results chains (from global preparatory work)

These diagrams attempt to describe the results chain and relationship between aid effectiveness and development results. They are drawn from earlier global work.

