

Nota sobre los resultados del taller sobre conclusiones obtenidas realizado del 7 al 10 de diciembre de 2010 en Bali

El presente resumen de las discusiones está en circulación (en inglés, francés y español) entre todos los miembros del Grupo de Referencia Internacional, del Grupo de Referencia Nacional y de cada uno de los equipos de evaluación y de estudio. Presenta los resultados de esta reunión de etapa y establece las bases de las próximas etapas de la evaluación.

A. Evaluación global del taller

Según el Grupo de Gestión y el Equipo Central de Evaluación, el taller fue de gran utilidad, visto que permitió a los participantes examinar y validar las conclusiones obtenidas y al mismo tiempo establecer las bases para finalizar la evaluación.

En anexo se encuentra una compilación de la evaluación que los participantes hicieron del taller, en la cual se presenta la tasa de respuesta global y la clasificación en función de cada uno de los objetivos del taller (Anexo 1). Además, dicha compilación indica los comentarios que recibió cada pregunta (Anexo 2). El Grupo de Gestión y el Equipo Central de Evaluación compartieron esas evaluaciones generales hechas por los mismos participantes, a las cuales agregaron las orientaciones presentadas más adelante y algunas de las lecciones aprendidas de las dificultades que se presentaron.

El examen del proceso de evaluación global, realizado por Michael Patton y su equipo, continuará. La próxima etapa será una encuesta en Internet que se llevará a cabo en febrero. Invitamos a todas las partes interesadas a participar a dicha encuesta.

B. Documento de fondo

El diaporama adjunto (en inglés, francés y español), "Refinamiento del Informe de Conclusiones Obtenidas", constituye el documento de fondo de los resultados del taller. El documento "Etapas de la síntesis", el cual es mucho más detallado, completa el diaporama. Ambos documentos se pondrán en el Extranet y en la página de la Declaración de París que se encuentra en el sitio Web de la Red Evalnet del CAD, y servirán de guía para finalizar los estudios individuales de la fase 2 y realizar el trabajo de síntesis.

Tal y como se acordó en la última sesión del taller, no todos los participantes han aceptado los puntos incluidos en las diapositivas sobre el "refinamiento" (en particular las diapositivas Q2i a Q3d), pero todos esos puntos serán examinados con suma atención al momento de extraer y sintetizar las conclusiones de los informes nacionales y de los informes de las oficinas centrales de los donantes sobre la fase 2. Los informes más detallados de cada una de las reuniones en grupos pequeños también se consultarán para esclarecer ciertos puntos recalcados, de ser necesario.

Finalmente, la mayor parte de las 16 sugerencias y preguntas expuestas en el "pizarrón de ideas" del taller (sobre todo en cuanto a las dificultades metodológicas) han sido objeto de discusiones bilaterales con los relatores y han sido precisadas en la presentación final sobre el refinamiento. La mayoría siguen presentando retos importantes que exigirán una gran atención durante el proceso de síntesis.

C. Exigencias esenciales para finalizar los informes

Ahora que los equipos nacionales y los equipos de las oficinas centrales de los donantes retomarán la finalización de sus propios informes, tomando en cuenta las directrices generales presentadas en el taller y las sesiones de retroacción individual que se pidieron, se debe hacer hincapié en tres puntos importantes.

En primer lugar, los equipos de evaluación deben concentrarse en los problemas/asuntos para los cuales tienen pruebas y pueden corroborar las conclusiones, en vez de perder un tiempo valioso buscando nuevas pruebas.

En segundo lugar, los equipos de evaluación independientes son responsables del contenido de los informes finales de los países y de las oficinas centrales de los donantes y agencias. Eso es esencial para garantizar la credibilidad de toda la evaluación, y se debe proteger y garantizar la integridad de los equipos. El taller debe haber ayudado a precisar la manera en que se debe satisfacer esa exigencia en la práctica, a medida que la evaluación entra en esta etapa crucial. El papel, y las respectivas responsabilidades, de los Coordinadores de Evaluación Nacional (CEN), los Grupos de Referencia Nacionales (GRN) y los Equipos de evaluación, que se establecieron inicialmente en el Marco de Evaluación y se reiteraron en la Nota sobre evaluación de la calidad y estructuras de gobernanza, se siguen aplicando. Es importante recalcar de nuevo que si las evaluaciones de los GRN y CEN difieren significativamente en cuanto a lo que se puede considerar como resultados, conclusiones o recomendaciones justificadas por los equipos, no solo es posible sino también es un signo positivo de una evaluación rigurosa, el hacer constar esas diferencias en el informe final (en una nota al pie de la página, en el texto o en anexo).

En tercer lugar, de un punto de vista muy práctico, se ganará tiempo y se ahorrarán recursos durante el trabajo de síntesis que se avecina si los equipos presentan dos versiones de su informe final: un texto "limpio" y un segundo texto con "cambios indicados" que hagan resaltar las revisiones que se han hecho. Sin una versión con cambios indicados, el Equipo Central de Evaluación tendrá que realizar la tarea laboriosa de identificar todos los cambios para asegurarse que las evaluaciones reunidas para el informe sobre conclusiones obtenidas se modifiquen como se debe.

D. Fechas límite y calendario para el resto del proceso de evaluación

3 de enero de 2011: Fecha límite para entregar la versión final de los informes nacionales y de las oficinas centrales de los donantes y agencias. El equipo de síntesis utilizará los informes que se hayan recibido hasta esa fecha. Para fines de publicación de los informes, se aceptarán las copias hasta el 28 de enero.

8 de marzo de 2011: Entrega de la versión preliminar del informe de síntesis al Equipo Central de Evaluación para fines de evaluación de la calidad, y al Grupo de Gestión para fines de examen.

7 de abril de 2011: Entrega de la versión preliminar del informe de síntesis (en inglés, francés y español) al Grupo de Referencia Internacional para que lo pueda examinar y comentar.

27 y 28 de abril de 2011: 4ª reunión del Grupo de Referencia Internacional para comentar la versión preliminar del informe de síntesis.

15 de mayo de 2011: Entrega de la versión final del informe de síntesis al Grupo de Gestión para última lectura.

E. Preparación para la difusión y el uso de los informes de evaluación

Productos: Mientras los equipos finalizan la versión preliminar de sus informes, se les pide que aprovechen la ocasión para sacar historias importantes que ilustren las conclusiones principales del informe y los hagan resaltar (p. ej. en recuadros). Para fines de difusión y uso último de los informes, es muy importante revisar el texto para mejorar la legibilidad y suprimir la jerga y los acrónimos. Esto se aplica en particular a los resúmenes, para que sean accesibles a las personas que no son especialistas.

Procesos: No es demasiado temprano para que los coordinadores nacionales, los grupos de referencia y los equipos empiecen a planificar la difusión y el uso. Pueden nombrar "titulares" o equipos para esta fase, y obtener consejos especializados. Algunas de las experiencias que otros países presentaron en el taller pueden ser útiles.

Anexo 1: Resultados de la evaluación del taller

Núm. de participantes (excluyendo miembros del ECE)	113
Núm. de respuestas	78
Índice de respuesta	69%

Objetivos del taller	Evaluación: Núm. de respuestas				Índice medio (dónde muy mal = 1, muy bien = 4)
	Muy mal	Mal	Bien	Muy bien	
1. Compartir y validar las conclusiones obtenidas en base a las respuestas a las tres preguntas generales de evaluación global, y evaluar las evidencias	0	3	40	34	3.40
2. Integrarlas al proceso de síntesis	0	4	40	34	3.38
3. Confirmar la apropiación y el compromiso colectivos con el proceso y los productos de la evaluación	0	1	43	33	3.42
4. Acordar y comprometerse con el camino a seguir para el FAN 4	1	5	43	26	3.25

Anexo 2: Evaluación del taller – comentarios / sugerencias de los participantes

Objetivo 1:

Compartir y validar las conclusiones obtenidas en base a las respuestas a las tres preguntas generales de evaluación global, y evaluar las evidencias

- There were limitations related to:
 - Reports sent late
 - Reports not to be quotedThat interfered the efficiency / effectiveness of the sharing
- Les différents groupes ont effectivement répondu aux 3 questions posées.
- Pour ceux qui ont eu des problèmes pour comprendre les preuves, il fallait leur donner un exemple pratique d'utilisation de la Matrice.
- Not enough room / chance to manoeuvre to share; more variety of country groups is suggested
- Objective achieved in the small groups particularly
- More time should have been provided to clarify the differences in the findings and countries
- Little groups were very useful
- Good and frank discussions in breakout groups, but reporting back a bit tedious
- If all the country evaluation reports are available it will be better
- Clarification of some of the outcomes would have been very helpful
- Very well done
- Well managed process
- Need to look into/focus more critically at development results and PD/AAA linkages, why or why not changes/improvements happened after half a decade (of course taking into account country and global contexts)
- Good to highlight the evidence quality issue and independence issue
- Most teams seemed to own their own finding and more able to explain them – several of their findings seem really independent and of high quality
- A bit more systematic attention to Question 1 would have been good
- We might have made more progress had we used the smaller group format more
- Note USAID comments re: structuring responses to “direction, pace and distance of travel”
- It was difficult to achieve this at this stage as most reports were not finalised yet by country evaluation teams, let alone acceptable to gov't for submission
- This has been excellent
- A complex issue managed well with the various constraints – time, new entry people, divergent countries
- Some concerns over the way findings were summarised into fairly banal statements on ‘direction of travel’ – it's the texture that matters
- There is still evidence of misunderstanding of some key concepts e.g. PD as a document vs PD as a framework to provide direction
- Groups well formulated, e.g. Mozambique-Zambia combination gave real value added for the discussion
- Sharing emerging finding = good; Validating emerging findings = poor

- Would have been better if participants read the first report carefully and referred to it specifically. This could have been easier in turn if the base reports had been available for citation and quotation
- In depth validation is expected after the Bali IRG
- Need to maintain consistency with regard to evaluation questions and responses from various countries
- Comments from the workshop to validate early findings
- I believe that many countries (coordinators and national evaluation teams) did not read the emerging findings report before the meeting. They were therefore not really in a position to crosscheck their findings with those in the synthesis. However, many countries are more interested in their own reports than in the synthesis report.
- Time was not bad in groups but chairs could have had a better brief and structure of report back should have been transparent to allow group to shape discussion better
- Sharing part is very good, validating might have needed more time – overall good
- Could have made better use of time through e.g. feedback – maybe have different groups looking at different outcomes and feeding back
- Most useful for Core Team, least for IRG members not directly involved – but that's OK

Objetivo 2: Integrarlas al proceso de síntesis

- A great job from the CET; not an easy job the synthesis process
- Du temps aux participants pour lire et contribuer par mail
- Good organisation of discussion but need more sub-group discussion
- Not as good – too much plenary; should have had more small group
- HQ studies somewhat 'down played' (focus on Q2 and Q3, HQ studies rather Q1 and Q2)
- Very good report back from CET
- Synthesis of donor and country evaluation reports is a challenge for CET
- Care must be taken to avoid presenting a 'donor side' synthesis report which might create an impression that the onus of achieving the PD is a responsibility of partner countries
- Not enough time
- Has been instrumental to prepare the synthesis work
- Hard to accomplish, but enough was done to proceed
- Still a long way to go – overambitious at this stage
- The political nature and its sensitivities seem to be inadequately captured; what are the obstacles to implementing PD and how can these be overcome in developing countries will be critical
- Workshops, discussion were very rich and informative and also allowed for further reflection. Hopefully, the synthesis report would be able to capture the essence of the inputs
- Would have liked a bit more time to discuss approach and method for this but confident the team are and will be doing an excellent job
- Very important that teams and IRG had chance to meet and provide inputs and get impression of where we are
- I would have preferred to see more 'up front' emphasis on 'emerging donors'

- Late delivery of some reports hampered synthesis work
- The discussions have added to better defining the outcomes – highlighted the focus of synthesis findings
- Good, based on testimony of Core Team
- Possibly only became apparent to most participants at a late stage – because of the need to keep focus on emerging findings
- To reflect impact of PD as well as recommendations very clearly with respect to bilateral/multilateral donor
- Still unanswered questions but IRG and team very accessible
- Difficult task – addressing each and every question is not possible; effort to striking balance is great
- Formally and informally (CET very open)
- Need to maintain consistency with regard to evaluation questions and responses from various countries

Objetivo 3:

Confirmar la apropiación y el compromiso colectivos con el proceso y los productos de la evaluación

- Good perception of ownership; good opportunity / space to participate
- Again, too much plenary discussion – too often only a small group of people speak up
- In particular cases (countries) donor/development partners still having limited ownership on the process; limited changes also in the donors behaviour
- Participatory process helped and constructive discussion mostly although some 'old' issues again come up
- Although it was good, I hope that we have succeeded
- Very much accomplished; ownership strengthened
- Availability of CET; confidence on future product
- Impressed with the degree to which holding clear interest and momentum on findings
- Very much welcome the process reflections and re-iteration of IRG responsibility as evaluators
- Enhanced sense of commitment from all parties to use PDE as a meaningful construct providing future direction
- It's not completely clear how much the evaluations shall be kept independent, how much the governments should influence them
- Not fair for me to judge – 1st meeting – I don't feel ownership myself
- Maybe too early to tell, but so far so good
- Inclusive process to be applauded (high investment – money, time – justified)

Objetivo 4:

Acordar y comprometerse con el camino a seguir para el FAN 4

- This will also be a very hard job (to 'get' to feed the HLF) BUT this will give sense of all the previous good work

- Good dissemination
- Not sure this was really done since time was limited and people agreed accordingly
- Need more campaign nationally and internationally to achieve better commitment for aid effectiveness for development
- Not primary purpose of the meeting, but clarified
- The further process to produce the draft synthesis report and finalise underlying reports is clear
- Not totally clear but adequate
- Too ambitious, not at this stage yet
- Discussed only on procedures
- Attract only several participants
- Less clear how the evaluation will link up to e.g. the monitoring survey, the INCAF process etc (do we expect it to?)
- Difficult to assess
- One query re: how PDE BIG STORIES / briefing papers will be done if contract for PDE ends in May?
- Presentation on Busan (by OECD/DAC member) could have been given earlier in the programme
- Exciting
- Was this not already determined?
- Still some way to go but the commitment is evident
- There is much good in the process – based on a thorough assessment of value added and lessons learned
- We hope so
- Perfunctory – good briefing and fortunately no senior disagreements – good homework? High levels of trust in the team?
- Useful: presence of OECD/DAC member – but continuous close interaction needed to make sure evaluation results are made full use of

¿Otro comentario?

- The small group afternoon session was excellent. The group feedback on some questions from groups was not interesting. More small mixed groups would have been helpful. Evaluation session on Thursday PM was excellent. The CET had a very difficult job which they are doing as well as possible. Too much plenary. Thanks very much for inviting us.
- Améliorer la disponibilité de documents en français pour permettre une meilleure participation des francophones. Félicitations pour les conditions de travail
- Counterfactual not really addressed; Overly diplomatic at times, i.e. real reason for lack of ownership in some countries and alignment of donors to country systems (namely corruption issues); Clustering may be problematic but necessary to really understand some of the findings i.e. Afghanistan (nation building / security exercise?)
- Efficient time management is necessary; Chair should be more strict towards participants dominating the discussions / question sessions; good support from the Secretariat, especially host Bappenas should be acknowledged
- Poor time management (during sessions); Good hosting job by Bappenas and A4DES; excellent work by the team

- Not an observation but maybe a suggestion or clarification – is there a way or mechanism to ensure that NRG is actually overseeing or seriously doing its functions?
- Overall very good; Also nice with visits outside town; Excellent logistical support
- Great thanks for mobilisation, organisation and collective working process
- As the evaluation report should capture and serve the purpose of 'aid in the changing development context' at the HLF4 therefore the development factors that influence the aid agenda in general, to PD implementation in particular should be in focus
- It would also be helpful to ensure that the country reports interlink the principles on whether one is dependent on the other and whether it has an effect or not; Note – CSO application of PDE is dependent on the political environment and effectiveness of CSO will also be dependent on how much space and level of regulation is applied to them
- Country teams should be part of the validation process for the synthesis report; Extension of the deadline for submission of revised country reports to second week of January
- Thanks for the emphasis on strong evidence. However, consider the deadline for submission. Note all the issues that have been raised at this meeting. An extension will make the synthesis easier and faster.
- Good workshop overall. Perhaps the group work was a bit rushed. The challenge there was to validate the synthesis from actual findings of the evaluation and not from opinion of participants.
- Positive: collaborative spirit, confidence in the evaluation reinforced, confidence in core team reiterated, complexity of tasks clarified; Challenging: we have to wait and see whether some underlying reports will be reinforced, timeliness of submission of underlying studies, include other finding (some important ongoing evaluations e.g. anti-corruption evaluation)
- Morning of Day 2 unnecessarily tedious
- Q1 should have been emphasised as much as Q2 and Q3
- It would have been a good idea if the evaluators (external) met in order to share issues/constraints/limitations to their work and core team to listen to them, because their comments and observations could've been taken into account. Gov'ts and usually political and diplomatic language doesn't give a realistic picture of the evaluation.
- Patton review very welcome; beautiful venue – thank you
- Well prepared, managed – thank you very much. We are still in the evaluation process, however having a rich group of resource people from partner countries, we could have discussed how we should make much of these Emerging Findings or possible results of this event towards agenda setting / theme of HLF4
- The matrix that was used for the small group exercise on Day 2 appeared to be structured in a way that is a little too specific / detailed for discussions in such a small sized group. For some questions it was difficult to find a common ground for making discussions to the point. Would have been suitable for a bigger sized group discussion. Overall, an excellent and effective workshop.
- Thanks to the preparation of both the PDE Secretariat, the Gov't of Indonesia, the CET, the country evaluation teams and country ref groups, this was a very well organised and productive workshop. We have made a lot of progress towards our end goal. Looking forward to continued progress. Thanks and compliments to all.
- There is absolute need for everyone to understand 'ownership' as conceived in Paris 2005. Ownership is for the partner countries to lead the way with support from other stakeholders including donors. Ownership means government (executive, legislative and judiciary).
- In my opinion, this meeting will be remembered by all of us as the best result oriented workshop on PDE2. I believe the outcome of this workshop will help us in producing an excellent report
- The 3rd IRG meeting is a great milestone to achieve the aims and objectives of the PD. The outcomes of this meeting will help the donor and partner countries to go forward towards development effectiveness.
- Communicating PD and AAA in terms that are real for politicians in donor countries will be important. Avoid technicalities. Emphasise the political.
- Workshop was well organised; logistics and other arrangements were also equally satisfactory. The discussions were enriching especially the group discussions. Felt that there are differences especially among the donors about the relevance and application of PD in the context that ODA is often linked with foreign policies. Also felt that some of the

donors are very reluctant to go for SWAP, GBS like modalities. Instead, it is felt, they prefer to continue with project modalities primarily to justify their citizens and tax payers and also to claim credit for contributions. The level of participation was somehow low. As PD is a political commitment and to get it implemented policy makers or the people drafting policies should have been invited. Not only the level of political input was low, but also most if not all participants came from evaluation sections or divisions. This leaves with a question, rather a big question: will the policy makers be considering the conclusions or findings of the evaluations?

- A common voice can be formed in the HLF4 to boost up aid more effective. In addition to the Paris principles more dimensions can be addressed there like 'aid for development', 'aid for resolving unemployment' etc. Accountability may also be added with transparency. Country system and predictability issues to be more emphasised in Busan. Also political masters to be involved in this process to make aid more effective to achieve development results.
- Fantastic effort by the CET to do the preliminary analysis to enable the discussion when so many reports came in quite late. Welcome responsiveness by the Management Group and CET to issues raised by the IRG. For IRG could there be a bit more space to discuss methods and analytical issues (even on a self-selected optional basis for evaluation types) in addition to only focus on the actual findings.
- I hope the Core Group obtained what it needed from the IRG. The role of the chair is key to keeping group on task – Joakim did very well, firm but light touch.
- The date given as final is too near. With the holidays in between in puts country evaluation teams under pressure and will compromise the quality that is of the concern already to many of the participants. My proposal would be to let the countries submit the reports by mid January. This will give time for reflection of the discussions from this meeting.
- Many issues were clearly explained. I feel more confident as an evaluator to proceed with the work to its final conclusion.
- The group work was more productive than the plenary. More of the schedule could have been given over to group work on specific topics. Some plenary sessions were poorly designed, leading to a rather unfocused discussion.
- It's been a constructive and good process – impacts on individual country representatives will vary but we feel that we have enhanced capabilities to progress in this area
- Good time management
- I would recommend that a new, more specific agenda of evaluation research topics and modalities for 'joint/collaboration' research between donor countries be considered and funded – you've created assets and momentum on which to build a more sophisticated agenda of research – or maybe in DAC?
- Feedback from CSO/NGO/INGO could have been better
- Very good management, logistics, venue selection. Evaluation methodology and quality assurance part is fair. Some participants blindly went for numbers and figures but I believe getting nearer to people, talking and key informants, physically observing the context, situation can give more real and practical information than numbers can do. Sometimes merely numbers may mislead if parameters are wrong. This evaluation process has good triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data.
- Perfect logistical support – thanks
- Should the evaluation feed into the overall development effectiveness process? If so, it is not clear to me how. If not, why not?