

ANEXO B DA AVALIAÇÃO DA DECLARAÇÃO DE PARIS EM MOÇAMBIQUE: MATRIZ DO PAÍS

Joint Evaluation of the Paris Declaration, Phase 2

Operational Matrix for Country Evaluations

For Evaluation Team Leaders and Members: Understanding and using this Matrix as a working tool.

- 1. Do not be alarmed by the number of points or pages here.** This matrix has been designed and developed to make your task of answering the evaluation questions and sub-questions easier, and yield comparable evaluation findings for the whole Evaluation.
- 2. Keep the program theory of the Paris Declaration in view.** It is important to keep constantly in mind the Note on the Program Theory+ and the annexed diagrams, which help locate all the questions, data and ultimately findings emerging from the matrix.
- 3. Use basic materials to get a faster start.** With the support of the Evaluation Management Group, the Core Team has identified a standard set of key documents that need to be collected by all National Coordinators (with the support of Reference Groups) and provided to Teams. These materials will form a key part of the Country Dossier and should ensure that the most fundamental documentary sources are available at the outset, saving the Teams from expending a lot of time in searching out these materials. Discrepancies between data sets should be noted.
- 4. Balance comprehensiveness, emphases and level of effort.** All the Evaluation questions and sub-questions need to be dealt with, even if in some rare instances it is simply to show that a sub-question is not relevant to the particular country situation, and why not. With respect to the selected progress markers and related indicator(s), the aim is to use several good measures where possible (both quantitative and qualitative), to triangulate and cross-check data/ information as a basis for reaching a judgement on progress. In some cases, Teams will find that not all progress markers or indicators can be reliably sourced or used in their particular evaluations. Where Teams meet major difficulties in finding reliable trend data for these multiple measures, they should not invest excessive time and effort; but move on having documented where data is not readily available and reasons for this. If critical gaps remain, they can be identified at the draft stage and remedied wherever possible. Disaggregate all data whenever possible by gender and excluded group.
- 5. Use the interview guide strategically.** The interview guide is designed to answer questions in the matrix that need to be covered or supplemented by informed respondent interviews. Interviewers need to keep very much in mind that most such interviewees - given their particular responsibilities and backgrounds - will only be knowledgeable on some of the questions in the interview guide. Thus they should be asked first about the areas where they are most informed, and then offered the chance to respond in other areas, but without necessarily expecting that all will be covered in each interview.
- 6. Explain rating judgements.** The rating scales used have been carefully selected. The matrix will not try to pre-define the criteria for rating judgements each Team will need to determine their own meaning behind a particular point on the rating scale. Teams will also need to apply their own weighting across one or more indicators when reaching judgements on progress and in forming overall conclusions at the end of each core question section.
- 7. Refer to the outline of the Country Evaluation Report.** Ensure that the focus of the narrative of the report is on analysis and that effort of the Team is proportionate to the length of each report section (as indicated in the Generic ToR).
- 8. Establish a basis for sampling donors/agencies for a particular indicator.** At a minimum take the sub-set of the five largest (financial flows) donors/ agencies present. This could be extended through a purposefully selected cross section of donors/ agencies reflecting differences in size, type of agency (bilateral, multi-lateral, Global Programme etc) or performance to date on a particular parameter (strong/ weak). In isolated cases data for the whole set of donors/ agencies may be readily available.

Core Q1. “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)

Key Characteristics of the Country: Poverty/Development Status	Sources of Evidence / Indicators	Methods / Forms of Analysis (see Annex A, section 2)	Categories for Analysis & Judgements
1a) What are the key characteristics of the country that have been most relevant to the implementation of the Paris Declaration?			
Baseline (2000) plus changes identified between 2005 and 2010 (milestones of 2005 & 2009)			
<p>i. Human development, social and poverty conditions including gender equity.</p>	<p>At a minimum refer to country specific data within the following global sources (see Country Profile, Section 3 Country Dossier), complemented by standardised/ agreed data sets in the country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Development Index (UNDP) • World Bank Poverty Assessments: Proportion of population below national poverty line (World Bank/ National) • MDG Progress Reports (on track/ off track) (UNDP) • Gender and Empowerment (GEM) status (UNDP/ UN Genderstats) • Gender and Development Index (GDI) (UNDP/ UN Genderstats) • Gini co-efficient (UNDP) 	A, B	<p>Description of broad contextual/ structural conditions of the country noting and analysing trends including the pace of change in respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Economic & social conditions ➤ Governance ➤ Development strategy ➤ Aid management policy ➤ Level and source of ODA

Key Characteristics of the Country: Poverty/Development Status	Sources of Evidence / Indicators	Methods / Forms of Analysis (see Annex A, section 2)	Categories for Analysis & Judgements
ii. Key economic features, issues and trends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GDP / GNI per capita (World Bank/ National) • Doing Business indicators (World Bank) • Creditor Reporting System reports (OECD-DAC) • Global Competitiveness Reports (2005/ 2010) World Economic Forum • International Trade and tariff statistics (WTO/ UNCTAD) 	A, B	
iii. Governance and fragility (the rule of law and a functioning legislature, and respect of human rights are likely to be key conditions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Africa: Ibrahim Index • CPIA (World Bank) • List of Fragile States (World Bank) 	A	
iv. National development strategies ¹ (NDS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence/ absence and date of National Development Strategies (or equivalent) and revisions • Key priorities in the NDS 	A	

¹ The Term National Development Strategy (NDS) is used here as it is applied in the Paris Declaration; namely, to include poverty reduction and similar overarching strategies, as well as sector and thematic strategies.

Key Characteristics of the Country: Poverty/Development Status	Sources of Evidence / Indicators	Methods / Forms of Analysis (see Annex A, section 2)	Categories for Analysis & Judgements
v. Organisation of Government; aid management, decentralisation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of key actors in the development process (Government, Civil society & Private Sector). • Presence/ absence and date of national Aid Management Policy statements/ revisions • Constitutional arrangements; nature and extent of decentralisation. 	A, F	
vi. External and domestic resource mobilisation patterns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National sources • Levels of Official Development Assistance; International Development Statistics (OECD) • Major development actors: International Development Statistics (OECD) 	A, B	
1b) What are the most important national and international events that have affected [in the country] the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action priorities, and how?			
Changes identified between 2005 - 2010			

Key Characteristics of the Country: Poverty/Development Status	Sources of Evidence / Indicators	Methods / Forms of Analysis (see Annex A, section 2)	Categories for Analysis & Judgements
<p>i. Identification of key issues that have / are influencing the aid arena in country: For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political priorities and policy reforms, governance reforms, decentralisation. • Economic conditions; both domestic and international macro level changes e.g. financial crisis, including changes in donor countries influencing future aid flows. • Civil unrest, natural & man-made disasters. • New resources (internal or external). • Radical changes in relations with key donors, new entrants • National / international drivers e.g. upcoming High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness. 		A, C, D	<p>Among possible list of influences, identify those that are important and rank the significance of each in terms of its implications for the implementation of the PD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Very significant</i> • <i>Quite significant</i> • <i>Limited significance</i> • <i>Insignificant</i> • <i>Did not occur</i> <p>The Degree of change in the wider environment affecting the aid arena since 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Very significant change</i> • <i>Quite significant change</i> • <i>Limited change</i> • <i>Very limited change</i> • <i>No change</i>
<p>1c) 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>Baseline (2000) plus changes identified between 2005 – 2010 (milestones of 2005 & 2009)</p>			

Key Characteristics of the Country: Poverty/Development Status	Sources of Evidence / Indicators	Methods / Forms of Analysis (see Annex A, section 2)	Categories for Analysis & Judgements
i. Pre and post PD trends in Official Development Assistance shares and components of external and overall development finance and national resource mobilisation (inc. private investment, trade receipts, remittances etc.).	OECD-DAC statistics on Official Development Assistance and other development finance ² (alongside other international sources ó World Bank, UNDP, etc.) Financial flows through South-south programmes National budget / forecasts on revenue Trade receipts Remittance inflows as % of GDP / ODA Levels / sources of new resources (internal or external) Private sector investment (domestic / external ó FDI etc)	A, B	Aid / ODA as a proportion of GDP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Significant increase</i> • <i>Slight increase</i> • <i>Stable</i> • <i>Slight decline</i> • <i>Significant decline</i> Aid / ODA as a proportion of total national budget (and as a proportion of capital/ development budget) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Significant increase</i> • <i>Slight increase</i> • <i>Stable</i> • <i>Slight decline</i> • <i>Significant decline</i>
ii. How the government ó donor/agency landscape has evolved; how close and how important is the relationship with different donors? New entrants/ new sources of development finance?	Reports Government/ Donor Forums.	D	Breakdown of aid modalities: <i>1st level</i> ; distinction between on budget and off budget
iii. How is the delivery of aid organised, e.g. is there a strong coordinating Ministry, is there a joint assistance strategy? What are the key modalities used?	Major shifts in Partner Government (sectoral) spending and in donor/ agency aid (sectoral) commitments	A	<i>2nd level</i> ; distinction using the categorisation adopted by the country. This is likely to cover a number of categories (that may overlap);

² The Core Evaluation Team will provide the compilation of best available international sources and statistics to all Country Teams in relation to these questions, for them to cross-check, widen and deepen from national sources (e.g. National ODA database) wherever possible.

Key Characteristics of the Country: Poverty/Development Status	Sources of Evidence / Indicators	Methods / Forms of Analysis (see Annex A, section 2)	Categories for Analysis & Judgements
<p>iv. What shares and types of ODA flows in turn are in practice subject to PD principles?</p> <p>Note: <i>Ensure appropriate coverage of technical cooperation, South-South and triangular cooperation, NGOs/CSOs and faith-based groups, and other sources of development cooperation not covered by the PD.</i></p> <p>See Guidance Note on “What is Aid”</p>	<p>Proportion of total ODA from PD signatories</p> <p>Modalities (proportion of PD-type aid using programme-based approaches (GBS, SBS etc)</p> <p>Number/ volume of Global Programs.</p>	<p>A, B</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project aid • Technical co-operation. • Sector support (e.g. sector wide approaches and sector narrow approaches such as single issue support) • General Budget Support • Other programme aid • Fellowships, scholarships etc. • Other (specify e.g. humanitarian assistance) <p>Estimated share of total aid provided from sources not yet endorsing PD.</p> <p>Development and use of joint co-operation strategies / joint institutional structures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant increase [volume terms] • Slight increase • Stable • Slight decline • Significant decline
<p>1d) Which are the key actors, in the country and among its development partners, who take major decisions on aid? What influence do the Paris Declaration and AAA commitments have on them, in relation to their other priorities and incentives?</p>			
<p>Changes identified between 2005 - 2010</p>			
<p>i. Chronology of major decisions taken by Partner Government and donors/ agencies affecting the level and nature of ODA</p>	<p>Key points in budget and spending estimates cycles, main aid consultations and pledging sessions, joint performance reviews, if applicable</p>	<p>A, D</p>	<p>Proportion of total resource flows (including ODA) to decentralised structures</p>

Key Characteristics of the Country: Poverty/Development Status	Sources of Evidence / Indicators	Methods / Forms of Analysis (see Annex A, section 2)	Categories for Analysis & Judgements
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 the country, relative to the commitments of the PD and AAA. Taking account of changing relations with key donors, parliament, local government and decentralised funding, civil society, organisations representing women and excluded groups, private sector and media actors.	This evidence is related to, but goes beyond, the commitment, capacities and incentives surveyed in Phase 1.	C, F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Significant increase</i> • <i>Slight increase</i> • <i>Stable</i> • <i>Slight decline</i> • <i>Significant decline</i> <p>Level of delegated authority over donor / agency decisions at country level (e.g. decisions on financial approvals and decisions on new areas of/ additional support]</p>
iii. Consistency / degree of decentralised decision-making between donor/agency HQs and country Field Offices.		A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Significant increase</i> • <i>Slight increase</i> • <i>Stable</i> • <i>Slight decline</i> • <i>Significant decline</i>
iv. Who takes direct responsibility for PD implementation within national government?		A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Significant increase</i> • <i>Slight increase</i> • <i>Stable</i> • <i>Slight decline</i> • <i>Significant decline</i>
v. How many different donors are active and what shares of aid are provided by each? How concentrated is the donor community (i.e. shares of total aid provided by the top third, middle third and bottom third of contributors by volume).		A, B	
vi. Who are perceived as the five most important donors? Why? What institutional and financial resources do they direct to the implementation of the PD agenda in-country?		A, B	
vii. What are the mechanisms for parliamentary, public and civil society oversight of the budget and aid allocations?		A	

Key Characteristics of the Country: Poverty/Development Status	Sources of Evidence / Indicators	Methods / Forms of Analysis (see Annex A, section 2)	Categories for Analysis & Judgements
1e) To what extent and where have the PD principles been implemented?			
Baseline (2000) plus changes identified between 2005 – 2010 (milestones of 2005 & 2009)			
i. How have the different PD principles been interpreted, weighted and implemented in the country? Since when have they been implemented in the country? (e.g., pre-2005, later)	Shifts pre-2005 towards aid effectiveness discussion / processes / mechanisms, if relevant Date of adoption / endorsement of PD	A, C, D	Length and duration of engagement with PD (from 2005) in aid effectiveness agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Very significant engagement</i> • <i>Quite significant engagement</i> • <i>Limited engagement</i> • <i>Very limited engagement</i> • <i>No engagement</i>
ii. What have been formal statements and changes around PD implementation (implementation plan, Aid Management Policy, PD progress reports, consultations on e.g. AAA etc)	National level PD implementation strategy / targets Country progress reports re: PD implementation plan Brief updating of key Phase 1 evaluation results (where applicable.)	A	Length and duration of engagement prior to 2005 with PD like aid effectiveness agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Very significant engagement</i> • <i>Quite significant engagement</i> • <i>Limited engagement</i> • <i>Very limited engagement</i> • <i>No engagement</i>

<i>Conclusions on the Paris Declaration in context:</i>	
<p>A. Status and relevance of the aid effectiveness agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political engagement / take-up • Evidence of a level of continuing interest and engagement in the aid effectiveness agenda among key stakeholders 	<p>Take-up and application of the aid effectiveness agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Very significant take-up and application</i> • <i>Quite significant take-up and application</i> • <i>Limited take-up and application</i> • <i>Very limited take-up and application</i> • <i>No take-up and application</i> <hr/> <p>Evidence of continued interest / engagement in the aid effectiveness agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial interest / engagement</i> • <i>Some interest / engagement</i> • <i>Little interest / engagement</i> • <i>No interest / engagement</i> • <i>Reduced interest / engagement</i>
<p>B. What have been the main influences 2005-2010 that have affected the ways aid has worked?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accra Agenda for Action • Changes in the aid environment (donors, government actors, laws and regulations around aid) • Changes in national context (political change / unrest, political economy factors, change of government, natural disasters, changing population profile etc) • Changes in international context (economic volatility, impacts of climate change etc) 	
<p>C. Extent of adoption / implementation of the PD principles, and explanation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What have been the key factors influencing the extent of adoption/ implementation • Any evidence of perceived tensions / tradeoffs between principles? • Interest in and initiatives with regards to alternative approaches (not directly associated with the Paris Declaration) to aid effectiveness at country level 	

Core Q2. “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)

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
<i>Intended state of the aid relationship at country level in 2010 (PD)</i>	<p><i>What evidence of progress to date towards outcomes?</i></p> <p><i>4 primary sources for the progress markers indicated:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005)</i> • <i>Accra Agenda for Action (2008) (shaded)</i> • <i>Monitoring Survey (MS)</i> • <i>Regional workshop and IRG member suggestions</i> 	<i>MS refers to Monitoring Survey (2005 & 2008) and the results under its numbered indicators (see Annex B for reference)</i>	<i>See Annex A, section 2</i>	<p>Rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<i>To justify the judgement on progress</i>
A Country ownership over development³					
i. <u>Stronger</u> national strategies and operational frameworks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government lead in aid co-ordination at all levels with donors 	<i>Aid co-ordination groups led by government representatives</i>	A, C, E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDS with clear, results-oriented strategic priorities and bankable programmes^ø linked to MTEF⁴ or similar 	<p>MS Ind 1</p> <p><i>Linkages between NDS & annual and multi-annual budget processes</i></p>	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	

³ Core Question 2 is structured according to the main headings of the Accra Agenda for Action; (A) Ownership, (B) Partnerships and (C) Development Results.

⁴ Medium Term Expenditure Framework.

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased monitoring and scrutiny through parliamentary processes of progress with the national development strategy. 	<p><i>Dedicated parliamentary processes and records for NDS progress review debate.</i></p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully consultative process (including civil society organisations and those representing women and excluded groups, local authorities and the private sector) in NDS development 	<p><i>Clear frameworks for consultation</i></p> <p><i>Range of consultations undertaken and range of actors involved in dialogue</i></p> <p><i>Donor funded programmes / activity around engagement with non-state actors</i></p>	A, C, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NDS and sector strategies respond to international commitments on gender equality, human rights, disability and environmental sustainability 	<p><i>NDS has clear analytical basis which addresses gender, rights, disability and environmental sustainability</i></p> <p><i>NDS based on improved information systems, including e.g. disaggregated data around e.g. gender and disability</i></p>	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
ii. Increased alignment of aid with partner countries' priorities, systems and procedures, help to strengthen capacities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall support based on partner NDS, specific related priorities of sectoral ministries and NDS/ sector progress reviews 	<p>MS Ind 3</p> <p><i>Shifts in key donor country strategies / programmes / expenditure reflect changes in government priorities (e.g. new NDS and in progress reviews) and/or related financing gaps identified by the government</i></p>	A, C,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased use by donors/ agencies (and all vertical funds⁵) of country systems and procedures 	<p><i>Diagnostic reviews on country systems / reforms undertaken</i></p> <p><i>Rationale provided for non or limited use</i></p> <p>MS Ind 6</p> <p>MS Ind 5a</p> <p>MS Ind 5b</p>	A, C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A single framework and/or manageable set of indicators drawn from NDS and progress reviews from which donors derive their conditions 	<p><i>Single framework for conditions(NDS linkages) exists</i></p> <p><i>Conditions developed transparently and in consultation with other donors / government</i></p> <p><i>Joint indicator / conditions frameworks including disaggregated data</i></p>	A, C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased support to capacity-building of country systems 	<p>MS Ind 4</p> <p><i>Explicit objectives / strategies for capacity strengthening of partner systems within donor strategies and programmes</i></p> <p><i>Volume / proportion of support to capacity-building of partner systems</i></p>	A, C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	

⁵ See Glossary (Extranet) for a listing of vertical funds.

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
<p>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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthened financial management capacity 	<p><i>MS Ind 2</i></p> <p><i>Number of harmonised diagnostic reviews / performance assessment frameworks for PFM</i></p> <p><i>Proportion of diagnostic reviews followed up.</i></p> <p><i>Number and value of (joint) programmes addressing PFM / fiduciary reforms</i></p> <p><i>Use of sex-disaggregated data and analysis in public financial management systems, e.g. gender audits, gender budget analysis</i></p> <p><i>Use of tools such as gender audits, gender budget analysis to improve knowledge around PFM</i></p> <p><i>Thematic group on PFM, procurement, and fiduciary standards set up</i></p> <p><i>Number of audits of major development programmes accepted (without question) by Auditor General.</i></p>	<p>A, C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened national procurement systems 	<p><i>Number of harmonised diagnostic reviews / performance assessment frameworks for procurement</i></p> <p><i>Number and value of (joint) programmes & value addressing procurement reforms</i></p> <p><i>Number of procurement processes where local / regional firms allowed to compete</i></p> <p><i>Value of [% of total ODA] procurement under International Competitive Bidding / value of direct procurement</i></p> <p><i>Thematic group on procurement, standards set up?</i></p>	A, C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased use of mutually agreed fiduciary standards 	<p><i>Number of processes using internationally agreed standards or accepted best practices such as OECD-World Bank diagnostic tools and others</i></p> <p><i>Instances of International community agreeing on a common standard</i></p> <p><i>Number of audits of Government programmes approved by Auditor General</i></p>	A, C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased use of mutually agreed processes to carry out diagnostics, develop fiduciary reforms and monitor implementation 	<i>Thematic group on fiduciary standards set up?</i>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
B Building more inclusive and effective partnerships for development					
iv. <u>Less</u> duplication of efforts and rationalised, more cost-effective donor activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased use of donor comparative advantage (relative strengths / complementarity) led by government 	<p><i>Clear views/ strategy by Government on donors comparative advantage and how to achieve increased donor complementarity</i></p> <p><i>Evidence of reprogrammed aid according to statement of relative strengths</i></p>	A, C, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased division of labour⁶ at country / sector level 	<p><i>Mapping process conducted / maintained</i></p> <p><i>Number and type/theme of formal Division of Labour arrangements</i></p> <p><i>Reprogrammed aid according to Division of Labour agreements / arrangements</i></p> <p><i>Co-operative / joint work between agencies within e.g. project modalities</i></p>	A, C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased delegation to lead donors for the execution of programmes, activities and tasks 	<p><i>Increased use of donor lead arrangements [e.g. 'silent partnerships'⁷]</i></p>	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	

⁶ See Glossary (Extranet) for definition.

⁷ See Glossary (Extranet) for definition.

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced fragmentation, overall 	<i>% (Proportion) of donors to total volume of aid (i.e. 80% of aid provided by 20% of the number of active donors/ agencies)</i>	A, B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced fragmentation within sectors 	<i>Number of programmes/ projects, transactions, contracts and funding arrangements compared to the total aid volume within a sector</i>	A, B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased untying of aid⁸ 	MS Ind 8 <i>See also issues raised in Untying of Aid Report (2009)</i>	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	
v. <u>Reformed</u> and <u>simplified</u> donor policies and procedures, more collaborative behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of reforms and simplifications by individual donors in their own operations 	MS Ind 10	A, C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	

⁸ See Glossary (Extranet) for definition of untying.

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common or harmonised arrangements amongst donors at country level [for planning, funding (e.g. joint financial arrangements), disbursement, monitoring, evaluating & reporting to govt on donor activities & aid flows] 	<p><i>Joint Assistance Strategies / plans (national and sector level)</i></p> <p><i>Joint thematic strategies on cross-cutting issues, e.g. gender, exclusion, climate and environment</i></p> <p><i>Use of common procedures for pledged funds</i></p> <p><i>Shared conditions for tranche funding</i></p> <p><i>Joint monitoring / evaluation / reporting processes</i></p> <p>MS Ind 9</p>	A, C, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened incentives for harmonisation, alignment and results orientation 	<p><i>Extent to which action plans (Partner Governments, Donors/ Agencies) developed and implemented e.g. as part of the 2003 Rome High Level Forum</i></p> <p><i>Joint accountability frameworks featuring changed incentives, e.g. (joint) annual programme performance reviews</i></p> <p><i>Supportive incentives in donor agency performance management frameworks</i></p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
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)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in proportion of aid being committed through multi-year frameworks 	<p><i>Number of donors setting out indicative commitments within multi-year frameworks and delivering these</i></p> <p><i>Proportion in terms of (total volume and the number of) donors/ agencies providing indicative aid commitments 2010-2015; based on 3 year commitment, on 5 year commitment.</i></p>	A, B, C, E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More timely and predictable aid disbursements 	<p><i>Number / proportion of donors with clearly set out agreed disbursement schedules with government</i></p> <p>MS Ind 7</p> <p><i>Share / type of aid disbursed according to schedule</i></p> <p><i>Proportion of Government expenditure in line with budget.</i></p>	A, B, C, E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited set of mutually agreed conditions jointly agreed, made public and jointly assessed 	<p><i>Number of mutually agreed conditions made public</i></p> <p><i>Number of joint assessments</i></p>	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
vii. <u>Sufficient</u> delegation of authority to donors' field staff, and adequate attention to incentives for effective partnerships between donors and partner countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased levels of delegation to country offices 	<p><i>Levels of decision-making authority (financial approvals, reallocating resources) of donor country offices</i></p> <p><i>Number of technical staff within country offices proportionate to donor/agency commitment.</i></p> <p><i>Number of technical staff with gender expertise working within country Field Offices</i></p>	A, C, D, E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased capacity of staff in country offices to manage increased levels of delegation 	<p><i>Frequency of staff rotation</i></p>	C, E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incentives for changed behaviour in line with aid effectiveness principles 	<p><i>Donor performance frameworks (institutional and staff) for development effectiveness including references to aid effectiveness principles</i></p>	A, C, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
viii. <u>Sufficient</u> integration of global programmes and initiatives into partner countries' broader development agendas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Global programmes work to strengthen country policy environment / institutions 	<p><i>Global programmes' country implementation strategies based on NDS</i></p> <p><i>National planning / monitoring frameworks incorporating global programmes</i></p>	A, C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	

⁹ See Glossary (Extranet) for typology/ listing.

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
ix. <u>Stronger</u> partner countries' capacities to plan, manage and implement results-driven national strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results-oriented reporting and assessment frameworks for assessing the impact of development policies/ strategies. 	<p>MS Ind 11</p> <p>MS Ind 4</p> <p><i>Number of government plans /programmes / policies which set out clear linkages between expenditure and results over the medium term</i></p> <p><i>Frameworks including manageable number of disaggregated indicators / for which data sources are available</i></p> <p><i>Availability within Government of regularised socio-economic data sets</i></p> <p><i>Use of disaggregated data (gender, excluded group) within results and assessment frameworks</i></p>	A, B, C, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donor programming and resources increasingly linked to national level/ sector level development results 	<p><i>Proportion of donor country plans which specify links between expenditure and results</i></p> <p><i>Proportion of donor results frameworks which reflect national results areas (including cross-cutting issues e.g. gender, exclusion, climate change, environment)</i></p>	A, C, D, E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased joint support (analytic and financial) to capacity development for results 	<p><i>Explicit objectives / strategies for capacity strengthening within the NDS</i></p> <p><i>Explicit objectives / strategies for capacity strengthening within donor support programmes</i></p> <p><i>Joint initiatives for capacity development</i></p> <p><i>Number of country capacity analyses undertaken / strategies developed</i></p> <p><i>Volume / proportion of support to capacity-building objectives</i></p>	A, B, C, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
C Delivering and accounting for development results					
x. <u>Enhanced</u> respective accountability of countries and donors to citizens and parliaments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened parliamentary role in NDS / budgets 	<p><i>Regular reviews by parliament of development policies, strategies, budgets and performance</i></p> <p><i>National Audit reports on use of aid</i></p>	A, C, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timely, transparent and comprehensive information on aid flows publicly available (donors) 	<p><i>Publicly available donor annual reports on aid flows</i></p>	C, A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
<p>10b) Progress towards commitments in the Accra Agenda for Action (para. 24) on transparency and accountability for development results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing accountability and transparency to the public for development results 	<p>MS Ind 12</p> <p>Number of mutual assessments of (i) General Budget Support, (ii) Sector support (iii) other programs) conducted based on country results reporting and information systems</p> <p>Proportion of large Government (donor supported) programmes for which mutual assessments of an accepted quality have been completed</p> <p>Number of mutual assessments which address gender and exclusion issues</p>	<p>A, C, D</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting the strengthening of the existing international accountability mechanisms 	<p>Number of joint reviews of existing international accountability mechanisms e.g. number of peer reviews conducted and published</p>	<p>A</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
<p>xi. <u>Less</u> corruption and <u>more</u> transparency, strengthening public support and supporting effective resource mobilisation and allocation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater transparency in public financial management 	<p>Records of disclosure on both sides of aid disbursements, revenues, budgets, expenditures, procurement and audits</p> <p>Internal and external audits reporting progress on financial management</p>	<p>A, C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased measures to address corruption 	<p><i>Strategies and institutional mechanisms to tackle corruption on both sides</i></p> <p><i>Number of investigations undertaken / concluded on both sides</i></p> <p><i>Improved systems of investigation, legal redress, accountability and transparency in the use of public funds in partner countries.</i></p> <p><i>Increased steps by donors/ agencies to combat corruption by individuals or corporations and to track, freeze and recover illegally acquired assets from donor/ agency funded programmes/ projects.</i></p>	A, C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Substantial</i> <i>Some</i> <i>Little</i> <i>None</i> <i>Regression</i> 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
<i>Conclusions on the effects of Paris Declaration implementation:</i>					
<p>A. Report against 3 dimensions of aid effectiveness covered by Core Question 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Improvements in the efficiency of aid delivery</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. <u>Less</u> duplication of efforts and rationalised, more cost-effective donor activities v. <u>Reformed</u> and <u>simplified</u> donor policies and procedures, more collaborative behaviour [extent to which donor/ agency operations in-country are fit for purpose in line with honouring the commitments of the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action] 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Improvements in the management and use of aid; extent of change, contributing factors (why?) and validity</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. <u>Increased</u> alignment of aid with partner countries' priorities, systems and procedures, help to strengthen capacities viii. <u>Sufficient</u> integration of global programmes and initiatives into partner countries' broader development agendas i. <u>Stronger</u> national strategies and operational frameworks ix. <u>Stronger</u> partner countries' capacities to plan, manage and implement results-driven national strategies xi. <u>Less</u> corruption and <u>more</u> transparency, strengthening public support and supporting effective resource mobilisation and allocation 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 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Better (more inclusive and effective) partnerships</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> x. <u>Enhanced</u> respective accountability of countries and donors to citizens and parliaments 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)] vii. <u>Sufficient</u> delegation of authority to donors' field staff, and adequate attention to incentives for effective partnerships between donors and partner countries 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 		

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
B. Is there evidence of the Accra Agenda for Action triggering an acceleration of the aid effectiveness agenda in respect to progress on; (A) Country ownership over development, (B) Building of more inclusive and effective partnerships for development, and (C) delivering and accounting for development results.					
C. Have there been unintended consequences of the Paris Declaration for aid effectiveness (e.g. unintended impacts on particular groups including women and girls, new transaction costs due to additional meetings, reports etc)?					
D. Are there possible alternative ways of achieving more effective aid, e.g. in the experience with non-PD donors?					

Core Q3. “Has the implementation of Paris Declaration strengthened the contribution of aid to sustainable development results? How?” (Development outcomes)

Note: Not a linear results chain ó mapping [in 3a, 3b, 3c] the plausible contribution of the PD towards development results. Basis for establishing the extent to which there is evidence of PD implementation having accelerated progress towards development outcomes?

SECTOR LEVEL VIEW

3a) Were results in specific sectors enhanced through the application of the PD principles?” [minimum of the ‘Health sector’ as a case study and option of case study coverage of an additional 1-2 specified other sectors] [Further Guidance to follow]

Intended development results (specify)	Interim development results	Contribution of aid (finance/ other) to the sector	Effects of PD on the aid relationship	Overall aggregate judgement	Key reasons & explanations
<p>Effective, efficient and sustainable progress towards sector long term development goals</p>	<p>Good progress against sector programmes, strategies, policies and related targets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of progress towards policy goals? • Sector plans implemented as intended? • Sector strategies on track? • Progress reviews indicate that delivery on-track to meet targets? <p>Sector governance improved / Institutional mechanisms operating effectively</p>	<p>Overall scale of committed aid within the sector, predictability and disbursement.</p> <p>Active and productive policy dialogue in the sector?</p> <p>Alignment of aid with sector programmes, strategies, policies and related targets</p> <p>Sector strategies and plans jointly financed (government and donor) to meet agreed national targets</p> <p>Barriers to achievement jointly recognised and strategies in place to address them. e.g. joint sector platforms, joint</p>	<p>[See note on Guidance to sector study ó Annex C for detailed set of progress markers/ indicators to work through in this column, covering;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency in aid delivery • Management and use of aid in the sector • Partnerships 		

Intended development results (specify)	Interim development results	Contribution of aid (finance/ other) to the sector	Effects of PD on the aid relationship	Overall aggregate judgement	Key reasons & explanations
		assessment frameworks, strategies and reviews			
<p>Judgement on progress, especially since 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<p>Judgement on progress, especially since 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<p>Judgement on progress, especially since 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<p>Judgement on progress, especially since 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<p><i>Has there been an acceleration (in the period 2005-2010 compared to 2000-2004) in progress towards development outcomes in the sector</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> <p><i>Has the contribution of PD implementation to any acceleration been</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Not relevant</i> 	

MACRO LEVEL VIEW

3b) Did the implementation of the PD help countries to improve the prioritisation of the needs [beyond income poverty] of the poorest people, including women and girls?"

Intended development results (specify)	Interim development results	Contribution of aid (finance/ other) to the sector	Effects of PD on the aid relationship	Overall aggregate judgement	Key reasons & explanations
<p>Greater prioritisation of the needs of the poorest including women and girls</p>	<p>Increased generation and use of disaggregated data and analysis around poor and excluded groups, including women and girls?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extreme poverty, gender and exclusion-focused analyses conducted? <p>Increased recognition of extreme poverty, exclusion and gender issues within development policy and planning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sector and national strategies reflecting data disaggregation by region, sex, excluded group etc? • Policy / strategy / programmatic & and sector responses? <p>More effective institutional machinery</p>	<p><i>For each of these interim results:</i></p> <p>What has been the scale of aid?</p> <p>The intensity and productivity of policy dialogue?</p> <p>Joint recognition of barriers to achievement jointly recognised and strategies in place to address them, e.g. joint thematic platforms, strategies and reviews?</p>	<p>E.g.</p> <p>Joint statements / dialogue / analysis</p> <p>Joint programmes / activity</p> <p>Joint groups / structures</p> <p>Are there more / wider entry points for productive dialogue and engagement between partner countries and donors?</p> <p>Unintended impacts or effects?</p>		

Intended development results (specify)	Interim development results	Contribution of aid (finance/ other) to the sector	Effects of PD on the aid relationship	Overall aggregate judgement	Key reasons & explanations
	<p>to comprehensively address extreme poverty, gender and exclusion issues?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required level of institutional mechanisms in place, staffed and functional? <p>Increased resource allocations to tackle extreme poverty, gender and exclusion issues?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levels of gender and exclusion-related budgetary allocations and expenditure flows? • Level of pro-poor, gender responsive priorities in national strategies, budgets? 				

Intended development results (specify)	Interim development results	Contribution of aid (finance/ other) to the sector	Effects of PD on the aid relationship	Overall aggregate judgement	Key reasons & explanations
<p>Judgement on progress, especially since 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<p>Judgement on progress, especially since 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<p>Judgement on progress, especially since 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<p>Judgement on progress, especially since 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<p><i>Has there been any improvement in the prioritisation by partner governments of the needs of the poorest people, including women and girls (in the period 2005-2010 compared to 2000-2004).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> <p><i>Has the contribution of PD implementation to any improvement been</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Not relevant</i> 	

MACRO LEVEL VIEW

3c) Has PD implementation led to sustainable increases in institutional capacities and social capital¹⁰ at all levels to respond to development challenges? Why, how and where, and what are the effects? [Guidance Note to follow]

Intended development results (specify)	Interim development results	Contribution of aid (finance/ other) to the sector	Effects of PD on the aid relationship	Overall aggregate judgement	Key reasons & explanations
Increased institutional capacity at all levels	<p>Improved administrative capacities among all development actors, including CSOs?</p> <p>Improved ability to consult with and account to stakeholders?</p> <p>Improved working through partnership and network formation?</p> <p>Evidence of learning by doing?</p> <p>Improved capacity to develop, implement and report upon comprehensive decentralisation plans?</p> <p>Improved capacity to design and implement effective regulation?</p> <p>Improved capacity for policy and strategic monitoring?</p> <p>Improved capacity for evaluation and reporting?</p>	<p><i>For each of these interim results:</i></p> <p>What has been the scale of aid?</p> <p>The intensity and productivity of policy dialogue?</p> <p>Barriers to achievement jointly recognised and strategies in place to address them e.g. joint strategies platforms, and reviews?</p>	<p>Country-led capacity development strategies?</p> <p>Alignment of support to national objectives and strategies for capacity strengthening?</p> <p>Effective use by donors/ agencies of existing capacities within partner countries?</p> <p>Harmonised support for capacity development?</p> <p>Joint identification of need for capacity strengthening to deliver services?</p> <p>Donors strengthen own capacities and skills to be more responsive to country needs?</p> <p>Jointly selected and managed technical co-operation?</p> <p>Use of local and regional resources including South-South</p>		

¹⁰ See Glossary (Extranet) for definition.

Intended development results (specify)	Interim development results	Contribution of aid (finance/ other) to the sector	Effects of PD on the aid relationship	Overall aggregate judgement	Key reasons & explanations
			co-operation? Promotion of operational changes to make capacity development more effective? Unintended impacts or effects?		
Increased social capital (i.e. problem-solving networks in society) at all levels	[Guidance to follow]	[Guidance to follow]	[Guidance to follow]		
Judgement on progress, especially since 2005 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	<i>Has there been a sustainable increase in institutional capacities and social capital at all levels to respond to development challenges (in the period 2005-2010 compared to 2000-2004). Has this been</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression <i>Has the contribution of PD implementation to any sustainable increase been</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Not relevant 	

MACRO LEVEL VIEW

3d) How and why has the mix of aid modalities (including general or sector-specific budget support) evolved and what has been learnt on the development results?

Intended development results (specify)	Interim development results	Contribution of aid (finance/ other) to the sector	Effects of PD on the aid relationship	Overall aggregate judgement	Key reasons & explanations
<p>Country has a mix of aid modalities ó defined as optimum by the partner country and respected by the donors/ agencies - to progress the NDS</p>	<p>Assessments of relative relevance and effectiveness of different modalities for different uses?</p> <p>Assessment of management and absorptive capacity for the defined mix of modalities?</p> <p>Government defines required mix of modalities?</p> <p>Donors commit 66% of aid to programme based approaches where feasible?</p> <p>Donors channel 50% or more of government-to-government aid through country fiduciary systems?</p>	<p>Agreement on optimal mix of modalities?</p> <p>Combined response to desired mix of modalities including programme-based modalities to support common approaches?</p> <p>Relative shares of allocations using agreed modalities?</p>	<p>Joint dialogue in and support for analysis of modalities?</p> <p>Alignment to preferred national mix of modalities?</p> <p>Harmonisation among donors re: mix of modalities?</p> <p>Mutual accountability and progress reviews?</p>		

Intended development results (specify)	Interim development results	Contribution of aid (finance/ other) to the sector	Effects of PD on the aid relationship	Overall aggregate judgement	Key reasons & explanations
<p>Judgement on progress, especially since 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<p>Judgement on progress, especially since 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<p>Judgement on progress, especially since 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<p>Judgement on progress, especially since 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<p><i>To what extent has the mix of aid modalities (in line with PD principles) changed in the period 2005-2010</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> <p><i>What has been the contribution of PD implementation to any change?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Not relevant</i> 	

Intended development results (specify)	Interim development results	Contribution of aid (finance/ other) to the sector	Effects of PD on the aid relationship	Overall aggregate judgement	Key reasons & explanations
<i>Conclusions on the influence of improved aid effectiveness on development outcomes:</i>					
A. Has the PD enhanced ODA's impact on achieving the goals of the national development strategy [and the MDGs]? What factors have facilitated this change?					
B. What (plausible) contribution has the Declaration made in terms of its own statement of <u>intended</u> effects, to: oIncrease the impact of aid in: 1. Reducing poverty 2. Reducing inequality 3. Increasing growth 4. Building capacity 5. Accelerating achievement of MDGsö (Paragraph. 2)					
C. Has the implementation of the PD had <u>unintended</u> consequences for development results, negative or positive?					
D. Is there evidence of different ways to make aid contribute more towards development results?					

Core Q 4. Framework for Overall 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, for women and men and for those who are excluded?
- iv. What effects has the implementation of the Declaration had on the respective burdens of aid management falling on the partner country and its respective 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-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?
- vi. What are the key messages for a) national stakeholders, and b) donor countries and agencies?
- 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?

Annex A

Paris Declaration Evaluation Phase 2 Country Evaluations: Key to Methods and Analysis

1. Approach

- The Evaluation takes both a **summative and formative approach** allowing judgments around outcomes and results whilst looking towards learning for future improvement. Country studies are asked to replicate this.
- Countries are expected to use a **multi-method approach** to their studies, combining qualitative and quantitative analysis (see below).
- Countries are asked to take a **longitudinal approach**, using *backward tracking* where relevant (as far as 2000) as indicated in the Country Operational Matrix, whilst bearing in mind *forward looking analysis* (to anticipate development results that are in formation but are not yet fully evident ó but which may help predict the likely direction of travel).
- **Gender and exclusion issues** should be mainstreamed across the analysis as far as data allows. (This is a specific question within the Country Operational Matrix).
- Given the likely complexity of the national studies, each country evaluation should produce a **concise statement on methodology**, including: the process undertaken, specific methods used, forms of triangulation / verification employed and limitations of the methodology.

2. Potential Methods / Forms of Analysis

Some or all of the following should be employed in country studies:

A). Documentary analysis, to answer or elucidate specified questions or issues in the Matrix. Types of documents would include:

For both *government* and *donors*:

- National and sector level statements, policies, strategies and plans
- Evaluations, reviews, audits and other assessments (national, international, local and external)
- Relevant reports and analyses including Paris Monitoring Survey Country Reports.
- Reporting under performance and accountability frameworks
- (Donor) conditionality policies
- Parliamentary Reports
- Political analyses and reports
- Programmatic design & implementation documentation
- Academic research
- Media reports
- Grey literature (internal reports, working documents etc)
- Records e.g. Minutes of meetings, decision making process etc

B). Quantitative / statistical analysis, including evolution around:

- International, national, poverty, development, social and economic indicators

- Aid-specific data ó aid flows and allocations at national and sector / theme level, types and shares of aid, technical assistance etc, relevant modalities.
- Economic data ó national resource flows, trade data, patterns of resource mobilisation, economic trends and forecasts, national financing patterns, loans etc
- Budgetary data ó allocations, sectors, disbursements, forecasts, etc
- Numbers/types of donor missions (national, sector, joint , etc)
- Financial and audit reports / analyses

C). Country Interview Guide

- Generic structured survey tool (provided by Core Team), focused particularly on the questions under Core Question 2 around aid effectiveness. To be adapted by country teams as required.

D). Interviews and focus groups

Semi-structured interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders, including:

- Current and former officials at different levels of government
- Donor representatives and observers
- Civil society representatives
- Private sector representatives
- Legislators
- Parliamentarians and politicians at different levels
- Academics
- Media representatives

E). Questionnaires

- Structured and targeted questionnaires / online surveys of key stakeholders from the list above

F). Stakeholder analysis

Assessment of respective roles, interests, priorities and influence of key people, groups of people, or institutions e.g.

- Aid co-ordination groups and structures (national, sector, theme, programme)
- Other joint groups (donor, government, civil society)
- Joint missions
- Donor country offices
- Line ministries
- Policy-making processes

Possible “mechanisms of change”

Examples of “mechanisms of change” recommended for exploration in the Approach Paper for the Evaluation are in the list below. Those marked with an asterisk (*) are now included in the draft operational matrix:

1. *Empowerment of development actors (including governments, CSOs óincluding umbrella media organisations-, parliaments and the private sector)
2. *Reforms perceived as positive (because supported by a broad country-based consensus)
3. * Increased levels of trust between development partners

4. *Increases in confidence by governments in recipient countries
5. *Improved decision-making skills
6. *Improvements in risk-management
7. Improvements in negotiating and influencing skills by donor agencies in their own policy communities
8. *Spill-over of capacities from aid to non-aid policy-making
9. Organisational supports for learning from policy experience
10. *Improved quality of needs analyses and available information
11. *More information sharing and transparency of information
12. ðLearning by doingö or experiential learning
Positive feedback loops from policy reforms and program innovations.

Annex B

Monitoring Survey Indicators [Source: Appendix III to Paris Declaration]

OWNERSHIP		TARGET FOR 2010
1	<i>Partners have operational development strategies</i> — Number of countries with national development strategies (including PRSs) that have clear strategic priorities linked to a medium-term expenditure framework and reflected in annual budgets.	At least 75% of partner countries have operational development strategies.
ALIGNMENT		TARGETS FOR 2010
2	<i>Reliable country systems</i> — Number of partner countries that have procurement and public financial management systems that either (a) adhere to broadly accepted good practices or (b) have a reform programme in place to achieve these.	<p>(a) Public financial management – Half of partner countries move up at least one measure (i.e., 0.5 points) on the PFM/ CPIA (Country Policy and Institutional Assessment) scale of performance.</p> <p>(b) Procurement – One-third of partner countries move up at least one measure (i.e., from D to C, C to B or B to A) on the four-point scale used to assess performance for this indicator.</p>
3	<i>Aid flows are aligned on national priorities</i> — Percent of aid flows to the government sector that is reported on partners' national budgets.	Halve the gap — halve the proportion of aid flows to government sector not reported on government's budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget).
4	<i>Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support</i> — Percent of donor capacity-development support provided through co-ordinated programmes consistent with partners' national development strategies.	50% of technical co-operation flows are implemented through co-ordinated programmes consistent with national development strategies.
5a	<i>Use of country public financial management systems</i> — Percent of donors and of aid flows that use public financial management systems in partner countries, which either (a) adhere to broadly accepted good practices or (b) have a reform programme in place to achieve these.	PERCENT OF DONORS
		Score* Target
		5+ All donors use partner countries' PFM systems.
		3.5 to 4.5 90% of donors use partner countries' PFM systems.
		PERCENT OF AID FLOWS
		Score* Target
5+ A two-thirds reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' PFM systems.		
3.5 to 4.5 A one-third reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' PFM systems.		
5b	<i>Use of country procurement systems</i> — Percent of donors and of aid flows that use partner country procurement systems which either (a) adhere to broadly accepted good practices or (b) have a reform programme in place to achieve these.	PERCENT OF DONORS
		Score* Target
		A All donors use partner countries' procurement systems.
		B 90% of donors use partner countries' procurement systems.
		PERCENT OF AID FLOWS
		Score* Target
A A two-thirds reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' procurement systems.		
B A one-third reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' procurement systems.		
6	<i>Strengthen capacity by avoiding parallel implementation structures</i> — Number of parallel project implementation units (PIUs) per country.	Reduce by two-thirds the stock of parallel project implementation units (PIUs).
7	<i>Aid is more predictable</i> — Percent of aid disbursements released according to agreed schedules in annual or multi-year frameworks.	Halve the gap — halve the proportion of aid not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled.
8	<i>Aid is untied</i> — Percent of bilateral aid that is untied.	Continued progress over time.

HARMONISATION		TARGETS FOR 2010
9	<i>Use of common arrangements or procedures</i> — Percent of aid provided as programme-based approaches.	66% of aid flows are provided in the context of programme-based approaches.
10	<i>Encourage shared analysis</i> — Percent of (a) field missions and/or (b) country analytic work, including diagnostic reviews that are joint.	(a) 40% of donor missions to the field are joint.
		(b) 66% of country analytic work is joint.
MANAGING FOR RESULTS		TARGET FOR 2010
11	<i>Results-oriented frameworks</i> — Number of countries with transparent and monitorable performance assessment frameworks to assess progress against (a) the national development strategies and (b) sector programmes.	Reduce the gap by one-third — Reduce the proportion of countries without transparent and monitorable performance assessment frameworks by one-third.
MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY		TARGET FOR 2010
12	<i>Mutual accountability</i> — Number of partner countries that undertake mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness including those in this Declaration.	All partner countries have mutual assessment reviews in place.

Important Note: In accordance with paragraph 9 of the Declaration, the partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC (Working Party on Aid Effectiveness) comprising OECD/DAC members, partner countries and multilateral institutions, met twice, on 30-31 May 2005 and on 7-8 July 2005 to adopt, and review where appropriate, the targets for the twelve Indicators of Progress. At these meetings an agreement was reached on the targets presented under Section III of the present Declaration. This agreement is subject to reservations by one donor on (a) the methodology for assessing the quality of locally-managed procurement systems (relating to targets 2b and 5b) and (b) the acceptable quality of public financial management reform programmes (relating to target 5a.ii). Further discussions are underway to address these issues. The targets, including the reservation, have been notified to the Chairs of the High-level Plenary Meeting of the 59th General Assembly of the United Nations in a letter of 9 September 2005 by Mr. Richard Manning, Chair of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC).

***Note on Indicator 5:** Scores for Indicator 5 are determined by the methodology used to measure quality of procurement and public financial management systems under Indicator 2 above.

Annex C

Paris Declaration Evaluation Phase 2 Country Evaluations: Guidance to Sector Tracer Study

A SECTOR LEVEL VIEW - Sectors employed: Health plus one other

Countries are asked to employ the following matrix, in gathering and interpreting data/ information to assess the effects of PD on the aid relationship within a targeted sector. This forms a key element within enquiries of the Evaluation Team in answering Core Question 3a. .

Countries are asked to include, where feasible, data **gathered on the specific sector** which has contributed to national reports into the OECD-DAC's PD Monitoring Survey. **National-level data of the Paris Monitoring Survey should not be included here**, but rather in the country-level matrix (core Question 2).

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
<i>Intended state of the aid relationship in the sector / area in 2010 (PD)</i>	<p><i>What evidence of progress to date towards outcomes?</i></p> <p>4 primary sources for outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) • Accra Agenda for Action (2008) (shaded) • Monitoring Survey (MS) • Regional workshop suggestions 	<p><i>MS refers to Monitoring Survey and the results under its numbered indicators (see Annex B for reference)</i></p>	<p><i>See Annex A, section 2</i></p>	<p>Rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	<p><i>To justify the judgement on progress</i></p>
A Country ownership over development					
i. <u>Stronger</u> national strategies and operational frameworks (in the sector)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government lead in aid co-ordination in the sector with donors 	<p><i>Aid co-ordination groups in the sector led by government representatives</i></p> <p><i>Aid co-ordination groups led by donor representatives</i></p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sector strategy with clear, results-oriented strategic priorities [linked to MTEF or similar] 	<p>MS Ind 1</p> <p><i>Linkages between sector strategy & annual and multi-annual budget processes</i></p>	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased monitoring and scrutiny through parliamentary processes of progress with the sector strategy 	<p><i>Dedicated parliamentary processes and records for sector strategy progress review debate</i></p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully consultative process (including civil society, parliaments, local authorities and the private sector) in sector strategy development 	<p><i>Clear frameworks for consultation</i></p> <p><i>Range of consultations undertaken and range of actors involved in dialogue</i></p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sector strategies respond to international commitments on gender equality, human rights, disability and environmental sustainability 	<p><i>Sector strategy has clear analytical basis which addresses gender, rights, disability and environmental sustainability</i></p> <p><i>Sector strategy based on improved information systems, including e.g. disaggregated data around e.g. gender and disability</i></p>	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
ii. <u>Increased</u> alignment of aid with partner countries' priorities, systems and procedures, help to strengthen capacities (in the sector)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall support to the sector based on national sector strategy and progress reviews 	<p>MS Ind 3</p> <p><i>Shifts in key donor sector strategies / programmes / expenditure reflect changes in government priorities (e.g. new policies, strategies in the sector)</i></p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased use (in the sector) by donors/ agencies (and all vertical funds¹¹) of country systems and procedures 	<p><i>Diagnostic reviews on country systems / reforms undertaken in the sector</i></p> <p><i>Rationale provided for non or limited use of country systems in the sector</i></p> <p>MS Ind 6</p> <p>MS Ind 5a</p> <p>MS Ind 5b</p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased support to capacity-building of country systems in the sector 	<p>MS Ind 4</p> <p><i>Explicit objectives / strategies for capacity strengthening of partner systems in the sector within donor strategies and programmes</i></p> <p><i>Volume / proportion of support to capacity-building of national sector systems</i></p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial Some Little None Regression 	
B Building more inclusive and effective partnerships for development					

¹¹ See Glossary (Extranet) for a listing of vertical funds.

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
iv. <u>Less</u> duplication of efforts and rationalised, more cost-effective donor activities (in the sector)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased use of donor comparative advantage/ complementarity led by government in the sector 	<p><i>Clear view [statement] by Govt on donor comparative advantage in the sector and how to achieve donor complementarity</i></p> <p><i>Reprogrammed sectoral aid according to statement of comparative advantage</i></p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Substantial</i> <i>Some</i> <i>Little</i> <i>None</i> <i>Regression</i> 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased division of labour¹² at sector level 	<p><i>Mapping process conducted / maintained</i></p> <p><i>Number and theme/type of formal Division of Labour arrangements</i></p> <p><i>Reprogrammed aid to the sector according to Division of Labour agreements / arrangements</i></p> <p><i>Co-operative / joint work between agencies within e.g. project modalities</i></p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Substantial</i> <i>Some</i> <i>Little</i> <i>None</i> <i>Regression</i> 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased delegation to lead donors for the execution of programmes, activities and tasks at sector level 	<p><i>Increased use of donor lead arrangements in the sector [e.g. 'silent partnerships'¹³]</i></p>	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Substantial</i> <i>Some</i> <i>Little</i> <i>None</i> <i>Regression</i> 	

¹² See Glossary (Extranet) for definition.

¹³ See Glossary (Extranet) for definition.

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced fragmentation in the sector 	<i>Number of programmes/ projects, transactions, contracts and funding arrangements compared to the total aid volume within the sector</i>	A, B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased untying of aid 	<p>MS Ind 8</p> <p><i>See also issues raised in Untying of Aid Report (2009)</i></p>	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	
v. <u>Reformed</u> and <u>simplified</u> donor policies and procedures, more collaborative behaviour (in the sector)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of reforms and simplifications by individual donors at sector level 	<p>MS Ind 10</p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common or harmonised arrangements amongst donors at sector level [<i>for planning, funding, disbursement, monitoring, evaluating & reporting to govt on donor activities & aid flows</i>] 	<p><i>Joint Assistance Strategies / plans (sector level)</i></p> <p><i>Use of common procedures for pledged funds</i></p> <p><i>Shared conditions for tranche funding</i></p> <p><i>Joint monitoring/ evaluation/ reporting processes</i></p> <p>MS Ind 9</p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Some • Little • None • Regression 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened incentives for harmonisation, alignment and results orientation in the sector 	<p><i>Joint accountability frameworks for the sector featuring changed incentives</i></p> <p><i>Supportive incentives in sector-level donor agency performance management frameworks</i></p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Substantial</i> <i>Some</i> <i>Little</i> <i>None</i> <i>Regression</i> 	
<p>vi. <u>More</u> predictable and multi-year commitments on aid flows (to the sector). [Has the nature of conditionalities - within the sector - been changed to support ownership in line with the AAA commitment (para. 25)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in proportion of aid being committed to the sector through multi-year frameworks 	<p><i>Number of donors setting out indicative commitments for the sector within multi-year frameworks and delivering these</i></p> <p><i>Proportion in terms of (total volume and the number of) donors/ agencies providing indicative aid commitments to the sector 2010-2015; based on 3 year commitment, on 5 year commitment</i></p>	A, B, C, E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Substantial</i> <i>Some</i> <i>Little</i> <i>None</i> <i>Regression</i> 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More timely and predictable aid disbursements to the sector 	<p><i>Number / proportion of donors with clearly set out agreed disbursement schedules with government</i></p> <p>MS Ind 7</p> <p><i>Share / type of aid in the sector disbursed according to schedule</i></p> <p><i>Proportion of government aid for the sector in line with budget</i></p>	A, B, ,D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited set of mutually agreed conditions in the sector, jointly agreed, made public and jointly assessed 	<p><i>Number of mutually agreed conditions made public</i></p> <p><i>Number of joint assessments</i></p>	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	
viii. <u>Sufficient</u> integration of global programmes and initiatives into partner countries' broader development agenda (for the sector).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global programmes work to strengthen sector policy environment / institutions 	<p><i>Global programmes¹⁴ country implementation strategies reflect relevant sector strategy</i></p> <p><i>Sector planning / monitoring frameworks incorporating global programmes</i></p>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	

¹⁴ See Glossary (Extranet) for typology/ listing.

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
<p>ix. <u>Stronger</u> partner countries' capacities to plan, manage and implement results-driven strategies (for the sector).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results-oriented reporting and assessment frameworks in the sector for assessing the impact of development policies 	<p>MS Ind 11</p> <p>MS Ind 4</p> <p><i>Number of sector plans which set out clear linkages between expenditure and results over the medium term</i></p> <p><i>Sector frameworks including manageable number of indicators / for which data sources are available</i></p> <p><i>Availability within Government of regularised socio-economic data sets</i></p> <p><i>Use of disaggregated data (gender, excluded group) within results and assessment frameworks</i></p>	<p>A, B, D</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Substantial</i> <i>Some</i> <i>Little</i> <i>None</i> <i>Regression</i> 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donor programming and resources in the sector increasingly linked to results 	<p><i>Proportion of donor sector plans which specify links between expenditure and results</i></p> <p><i>Proportion of donor sector results frameworks which reflect national results areas (including cross-cutting issues e.g. gender, exclusion, climate change, environment)</i></p>	<p>A, D, E</p>		

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
C Delivering and accounting for development results					
x. <u>Enhanced</u> respective accountability of countries and donors to citizens and parliaments (for the sector)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timely, transparent and comprehensive information on aid flows to the sector publicly available (donors) 	<i>Audit reports on use of aid in the sector</i> <i>Publicly available donor annual reports on aid flows</i>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Substantial</i> <i>Some</i> <i>Little</i> <i>None</i> <i>Regression</i> 	
xi. <u>Less</u> corruption and <u>more</u> transparency, strengthening public support and supporting effective resource mobilisation and allocation (for the sector).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater transparency in public financial management 	<i>Records of disclosure of aid revenues, budgets, expenditures, procurement and audits in the sector</i> <i>Internal and external audits reporting progress on financial management</i>	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Substantial</i> <i>Some</i> <i>Little</i> <i>None</i> <i>Regression</i> 	

PD expected outcomes	Progress markers	Potential indicators of change / milestones	Methods / Forms of Analysis	Judgement on progress, especially since 2005	Key reasons & explanation
Conclusions on the effects of Paris Declaration implementation:					
A. Report against the 3 components of Core Question 2 with respect to the sector / area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Improvements in the efficiency of aid delivery to the sector</i> 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Improvements in the management and use of aid in the sector</i> 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Better (more inclusive and effective) partnerships in the sector</i> 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Substantial</i> • <i>Some</i> • <i>Little</i> • <i>None</i> • <i>Regression</i> 	
B. Have there been unintended consequences of the Paris Declaration for aid effectiveness in the sector (e.g. unintended impacts on particular groups including women and girls)?					
C. Are there possible alternative ways of achieving more effective aid in the sector, e.g. in the experience with non-PD donors?					