

Evaluation of the Paris Declaration, Phase 2

Quality Assurance and Governance Arrangements

The quality assurance of the evaluation is closely linked to the overall governance and operational architecture of the evaluation. The evaluation architecture follows from the evaluation design – its tasks, methods and intended outputs. But in evaluations where there are many stakeholders, as in the case of the Paris Declaration, issues of power and influence can arise and the technicalities of operational architecture have to be reconciled with issues of governance. The Paris Declaration evaluation architecture and governance should support and strengthen “development partnerships” in their pursuit of aid effectiveness and development results. It should do this in ways that support joint ownership and, in line with the Accra Agenda for Action, do so in an inclusive way.

The governance of the evaluation entails appropriate involvement, cooperation and ownership by the main stakeholders in the Paris Declaration evaluation. This is to ensure that the evaluation will be relevant to stakeholders, its results will be used and that evaluators will be able to access needed information. There is also a firm prior expectation that all stakeholders will be committed to the quality, independence and professional credibility of the evaluation. This is particularly important if this complex effort to identify outcomes and results is to be successful and be accepted as credible and useful in order to be used by policy makers and aid administrators.

The quality assurance of the evaluation is supported by specific mechanisms outlined in sections III and IV below,

I Operational Structure

The evaluation is organized operationally at two levels:

1. ‘*Country-level Teams*’ and “*HQ-level Teams*” that under the guidance from the Core Evaluation Team and National Reference/Advisory Groups will be responsible for undertaking country-level evaluations and HQ-level evaluations.
2. A “*Core Evaluation Team*” that under the guidance and approval of the Evaluation Management Group will undertake overall design and facilitate coherence among country and HQ studies; interact closely with country and HQ teams; and contribute to the design of any required supplementary studies; it will also produce the evaluation’s synthesis report.

II Governance Structure

The Governance Structure comprises three levels. These are:

1. *The National Reference/Advisory Groups* i.e. the ones in the partner countries (*Country Reference Groups*) and those set up in donor countries or by agencies (*Donor/Agency HQ Reference Groups*). These groups consist of key government and non-government development stakeholders in a given partner/donor country, including but not confined to the central government and key donors.
2. *The International Reference Group* consists of a representative of each entity (country, donor or organisation) with a strong interest in the evaluation or actively participating in it, either through overseeing and coordinating participation at the country level or through

contributing financially or in kind to the evaluation. Accordingly, every country conducting a country study will be represented, as will all donors and other organisations participating in and contributing to the evaluation.

3. *The Evaluation Management Group* comprises six members representing partner countries and donors and the Evaluation Secretariat. The Management Group reports to the Reference Group but is separately charged with the responsibility to safeguard the quality and independence of the evaluation. The Evaluation Management Group is supported by a small secretariat.

III Quality assurance of Country Evaluations and Agency HQ Studies

Each evaluation/study is managed in-country, led by a National Evaluation Coordinator appointed by the government. The National Evaluation Coordinator is supported by a *Reference/ Advisory Group* including relevant national stakeholders and development partners.

The National Evaluation Coordinator will be responsible for initiating, facilitating, contracting and managing the country evaluation as well as for providing feedback to the National Reference/Advisory group and the Evaluation Management Group. He/she will:

1. Set up and schedule and convene meetings of the in-country National Reference/Advisory Group, expected to include major stakeholders from governments, donors, civil society and possibly academia;
2. Develop final TOR for the Country Evaluation in consultation with the National Reference /Advisory Group building on the common evaluation matrix for Country Evaluations and (if required) a module with country-specific evaluation questions;
3. Contract the consultants for the Country Evaluation (with selection where possible by the National Reference/Advisory Group);
4. Assure that the evaluation is of acceptable quality in reference to the chosen 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.
5. Act as in-country focal point for contact to the Evaluation's overall Management and Reference/Advisory Groups for the evaluation.
6. Bi-monthly reporting to the Evaluation Secretariat on the progress of the evaluation in a common simple format.
7. Submit the country evaluation report to the Core Evaluation team for use in preparing synthesis report and publishing.

The same process applies to the coordinators of the respective Agency HQ studies.

The National Reference/Advisory Group should include major stakeholders from government, donors, civil society and possibly academia. The purpose of this group is to ensure stakeholders' participation and buy-in to the evaluation process and results and to assure the independence of the evaluation. In some cases, an independent chair may reinforce the role of independent

members in ensuring the independence of the evaluation itself. Ideally, the Reference/Advisory Group should provide some standing capacity to follow up on the evaluation after completion.

The functions of the National Reference/Advisory Groups include:

1. Approving the design of the pertinent evaluation that comprises a common set of evaluation questions applicable to all country evaluations and a module with country-specific evaluation questions;
2. Deciding on selection criteria for the country teams;
3. Selecting the members of country evaluation teams, consistent with the selection criteria and national competitive procurement or tender rules;
4. Serving as a resource and to provide advice and feedback to teams;
5. Reviewing and commenting on (but not approving) the draft products of the evaluation.

The National Evaluation Coordinator is responsible for assuring that the evaluation is of acceptable quality before submitting the evaluation report to the Core Evaluation Team. (The evaluation report should adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and other stakeholders. It should answer all questions included in the Terms of Reference.) The quality should be assessed against national, regional or international Evaluation Quality Standards (e.g. the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards). Preference should be given to national standards where they exist.

Each evaluation team should establish internal quality assurance and control systems. The Team Leader [or contracted institution for whom the Team Leader works] is accountable for the organization 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, conclusions and recommendations, as well as a comprehensive final report which meets evaluation standards, within the contracted timeframe/ specifications.

The National Reference/Advisory Group has an important role to play in supporting the National Evaluation Coordinator by assessing the draft inception and final reports for validity and reliability of information, clarity of analysis (that conclusions are substantiated by findings, which are consistent with data collected and that recommendations and lessons learnt follow from the conclusions) and ensuring that any disagreements among the members of the evaluation team or between the evaluation team and relevant partners that are significant to conclusions and recommendations are reflected in the report, either in the form of comments in the text, footnotes or as a special section.

To support the quality assurance at national/donor level the Core Evaluation Team will work both pro-actively and responsively to engage with and support the Country Evaluations and if appropriate the Agency HQ studies. In addition to important arrangements for indirect support, face to face opportunities will be utilized to help lay solid foundations and clear directions for Country Evaluations to follow, support continuing adherence to evaluation standards, provide guidance if/ where evaluation teams run into problems, and facilitate sharing and learning among country teams. The Core Evaluation Team will provide and document its quality review feedback to the Country Teams and Reference /Advisory Groups, as well as the Evaluation Secretariat and Evaluation Management Group.

Quality assurance and control should not be mixed up with acceptance of the findings, conclusions and possible recommendations of the evaluation. **The evaluation teams have the final responsibility for the contents of the reports.**

IV Quality assurance of the work of the Core Evaluation Team

Quality assurance of the work of the Core Evaluation Team comprises three levels:

a) Internal quality control and assurance.

The Core evaluation Team contract-holder has appointed a senior staff member who is not a member of the team with experience from similar assignments as Quality Manager to take overall responsibility for the quality assurance. She will work with the core and country teams to design and monitor the necessary quality assurance frameworks and milestones throughout the course of the assignment.

1. With respect to the work and products of the country and donor HQ teams, the Core Evaluation Team will provide and document its quality review feedback to the teams and the National Reference/Advisory Groups, as well as the Evaluation Secretariat and the Evaluation Management Group at key milestones. The Quality Manager will monitor these processes and may comment on the Core Evaluation Team's final quality assessment of the finished studies submitted.
2. With respect to the work of the Core Evaluation Team itself, the Quality Manager will examine the key milestone documents, as well as the draft synthesis report and the final synthesis report, and be prepared to certify the quality of the products and underlying processes, and fulfilment of the requirements stipulated in the Terms of Reference.

b) Quality assurance by the International Reference Group

The International Reference Group is overseeing the evaluation. It will review evaluation products, including:

1. The Evaluation Approach Paper, the Terms of Reference for the Core Evaluation Team, Generic Terms of Reference for Country and Donor evaluations, Inception Report (including Methodology Paper), and Approach Papers for any supplementary studies.
2. Draft country/donor-level and supplementary study reports for quality, clarity and credibility.
3. Draft and final Synthesis Report for quality, clarity and credibility.

While the International Reference Group will approve the items mentioned under category "1)", it will only review and provide comments on the products mentioned under categories "2)" and "3)". In order to protect the independence and credibility of the evaluation, the International Reference Group will not approve or disapprove the reports produced by independent evaluation teams.

c) Quality assurance by the Management Group

The Evaluation Management Group reports to the International Reference Group but is separately charged with the responsibility to assure the quality and safeguard independence of the evaluation. Specific responsibilities in this respect include:

1. Oversee, and maintain regular interaction with, the Core Evaluation Team, including being responsive to requests from the Team during the course of the Evaluation.
2. Review all products by the Core Evaluation Team at draft stage (Generic Terms of Reference for Country and Donor evaluations, Methodology Paper, ToR for any supplementary studies, Inception Report, Progress Reports, and the Synthesis Report as well as other products that will emanate from the evaluation).
3. Ensure that the Core Evaluation Team gives full consideration and response to substantive comments from both the Management Group and the International Reference Group
4. Assess and sign off (approve) all products by the Core Evaluation Team for adherence to the Terms of Reference guiding the work of this Team, quality against the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards, and accessibility.

d) External Peer Review

At its meeting in May 2010 the Management Group decided, building on the successful experience in Phase 1 of the Evaluation, to establish a review panel comprising three eminent development thinkers, evaluators, academics and practitioners to review the draft and final Synthesis Report along three lines similarly to Phase 1:

- Are the findings, conclusions and recommendations grounded on adequate evidence and analysis?
- Are the conclusions and recommendations of strategic and policy relevance?
- Does the Synthesis Report communicate the key messages effectively and persuasively?

The Management Group has invited the following three persons who have all accepted to sit on the Panel:

Prof. Dr. Dewi Fortuna Anwar : Dr. Anwar was recently appointed Deputy Secretary for Political Affairs to the Vice President of Indonesia. She has been Associate Director for Research, The Habibie Center since November 1999. She is also a Researcher at the Centre for Political and Regional Studies, the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (PPW-LIPI), Jakarta. Between 1993 and 1999, she was Head of Regional and International Affairs and in November 1998 was promoted to Research Professor at PPW-LIPI. From 1992 to the present, she is a Research Executive, Centre for Information and Development Studies (CIDES), Jakarta. In early 2000 she became a Member of the Board of Directors. Other positions include Assistant to the State Secretary for Foreign Affairs, The State Secretariat, Indonesia and Assistant to the Vice President for Global Affairs, The Secretariat of the Vice President, Indonesia. Her other activities include from 1997 to present: Council Member, Australia-Asia Institute and in 2001 she became an International Council Member, The

Asia Society. Between 1998 and-1999, Member of Indonesia's People Consultative Assembly (MPR)

Dr. Mary Chinery Hesse was Chairperson of the Accra High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness and was Vice-Chair of the Ghana National Development Planning Commission. She is a Commissioner of the Commission on HIV/AIDS and Governance in Africa, and a member of the Board of Trustees of the Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation-UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. Between 1989 and 1999 she was Deputy Director General of the International Labour Organization. Before that she was Resident Representative of the United Nations Development Programme in Sierra Leone, Tanzania, the Seychelles and Uganda. Before joining the United Nations she was Principal Secretary, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, and Secretary of the National Economic Planning Council.

Lord George Mark Malloch-Brown, KCMG, PC, was until November 2009 Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office with responsibility for Africa, Asia and the [United Nations](#). In 1994 Malloch Brown joined the [World Bank](#) as Vice-President for External Affairs, which included responsibility for relations with the [United Nations](#). In 1999, he moved back to the United Nations where he was appointed Administrator of the [United Nations Development Programme](#) (UNDP) by the recently elected Kofi Annan. During his time he spear-headed a number of reforms, including following up the creation of the [United Nations Development Group](#) (UNDG),

Quality assurance and control should not be mixed up with acceptance of the conclusions of the evaluation. All **evaluation teams including the Core Evaluation Team have the final responsibility for the contents of their reports.**

oooooOooooo