

## **Note sur les résultats de l'atelier sur les conclusions émergentes tenu du 7 au 10 décembre 2010 à Bali**

Ce sommaire des délibérations circule chez tous les membres du Groupe de référence international, du Groupe de référence national et de chacune des équipes d'évaluation et d'étude (en anglais, en français et en espagnol). Il présente les résultats de cette réunion d'étape et jette les bases des autres étapes de l'évaluation.

### **A. Évaluation globale de l'atelier**

Le Groupe de direction et l'Équipe d'évaluation principale ont trouvé l'atelier très utile, car il a permis aux participants de tester et de valider les conclusions émergentes ainsi que de jeter les bases de l'achèvement de l'évaluation.

Vous trouverez ci-joint une compilation de l'évaluation que les participants ont faite de l'atelier. Cette compilation indique le taux de réponse global et le classement par rapport à chacun des objectifs de l'atelier (annexe 1), et compile également les commentaires par question (annexe 2). Le Groupe de direction et l'Équipe d'évaluation principale ont partagé ces évaluations générales faites par les participants eux-mêmes, en y ajoutant les orientations présentées ci-dessous et quelques unes des leçons apprises à la suite des difficultés rencontrées.

Veillez noter que l'examen du processus d'évaluation global, effectué par Michael Patton et son équipe, se poursuivra. La prochaine étape est un sondage sur Internet qui sera réalisé en février. Nous invitons toutes les parties prenantes à y répondre.

### **B. Document de fond**

Le diaporama ci-joint (en anglais, en français et en espagnol), intitulé « Peaufinage du Rapport provisoire sur les résultats préliminaires » constitue le document de fond des résultats de l'atelier. Le document intitulé « Étapes de la synthèse », beaucoup plus détaillé, vient compléter le diaporama. Ces deux documents seront affichés sur l'Extranet et sur la page de la Déclaration de Paris qui se trouve dans le site Web du Réseau du CAD pour l'évaluation, et ils orienteront l'achèvement des études individuelles de la phase 2 et la tenue du travail de synthèse.

Tel que convenu lors de la dernière séance de l'atelier, les éléments inclus dans les diapos sur le « peaufinage » (en particulier les diapos Q2i à Q3d) n'ont pas tous été acceptés par tous les participants, mais tous ces éléments seront examinés sérieusement au moment d'extraire et de synthétiser les constats tirés des rapports nationaux et des rapports des Directions des donneurs sur la phase 2. Les rapports plus détaillés de chacune des séances en petits groupes seront également consultés dans le but d'éclaircir certains points soulevés, au besoin.

Enfin, la plupart des 16 suggestions et questions affichées sur le « tableau des idées » lors de l'atelier (surtout en ce qui concerne les difficultés méthodologiques) ont fait l'objet de discussions bilatérales avec les rapporteurs et ont été précisées dans le diaporama sur le peaufinage. La plupart continuent de poser d'importants défis et demanderont une attention soutenue au cours du processus de synthèse.

### **C. Exigences essentielles pour achever les rapports**

Maintenant que les équipes nationales et les équipes des Directions des donneurs finaliseront leurs propres rapports, en tenant compte des lignes directrices générales présentées lors de l'atelier et des séances de rétroaction individuelles qui ont été demandées, trois importants éléments doivent être soulignés.

Premièrement, les équipes d'évaluation doivent se concentrer sur les problèmes ou questions pour lesquels elles disposent d'éléments probants et pour lesquels elles peuvent corroborer les conclusions, au lieu de perdre un temps précieux à chercher de nouveaux éléments de preuve.

Deuxièmement, les équipes d'évaluation indépendantes sont responsables du contenu des rapports finaux des pays et des Directions des donneurs/agences. Il s'agit là de l'élément essentiel pour assurer la crédibilité de toute l'évaluation, et il faut protéger et garantir l'intégrité des équipes. L'atelier doit avoir aidé à préciser la façon dont cette exigence doit être satisfaite en pratique, à mesure que l'évaluation entre dans cette étape cruciale. Les rôles et les responsabilités des coordinateurs de l'évaluation nationale (CEN), des groupes de référence nationaux (GRN) et des équipes d'évaluation, qui ont été convenus initialement et qui sont établis dans le Cadre d'évaluation et réitérés dans la Note sur le contrôle de la qualité et les structures de gouvernance, continuent de s'appliquer. Il est important de souligner encore une fois que si les évaluations des GRN et des CEN diffèrent largement à l'égard de ce qui peut être considéré comme des résultats, des conclusions ou des recommandations justifiées par les équipes, c'est possible, et même un signe positif d'une évaluation rigoureuse, d'exposer ces différences dans le rapport final lui-même (dans une note en bas de page, dans le texte ou en annexe).

Troisièmement, d'un point de vue très pratique, on gagnera du temps et on économisera des ressources au cours du travail de synthèse qui suivra si les équipes soumettent deux versions de leur rapport final : un texte « propre » final et un deuxième texte avec « suivi des changements » faisant ressortir les révisions qui ont été faites. Sans une version avec suivi des changements, l'Équipe d'évaluation principale devra entreprendre un exercice très laborieux d'identification des changements afin de s'assurer que les évaluations réunies pour le rapport sur les conclusions émergentes sont modifiées comme il se doit.

#### **D. Dates limites et calendrier pour le reste du processus d'évaluation**

**3 janvier 2011 : Date limite pour soumettre la version finale des rapports nationaux et des Directions des donneurs/agences.** L'équipe de synthèse se servira des rapports qui auront été reçus à cette date. Aux fins de la publication des rapports, les copies seront acceptées jusqu'au 28 janvier.

**8 mars 2011 :** Soumission de la version préliminaire du rapport de synthèse à l'Équipe d'évaluation principale, aux fins de l'assurance de la qualité, et au Groupe de direction aux fins d'examen.

**7 avril 2011 :** Soumission de la version préliminaire du rapport de synthèse (en anglais, en français et en espagnol) au Groupe de référence international afin qu'il puisse l'examiner et présenter ses observations.

**27 et 28 avril 2011 :** 4<sup>e</sup> réunion du Groupe de référence international pour commenter la version préliminaire du rapport de synthèse.

**15 mai 2011 :** Soumission de la version finale du rapport de synthèse au Groupe de direction pour dernière lecture.

#### **E. Préparation de la diffusion et utilisation des rapports d'évaluation**

**Produits :** Alors que les équipes finalisent la version préliminaire de leurs rapports, on leur demande de profiter de l'occasion pour tirer des histoires importantes qui illustrent les résultats principaux du rapport et de les mettre en valeur (p. ex. dans des boîtes de texte). Aux fins de la diffusion et de l'utilisation ultime des rapports, il est très important de réviser le texte afin d'améliorer la lisibilité et de supprimer le jargon et les acronymes. Cela vaut tout particulièrement pour les sommaires, qu'il faut rendre accessibles aux non-spécialistes.

**Processus :** Il n'est pas trop tôt pour que les coordinateurs nationaux, les groupes de référence et les équipes commencent à planifier la diffusion et l'utilisation. Ils peuvent nommer des « chefs » ou des équipes pour cette phase, et obtenir des conseils spécialisés. Certaines des expériences que d'autres pays ont présentées lors de l'atelier peuvent se révéler utiles.

## Annexe 1 : Résultats de l'évaluation de l'atelier

N°. de participants (membres de l'EEP non compris)	113
N°. de réponses	78
Taux de réponse	69%

Objectifs de l'atelier	Evaluation du degré de réalisation : N°. de réponses				Taux moyen (où très faible = 1, très bien = 4)
	Très faible	Faible	Bien	Très bien	
1. Partager et valider les résultats préliminaires, c'est-à-dire les réponses aux 3 grandes questions de l'évaluation et évaluer les faits probants	0	3	40	34	<b>3.40</b>
2. Contribuer au processus de synthèse	0	4	40	34	<b>3.38</b>
3. Confirmer l'appropriation et l'engagement collectif au processus et produits de l'évaluation	0	1	43	33	<b>3.42</b>
4. Se mettre d'accord sur les prochaines étapes menant au Forum de haut niveau 4 et s'engager à les suivre	1	5	43	26	<b>3.25</b>

## Annexe 2 : Evaluation de l'atelier – commentaires / suggestions des participants

### Objectif 1:

Partager et valider les résultats préliminaires, c'est-à-dire les réponses aux 3 grandes questions de l'évaluation et évaluer les faits probants

- 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

## **Objectif 2:** Contribuer au processus de synthèse

- 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

### **Objectif 3:**

Confirmer l'appropriation et l'engagement collectif au processus et produits de l'évaluation

- 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 – 1<sup>st</sup> 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)

### **Objectif 4:**

Se mettre d'accord sur les prochaines étapes menant au Forum de haut niveau 4 et s'engager à les suivre

- 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

## D'autres commentaires?

- 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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?