

Evaluation

Implementation of the Paris Declaration Finland



Evaluation report 2007:3

**MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF FINLAND
DEPARTMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT POLICY**

REPORT 2007:3	Implementation of the Paris Declaration – Finland ISBN: 978-951-724-663-7 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-664-4 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2007:2	Meta-Analysis of Development Evaluations in 2006 ISBN: 978-951-724-632-3 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-633-1 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2007:1	Finnish Aid to Afganistan ISBN: 978-951-724-634-7 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-635-4 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2006:3	Review of Finnish Microfinance Cooperation ISBN: 951-724-569-6, (printed), ISBN: 951-724-570-X (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2006:2	Evaluation of CIMO North-South Higher Education Network Programme ISBN: 951-724-549-1, ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2006:1	Evaluation of Environmental Management in Finland´s Development Cooperation ISBN: 951-724-546-7, ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2005:6	Evaluation of Support Allocated to International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGO) ISBN: 951-724-531-9, ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2005:5	Evaluation of the Service Centre for Development Cooperation in Finland (KEPA) ISBN: 951-724-523-8, ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2005:4	Gender Baseline Study for Finnish Development Cooperation ISBN: 951-724-521-1, ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2005:3	Evaluation of Finnish Health Sector Development Cooperation 1994–2003 ISBN: 951-724-493-2, ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2005:2	Evaluation of Finnish Humanitarian Assistance 1996–2004 ISBN: 951-724-491-6, ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2005:1	Ex-Ante Evaluation of Finnish Development Cooperation in the Mekong Region ISBN: 955-742-478-9, ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2004:4	Refocusing Finland's Cooperation with Namibia ISBN: 955-724-477-0, ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2004:3	Evaluation of the Development Cooperation Activities of Finnish NGOs and Local Cooperation Funds in Tanzania ISBN: 951-724-449-5, ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2004:2	Evaluation of Finland's Development Cooperation with Bosnia and Herzegovina ISBN: 951-724-446-0, ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2004:1	Evaluation of Finnish Education Sector Development Cooperation ISBN: 951-724-440-1, ISSN: 1235-7618
REPORT 2003:3	Label Us Able – A Pro-active Evaluation of Finnish Development co-operation from the disability perspective ISBN 951-724-425-8, ISSN 1235-7618
REPORT 2003:2 PART 2	Evaluation of Finnish Forest Sector Development Co-operation ISBN 951-724-416-9 ISSN 1235-7618
REPORT 2003:2 PART 1	Evaluation of Finnish Forest Sector Development Co-operation ISBN 951-724-407-X, ISSN 1235-7618
REPORT 2003:1	Evaluation of the Finnish Concessional Credit Scheme ISBN 951-724-400-2, ISSN 1235-7618

Evaluation

Implementation of the Paris Declaration

Finland

Evaluation report 2007:3

Evaluation

Implementation of the Paris Declaration

Finland

Jyrki Salmi
Merja Mikkola

Evaluation report 2007:3

MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF FINLAND
DEPARTMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT POLICY

This evaluation report was commissioned by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland to Indufor Ltd in cooperation with Ekonomik. The Consultants bear sole responsibility for the contents of the report. The report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.

This report can be accessed at <http://formin.finland.fi> and
hard copies can be requested from KEO-08@formin.fi

ISBN 978-951-724-663-7 (printed)

ISBN 978-951-724-664-4 (pdf)

ISSN 1235-7618

Cover Photo: Saija Sivén

Cover Design: Anni Palotie

Printing House: Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki, 2008

CONTENTS

PREFACE	iii
ACRONYMS	iv
ABSTRACTS	1
Finnish.....	1
Swedish.....	2
English.....	3
SUMMARIES	4
Finnish.....	4
Swedish.....	8
English.....	11
1 INTRODUCTION.....	15
1.1 General Evaluation Context.....	15
1.2 Finland-specific Evaluation Context	15
1.2.1 Development Policy and Cooperation Setting in Finland.....	16
1.2.2 Case Finland - Evaluation of the Paris Declaration.....	17
2 METHODOLOGY.....	18
2.1 Sampling.....	18
2.2 Data Collection Instruments.....	18
2.2.1 Existing Policy Documents, Reports and Information.....	19
2.2.2 Face-to-Face Interviews.....	19
2.2.3 E-mail Survey.....	19
2.2.4 Stakeholder Workshop.....	20
2.3 Analysis.....	20
2.4 Management of the Finnish Evaluation.....	21
2.5 Limitations	21
3 ASSESSING LEADERSHIP.....	22
3.1 Political Commitment	22
3.2 Ownership.....	23
3.3 Putting the Commitment into Practice	24
4 ASSESSING CAPABILITIES.....	27
4.1 Knowledge.....	27
4.2 Human Resources.....	28

4.3	Coordination	29
4.4	Decentralization.....	29
4.5	Specific Guidelines or Directives.....	30
4.6	Training.....	30
5	ASSESSING INCENTIVES.....	31
5.1	Tradition and Awareness	31
5.2	Performance Assessment Framework	32
5.3	Results-based Management System (RMS)	32
5.4	Incentive and Partner Countries.....	33
5.5	Disincentives.....	34
5.6	Transaction Costs.....	35
6	ASSESSING COHERENCE.....	35
6.1	Political Framework.....	35
6.2	Challenges for Coherence	36
6.3	National Coherence	36
6.4	Coherence with the EU and in Multilateral Cooperation.....	38
7	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	39
7.1	Leadership	39
7.2	Capacities.....	40
7.3	Incentives.....	41
7.4	Coherence.....	42
	REFERENCES	44
	ANNEX 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	46
	ANNEX 2 LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED	55
	ANNEX 3 LIST OF RESPONDENTS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY*	
	ANNEX 4 E-MAIL QUESTIONNAIRES*	
	ANNEX 5 ANALYSIS OF E-MAIL SURVEY RESULTS: CAPACITIES AND INCENTIVES*	
	ANNEX 6 PROGRAMME OF THE STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP*	
	ANNEX 7 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP*	
	ANNEX 8 EVALUATION MATRIX*	

* Annexes 3-8 contained in the attached CD

PREFACE

The objective of the Paris Declaration (PD), adopted in 2005, is to improve the effectiveness of development aid. The implementation of the declaration is followed closely and regularly by monitoring. The Declaration text saw it also necessary that the implementation of PD be externally evaluated, yet, so that no extra burden was exposed to the administrations. The Evaluation network sub-committee of the Development Committee (DAC) of OECD decided to undertake the evaluation as a joint-effort so that those evaluated were chosen on voluntary basis. It was planned to include ten development partners (donors) and ten partner countries. In the end, a total of 11 development partners and a total of seven partner countries had completed the evaluation. An international team of experts will amalgamate the findings of individual evaluations into a synthesis report, which will be forwarded to the High Level Forum in Accra in September 2008.

Finland was among those that volunteered to be evaluated. As a donor country, the evaluation comprised only the capital level, with some e-mail questionnaires having been sent to the embassies. The evaluation of the Implementation of Paris Declaration by Finland was entrusted to a team of two experts, Mr. Jyrki Salmi as the Team Leader and Ms. Merja Mikkola, Team Member, representing Indufor Ltd as the contractor. The time schedule of the Finnish evaluation was quite demanding, as there were also other significant processes running simultaneously. The evaluation report was completed in time and the results of the evaluation of Finland will be included in the global synthesis report. National reports can be separately published.

The major results of the evaluation of Finland are that Finland is highly committed to the Implementation of PD, but that PD is not very widely known or understood in Finland. A finding of concern is also that the implementation of PD is nearly solely looked as a public sector issue, and should be expanded to comprise also other players and stakeholders in development aid. The embassy level and decentralisation are seen of growingly important in the implementation of PD.

Helsinki, 20 December 2007

Aira Päivöke
Director
Unit for Evaluation and Internal Auditing

ACRONYMS

AfrEA	African Evaluation Association
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
Danida	Danish International Development Agency
DCD	Development Cooperation Directorate
DfID	Department for International Development, UK
DK	Denmark
DP	Development Partner
DKK	Danish Crown
DPC	Development Policy Committee
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
EU	European Union
EUR	Euro
EURODAD	European Network on Debt and Development
EvalNet	Network on Development Evaluation
FIDIDA	Finnish Disabled People's International Development Association
FNDP	Fifth National Development Plan of Zambia
FToR	Finnish Terms of Reference
GAERC	General Affairs and External Relations Council
GSP	Generalized System of Preference
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/ Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
HLF	High Level Forum on the Paris Declaration
HQ	Headquarters
IFI	International Financing Institution
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPCC	International Panel on Climate Change
JAS	Joint Assistance Strategy
JASZ	Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia
KAVAKU	Training course for the prospective career diplomats
KEO-08	Unit for Evaluation and Internal Auditing, Department for Development Policy, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
KEO-11	Unit for General Development Policy and Planning, Department for Development Policy, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
KEPA	Service Centre for Development Cooperation (Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskus)
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MFA	Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
MOF	Ministry of Finance of Finland
NEC	National Evaluation Coordinator
NGO	Non-governmental organisation

Norad	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OPCS	Operations Policy and Country Services
PAF	Performance Assessment Framework
PC	Partner Country
PD	Paris Declaration
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RMS	Results-based Management System
RSA	Republic of South Africa
SWAp	Sector-Wide Approach
SYKE	Finnish Environment Institute (Suomen ympäristökeskus)
TA	Technical Assistance
TAE	Annual budget proposal (Talousarvioehdotus)
TAKE	Annual target discussions (Tavoitekeskustelut)
ToR	Terms of Reference
TTS	Operational and Budget Plan (Toiminta- ja taloussuunnitelma)
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UPJ	New (public sector) salary system (uusi palkkausjärjestelmä)
US	United States
USA	United States of America
USD	United States Dollar
VALKU	Preparatory training before working abroad
WP-EFF	Working Party on Aid Effectiveness
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Pariisin Deklaraation toimeenpanon Evaluaatio: Suomi

Jyrki Salmi ja Merja Mikkola

Ulkoasiainministeriön evaluaatioraportti 2007:3

ISBN 978-951-724-663-7 (painettu); ISBN 978-951-724-664-4 (pdf);
ISSN 1235-7618

Raportti on luettavissa kokonaisuudessaan osoitteessa <http://formin.finland.fi>

TIIVISTELMÄ

Evaluaation tarkoituksena oli selvittää, missä määrin Pariisin Deklaraation (PD) sisältö on otettu huomioon Suomen hallituksen politiikassa, ja eritoten kehityspolitiikassa ja kehitysyhteistyössä. Evaluaatio suoritettiin asiakirjojen arviointina ja haastatteluina vuoden 2007 toisella puoliskolla.

Suomi on hyvin sitoutunut PD:n toteuttamiseen sekä poliittisella että käytännön toteutuksen tasolla. Ulkoasiainministeriö (MFA) painottaa omistajuutta ja harmonisaatiota kun taas Valtiovarainministeriössä (MOF) painotetaan tulosperustaista lähestymistapaa. Monet päätöksentekijät ja kehitysyhteistyötä toteuttavat tahot näkivät ongelmana sen että PD kohdentuu vain julkiselle sektorille. Sen sijaan PD ei huomioi julkisen sektorin ulkopuolisten tahojen roolia eikä myöskään kehitysyhteistyön sisältökysymyksiä.

Evaluaatio suosittaa, että Suomi jatkaisi vuoropuhelua kumppanimaiden kanssa avun muodoista ja vaikutuksista. Ymmärtämyksen ja tiedon lisäämiseksi suositellaan, että MFA ja muut kehityspolitiikan osapuolet järjestäisivät systemaattista ja laajaa kehitysyhteistyöhön ja PD:n rooliin liittyvää koulutusta. Suosituksena on myös, että Suomi sijoittaisi kahdenvälisen kehitysyhteistyön hallintoon erikoistuneita asiantuntijoita kehitysmaissa sijaitseviin lähetystöihinsä.

Arvioinnin tuloksissa nousee korostetusti esiin kaikilla tasoilla, hallinnon sisäisellä sekä hallitusten välisellä, tarve johdonmukaisuuden korostamiseen. Johdonmukaisuus on erityisen tärkeää keskusteltaessa eri teemojen välisistä yhteyksistä, esimerkiksi sellaisten kuin ilmaston muutos ja luonnonvarojen käyttö.

Avainsanat: Pariisin Deklaraatio, harmonisaatio, koherenssi

Evaluering av verkställandet av Parisdeklarationen: Finland

Jyrki Salmi och Merja Mikkola

Finska Utrikesministeriets utvärderingsrapport 2007:3

ISBN 978-951-724-663-7 (print); ISBN 978-951-724-664-4 (pdf);
ISSN 1235-7618

Rapporten i sin helhet kan läsas under <http://formin.finland.fi>

ABSTRAKT

Syftet med evalueringen var att utvärdera i vilken omfattning Parisdeklarationen har inkluderats i Finlands regerings politik, i synnerhet i utvecklingspolitiken och genomförandet av utvecklingssamarbetet. Evalueringen genomfördes som dokumentanalys och intervjuundersökning i slutet av år 2007.

Finland förbinder sig helt till Parisdeklarationen när det gäller både genomförandet av principprogram och det praktiska genomförandet. Utrikesministeriet poängterar dock ägarskapet och harmoniseringen, medan Finansministeriet poängterar resultatstyrningen. Flera beslutsfattare inom utvecklingssamarbetet och parter, som i praktiken utför utvecklingssamarbetet, anser det problematiskt att Parisdeklarationen fokuserar enbart på den offentliga sektorns stöd. De andra principiella utvecklingsfrågorna, förutom rollerna för aktörerna inom den offentliga sektorn samt innehållet i utvecklingssamarbetet, får inte uppmärksamhet i deklarationen.

Evalueringen rekommenderar att Finland fortsätter dialog om bidragets former och konsekvenser med samarbetsländerna. För att kompetensen ska kunna stärkas rekommenderar man att utrikesministeriet och andra instanser som arbetar inom utvecklingspolitiken arrangerar omfattande och systematisk utbildning i utvecklingsfrågor och i Parisdeklarationens betydelse för utvecklingsarbetet. Dessutom rekommenderar man att Finland skulle placera administrativa experter på bilateralt utvecklingssamarbete i utvecklingsländernas ambassader.

Främjandet av utvecklingspolitikens koherens på alla nivåer (inom och mellan förvaltningsgrenar samt mellan regeringar) framhävs. I synnerhet en systematisk behandling av många tematiska frågor, till exempel, klimatförändringarna och användningen av naturtillgångar förutsätter koherens.

Nyckel ord: Parisdeklarationen, harmonisering, politikens koherens

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration: Finland

Jyrki Salmi and Merja Mikkola

Evaluation Report of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007:3

ISBN 978-951-724-663-7 (printed); ISBN978-951-724-664-4 (pdf);
ISSN 1235-7618

The full report can be accessed at <http://formin.finland.fi/>

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the extent to which the Paris Declaration (PD) has been integrated in the policies of the Finnish government, particularly in development policy and the development cooperation. The evaluation was carried out as a document analysis and an interview study in late 2007.

Finland is fully committed to the PD. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA) emphasizes ownership and harmonization, whereas the Ministry of Finance of Finland (MOF) underlines management by results. A number of decision-makers and contractors in development cooperation see a problem in that the PD focuses on public-sector aid only. The declaration remains silent on the role of non-state stakeholders in development and on the substance of development cooperation.

It is recommended that Finland should continue to dialogue with development partners on forms and impacts of aid. To increase understanding, it is recommended that the MFA and other parties in development policy organize extensive and systematic training on development issues and on the significance of the PD in development cooperation. Moreover, Finland should assign experts in the administration of development cooperation in the embassies.

Policy coherence at all levels (internal, intra-governmental and inter-governmental) is highlighted. Thus, it is necessary in to maintain systematic discussion of various themes, such as climate change and use of natural resources.

Key words: Paris declaration, harmonisation, policy coherence

YHTEENVETO

Raportti sisältää Suomen osa-evaluatiion laajasta OECD/DAC:n evaluaatioverkoston toimeenpanemasta yhteisevaluatiion I-vaiheesta. Arvioinnin tarkoituksena oli *”arvioida, missä määrin Pariisin julistuksen käsitteet on sisällytetty Suomen hallituksen politiikkaan, kehitysapupolitiikkaan ja kehitysavun toteutukseen, mukaan luettuina suuntaviivat ja suunnittelutyökalut, selvitykset ja keskitetty päätöksentekorakenne Helsingissä, ja soveltuvien osin myös maatasolle Suomen diplomaattisissa edustustoissa”*. Tarkoituksena oli myös selvittää, ovatko kehityspolitiikan toteuttajien ja kehitysavun toimituskanavien toimintalinjat ja toimenpiteet keskenään johdonmukaisia.

Kokonaisarvioinnin ajoitus oli Suomen kannalta haastava. Arviointi oli haastavaa siksikin, että maaliskuussa 2007 nimitetty Suomen hallitus oli julistusta koskevan arvioinnin aikana uudistamassa hallituksen nelivuotista kehityspoliittista ohjelmaa. Lisäksi Suomen kehityspolitiikkaa koskevan, Taloudellisen yhteistyön ja kehityksen järjestön (OECD) sekä sen kehitysapukomitean (DAC) vuoden 2007 Suomen kehityspolitiikan ja -avun vertaisarvioinnin ensimmäinen luonnos valmistui Suomen Pariisin julistusta koskevan evaluaatiotyön aikana.

Evaluatio kesti yli kaksi kuukautta vuoden 2007 elokuun loppupuolelta lokakuun loppupuolelle. Arviointia varten kerättiin tietoja

- tutkimalla olemassa olevia selvityksiä ja tietoja
- toteuttamalla laaja sähköpostikysely
- haastatteleamalla henkilökohtaisesti keskeisiä tiedonlähteitä
- järjestämällä työpaja toimijoille.

Raportti sisältää arvioinnin tärkeimmät *havainnot ja suositukset*. Siinä esitetään ensin muutamia yleisiä havaintoja ja sitten tiivistelmä evaluaation neljään tärkeimpään aiheeseen – *johtajuus, valmius, kannustimet ja johdonmukaisuus* – liittyvät havainnot ja suositukset.

Yleistä

Suomi on täysin sitoutunut Pariisin julistuksen toteutukseen sekä periaateohjelmien että käytännön toteutuksen tasolla. Kahden merkittävän toimijan näkemykset kuitenkin eroavat Pariisin julistuksen periaatteita ja mittareita koskevissa painopisteistä: Suomen ulkoasiainministeriö (UM) painottaa omistajuutta ja yhteensovittamista, kun taas valtiovarainministeriö (VM) korostaa tulosohjausta.

Suomi on kahden viime vuosikymmenen aikana tehnyt kehityspolitiikkaansa vain vähäisiä muutoksia. Voidaankin sanoa, että Pariisin julistuksen periaatteet ovat näkyneet Suomen politiikassa jo kauan ennen julistuksen laatimista. Pariisin julistus

on kuitenkin vaikuttanut tuntuvasti Suomen kehitysavun hallinnointiin ja toteutukseen, ja Pariisin julistusta on yhä useammin käytetty järjestelmällisesti Suomen kehitysapua koskevassa päätöksenteossa. Yleisellä tasolla, Suomi on edennyt hyvin Pariisin julistuksen toteutuksessa.

Tietyt toimijat, UM:n työntekijät ja poliitikot/päätöksentekijät pitivät kuitenkin varsin ongelmallisena Pariisin julistuksen toimeenpanon nykyistä kehystä ja sitä, mihin suuntaan kehitysyhteistyö näyttää olevan etenemässä julistuksen toteutuksen vuoksi. Pariisin julistuksessa nimittäin keskitytään yksinomaan julkisen avun kanavointiin mutta jätetään huomiotta periaatteelliset kehityskysymykset, sekä muiden kuin julkisen sektorin toimijoiden rooli ja kehitysavun sisältö. Viimeksi mainittu on jätetty kumppanimaiden päätettäväksi niiden omien kansallisten poliittisten prosessien yhteydessä. Samat toimijat mieltävät Pariisin julistuksen keinoksi parantaa ja lisätä julkista apua, jolloin se käytännössä rajoittaa – joskin ehkä tahattomasti – laajapohjaista keskustelua kehityksestä. Ne tuntuvat olevan sitä mieltä, että Pariisin julistuksen toteutuksessa on edetty hyvin mutta, että suunta ei olisi oikea.

Vuonna 2006 tehdyn, Pariisin julistuksen toimeenpanon seurantalulokset herättivät keskustelua, sillä sen mukaan Suomi oli menestynyt keskimääräistä heikommin avun ennakoitavuuden osalta. Vuoden 2006 tutkimuksen tuloksia olisikin arvioitava järjestelmällisesti esimerkiksi avun vaikuttavuutta käsittelevässä UM:n työryhmässä. Sen jälkeen olisi tehtävä tarvittavat päätökset, jotta voidaan poistaa havaitut pullonkaulat ja parantaa Suomen kehitysavun tuloksia.

Johtajuus

Suomi on sitoutunut Pariisin julistuksen periaatteisiin. Poliittinen tuki kumppanimaiden omistajuuden kunnioittamisessa ja tarve toimia yhtenäisesti on vahvaa. Omistajuus ja muut Pariisin julistukseen liittyvät periaatteet on ymmärretty ja niistä on keskusteltu Suomessa monta vuotta. Suomen antaman tuen yhteensovittaminen on meneillään, mutta se on edelleen haaste. Suomi on avun vaikuttavuuden lisäämiseksi ja yhteistyön yhteensovittamiseksi valmis tietyssä määrin suuntaamaan apuaan uudella lailla. Suomen kehitysavun ennakoitavuudesta on keskusteltu vilkkaasti vuoden 2006 monitorointitulosten tultua julki.

Evaluatio suosittaa, että Suomen ja yhteistyökumppaneiden välillä on jatkettava huolellisesti pohjustettuja korkean tason neuvotteluja, joissa voidaan keskustella ja löytää yhteisymmärrys kaikista avun muodoista. Lisäksi on keskusteltava avun vaikutuksista. Suomen kehitysavun suunnittelun on jatkossakin oltava realistista, ja siinä on otettava huomioon kumppanimaiden tilanne, jotta apu voidaan kohdentaa oikea-aikaisesti.

Voimavarat

Suomessa vain suoraan Pariisin julistukseen liittyvien kysymysten parissa toimivilla UM:n työntekijöillä on julistusta koskevaa perusteellista tietoa. Tieto on puutteellista useilla UM:n tasoilla ja erityisesti UM:n ulkopuolella muiden suomalaisten toimijoiden keskuudessa. UM:n työntekijöille järjestetään muodollista koulutusta,

mutta se on joko riittämätöntä, eikä tavoita kaikkia koulutusta tarvitsevia. Myös Pariisin julistuksen toteutusta koskevien helposti saatavilla olevien tilastotietojen puute vaikeuttaa osaamisen lisäämistä ja ylläpitoa. Kehitysyhteistyötä koskevassa ministeriön tilastointijärjestelmässä ei ole Pariisin julistusta koskevia tunnisteita, eikä tunnisteiden käyttö ole pakollista sitoumuksia ja/tai varojen käyttöä koskevia tietoja päivitettäessä.

Suosittelaa järjestettäväksi säännöllisesti ministeriökohtaisia tai alueellisia koulutustilaisuuksia ja tapahtumia, joissa voidaan vaihtaa kokemuksia UM:n sisällä merkittävistä periaate- ja menettelytapakysymyksistä erityisesti Pariisin julistuksen toteutuksessa. Voitaisiin järjestää esimerkiksi vuotuisia seminaareja ajankohtaisten koulutuskokonaisuuksien muodossa kansalaisjärjestöille ja konsulteille/alihankkijoille. UM:n olisi harkittava pakollisten tunnisteiden – erityisesti Pariisin julistusta koskevien valikoitujen tunnisteiden – käyttöönottoa tilastointijärjestelmässä.

Kehitysavun hallinnoinnin hajauttamista, jossa kahdenvälisen kehitysyhteistyön hallinnointi siirretään edustustoille, on kokeiltu jo kahden vuoden ajan. On aika tarkastella tuloksia ja kehittää niiden perusteella nykyistä pysyvämpi ratkaisu.

Evaluaatio suosittaa, että UM:n olisi harkittava kahdenvälisen kehitysyhteistyön hallinnoinnin siirtämistä pysyvästi edustustoille pilottihankkeesta saatujen tulosten perusteella ja poistettava päätöksentekoa vaikeuttavat pullonkaulat. Tätä varten olisi laadittava ja annettava ohjeita tai suuntaviivoja.

Kannustimet

Suomen julkishallinnossa, etenkin UM:ssä, toiminta on perinteisesti pohjautunut periaateohjelmiin ja muodollisiin päätöksiin, eikä odotettujen tulosten edistämiseksi tai takaamiseksi ole tarvittu kannustimia. UM:ssä ei siksi ole järjestelmällisesti pohdittu sellaisten kannustinjärjestelmien käyttöönottoa, joissa palkittaisiin kumppanimaiden hyvistä tuloksista. UM:n uusi tulosohjausjärjestelmä on hyvä ja myönteinen edistysaskel. Järjestelmässä saavutettujen hyvien tulosten yhdistämistä mahdollisiin kannustimiin on syytä pohtia tarkkaan.

Suosittelaa, että UM:n sisällä sekä UM:n ja VM:n välillä käytäisiin uudenlaista ja ennakkoluulotonta keskustelua kannustimien käyttöönotosta ja niiden yhdistämisestä UM:n tulosohjausjärjestelmään. Vastaavasti olisi keskusteltava mahdollisuudesta ottaa käyttöön kannustimia kumppanimaiden kanssa tehtävissä yhteistyösopimuksissa.

Johdonmukaisuus

Paitsi UM:n työntekijät myös muut suomalaiset toimijat tulkitsevat johdonmukaisuuden (koherenssin) monin eri tavoin. Suomen yhtenäinen kehityspolitiikka on osaltaan lisännyt toteutuksen johdonmukaisuutta, ja johdonmukaisuudelle on Suomessa annettu suuri painoarvo. Suomi pyrkii toimimaan johdonmukaisesti monenvälisissä yhteyksissä. Suomen tavoitteena on, että kaikki monenväliset toimijat ottavat täysimääräisesti huomioon Pariisin julistusta koskevat kysymykset.

Johdonmukaisuus olisi otettava huomioon eri tasoilla (hallinnonalojen sisällä ja välillä sekä hallitusten välillä). Johdonmukaisuutta olisi pidettävä välineenä eikä itseisarvona vaikuttavuuden saavuttamisessa. Suomen tulisi jatkaa johdonmukaisuuden korostamista monenvälisissä yhteyksissä.

UM on pääasiallisesti vastuussa johdonmukaisuudesta kehitysasioissa. Johdonmukainen toiminta ajasta ja tilanteesta riippumatta on Suomen viranomaisille vaativa tehtävä. Johdonmukaisuuden takaamiseksi on olemassa useita prosesseja ja ohjausmekanismeja ministeriön sisäisiä ja ministeriöiden välisinä työryhminä. Muissa ministeriöissä ei kuitenkaan ole Pariisin julistusta ja sen sisältöä koskevaa osaamista.

Sekä UM:n sisällä että ministeriöiden välillä tarvitaan uusia työryhmiä, jotta voidaan varmistaa johdonmukaisuus esimerkiksi ilmastonmuutoksen, luonnonvarojen käytön ja maatalouden kaltaisissa kysymyksissä. Työryhmien toiminnan olisi yleisesti ottaen oltava entistä muodollisempaa ja jäsentyneempää. Johdonmukaisuutta koskevien yhteisten lähestymistapojen edistämiseksi tarvitaan hyvin laadittuja ohjeita, suuntaviivoja ja koulutusta.

SAMMANFATTNING

Utvärdering av genomförandet av Parisdeklarationen (PD) i Finland, är det finska bidraget till det första steget i den gemensamma globala utvärderingen av Parisdeklarationen. Syftet med den här utvärderingen var att: *”fastställa i vilken utsträckning begreppen från Parisdeklarationen har tagits med i beräkningen i den finska regeringens policy, i utvecklingen av biståndspolicy samt på nivån för organiserandet av biståndsleverans, inklusive riktlinjer och planeringsverktyg, rapporter och det övergripande ansvaret för ramverket vid högkvarteret (HK) i Helsingfors samt i nödvändig utsträckning också på landsnivå i Finlands diplomatiska beskickningar”*. Dessutom var syftet att utvärdera om policy och åtgärder är samordnade mellan de olika utförarna av utvecklingspolicy och kanalerna för biståndssamarbete.

För Finland var tidpunkten för utvärderingen utmanande, eftersom den skedde under den tid då den finska regeringen, som valdes i mars 2007, var mitt i revideringen av regeringens fyraåriga utvecklingspolicy. Det första utkastet till referentgranskning från OECD (Organisationen för ekonomiskt samarbete och utveckling)/DAC (Biståndskommittén) 2007 av Finlands utvecklingspolicy utfärdades under samma tid med evaluering av Parisdeklarationen.

Evalueringen utfördes under två månader, från senare delen av augusti till senare delen av oktober 2007. Information för utvärderingen samlades in genom att:

- befintliga rapporter och information granskades
- en brett distribuerad e-postenkät genomfördes
- personliga intervjuer med nyckelpersoner genomfördes
- seminarier hölls för intressenter

De viktigaste *slutsatserna och rekommendationerna* av utvärderingen presenteras i denna rapport. Först inkluderas några generella slutsatser och därefter en förkortad version av slutsatserna och rekommendationerna som hör till de fyra viktiga teman för vilka utvärderingen gäller: *ledarskap, kapacitet, belöning och samordning*.

Generellt

Finland är helt engagerat i genomförandet av Parisdeklarationen, både på politiska och praktiska genomförandenivåer. Det finns emellertid lite olika syn på prioriteringar vad gäller principer för Parisdeklarationen och indikatorer bland två av de viktigaste finska intressenterna. Nämligen, Utrikesministerium betonar ägarskap, inriktning och harmonisering medan Finansministerium understryker administration som ger resultat.

Finland har endast gjort små ändringar av sin utvecklingspolicy under de senaste två decennierna. Principerna för Parisdeklarationen kan sägas ha passat bra in i den

finska policyn långt innan överenskommelsen om Parisdeklarationen. Parisdeklarationen har däremot verkligen påverkat det finska biståndet. Principerna i Parisdeklarationen har använts i allt större omfattning på ett mycket systematiskt sätt vid beslutsfattande om finskt bistånd. Finland är på rätt spår.

En del leverantörer, personalen på utrikesministeriet och politiker/beslutsfattare ser ett stort problem i det nuvarande ramverket för Parisdeklarationen och den inriktning genomförandet verkar ta i utvecklingsarbetet, nämligen att Parisdeklarationen enbart fokuserar på hur hjälp till den offentliga sektorn riktas men förblir tyst när det gäller de grundläggande frågorna om utveckling, rollen för icke-statliga intressenter och om innehållet eller substansen i biståndet. Beslut om det senare har överlämnats till partnerländerna och deras nationella politiska processer. Samma intressenter uppfattar Parisdeklarationen som ett sätt att förbättra och öka den offentliga sektorns bistandsflöden och därmed effektivt begränsa - kanske inte medvetet - en bredare debatt om utveckling. De verkar att medan genomförandet av Parisdeklarationen kan vara på rätt spår så leder spåret oss i fel riktning.

Resultatet av 2006 års granskning, övervakning av genomförandet av Parisdeklarationen, har skapat en livlig diskussion och fastställt det faktum att Finland uppbar en mindre grad av bistandsförutsägbarhet än genomsnittet. Resultatet av granskningen 2006 ska verkligen analyseras systematiskt, t.ex. i Finlands utrikesministeriums arbetsgrupp för biståndseffektivitet. Därefter ska nödvändiga beslut tas för att få bukt med identifierade flaskhalsar och för att förbättra Finlands prestationer.

Ledarskap

Finland är engagerat i principerna för Parisdeklarationen. Det politiska stödet för att respektera ägande i partnerländer samt att alltid agera på ett enhetligt sätt är starkt. Ägande samt andra frågor relaterade till Parisdeklarationen har förståtts och debatterats i Finland under många år. Inriktningen på Finlands hjälp är pågående men samtidigt utmanande. För att kunna öka biståndseffektiviteten och skapa ett mer harmoniserat samarbete är Finland i viss utsträckning villigt att ändra inriktningen för sin hjälp. Förutsägbarheten för finskt bistånd har varit mycket debatterad efter granskningen 2006 om övervakning av Parisdeklarationen.

Utvärderingen rekommenderar att bra och noggrant förberedda konsultationer på hög nivå mellan Finland och utvecklingspartner ska fortsätta som ett forum både för diskussioner av alla typer och former av bistånd och för att nå överenskommelse om dem. Dessutom kan det inflytande som erhålls genom biståndet diskuteras med respektive partner. Planering och utformning av finskt bistånd ska fortsätta att vara realistiskt och ta med situationen i partnerländerna i beräkningen för att göra tilldelningar av bistånd i rätt tid.

Kapacitet

Djup kunskap om Parisdeklarationen är i Finland begränsad till personalen på Finlands utrikesministerium som arbetar direkt med frågor relaterade till

Parisdeklarationen. Det finns kunskapsluckor på olika nivåer inom Finlands utrikesministerium och speciellt utanför detta bland andra finska intressenter. Det finns formella utbildningsarrangemang för personal på Finlands utrikesministerium men de är antingen otillräckliga eller också när de inte dem som behöver utbildningen. Bristen på enkelt tillgänglig statistisk information om genomförandet av Parisdeklarationen är också ett hinder för ökad kunskap. Det statistiska systemet hos Finlands utvecklings- och samarbetsministerium inkluderar inte markörer som är specifika för Parisdeklarationen. Användningen av ett markörsystem är inte heller obligatoriskt i registreringen av engagemang och/eller användningen av medel.

Utrikesministeriet skulle organisera departementsutbildning eller regional utbildning/evenemang på ett systematiskt sätt för utbyte av erfarenheter inom Finlands utrikesministerium när det gäller viktig policy och procedurämnen som speciellt refererar till genomförandet av Parisdeklarationen. Organisera t.ex. årliga seminarier runt ämnesutbildning i paket för NGO (icke offentliga organisationer) och konsulter/leverantörer. Finlands utrikesministerium bör överväga att i sitt statistiska system introducera obligatoriska markörer som speciellt refererar till valda nyckelmarkörer för Parisdeklarationen.

Decentraliseringen av biståndsadministration och ledning genom delegering av bilateral administration av utvecklingssamarbete på ambassader har pågått som pilotprojekt under två år. Det är nu dags att lära sig av detta och dra slutsatser om en mer permanent lösning.

Finlands utrikesministerium bör överväga att permanent delegera administrationen av bilateralt utvecklingssamarbete till ambassader, baserat på erfarenheterna från pilotprojektet samt att ta bort återstående flaskhalsar som är relaterade till begränsningar hos beslutsfattande krafter. De respektive instruktionerna eller riktlinjerna ska förberedas och utfärdas.

Belöningar

Inom finsk offentlig förvaltning och speciellt inom Finlands utrikesministerium, finns det en tradition av att agera utifrån policy och formella beslut utan behov av belöningar som ett medel för att uppmuntra och försäkra sig om att uppnå förväntade resultat. Följaktligen har det inte förekommit något systematiskt tänkande inom Finlands utrikesministerium om att introducera ett belöningssystem som skulle belöna bra prestationer i partnerländer. Finlands utrikesministeriums nya Resultatbaserade ledningssystem (RMS) är en bra och positiv utveckling. Att koppla bra prestationer i RMS till möjliga belöningar är värt omsorgsfullt övervägande.

Det rekommenderas att hålla innovativa och förutsättningslösa interna diskussioner om introduktionen av belöningar och att koppla dem till Utrikesministeriets RMS bör ske inom Utrikesministeriet och mellan Utrikesministeriet och Finansministeriet. På samma sätt bör möjligheten att introducera belöningar vid ekonomiska överenskommelser med partnerländer diskuteras.

SUMMARY

This evaluation report is the Finnish contribution to the first stage of the OECD/DAC joint evaluation of the first phase of the Paris Declaration. The purpose of this evaluation was to: *“assess the extent to which the concepts of the PD have been taken into account in the policies of the Finnish government, in development aid policy, and at the level of organizational aid delivery, including guidelines and planning tools, reports and the overall accountability framework at the headquarters (HQ) in Helsinki, and to the extent necessary, also at the country level in the diplomatic missions of Finland”*. Furthermore, the purpose was to examine whether there is coherence in policies and actions between the various development policy implementers and aid delivery channels.

For Finland, the timing of the overall evaluation was challenging. In addition, the evaluation was challenging because during the evaluation of the PD, the Finnish Government, elected in March 2007, was in the middle of revising the Government's four-year development policy. Also, the first draft of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)/Development Assistance Committee's (DAC) 2007 peer review on Finland's development policy was issued during the course of the Finnish PD evaluation.

The evaluation was carried out over two months, from late August to late October 2007. Information for the evaluation was collected by means of:

- Reviewing existing reports and information
- Carrying out a broadly distributed E-mail survey
- Face-to-face interviews of key informants
- Stakeholder workshop

The main *findings and recommendations* of the evaluation are presented in this report. First, some general findings are included, and thereafter an abridged version of the findings and recommendations relating to the four main evaluation themes: *leadership, capacity, incentives and coherence*.

General

Finland is fully committed to the implementation of the PD, both at the political and practical implementation levels. However, there are slightly differing views on the priorities regarding the PD principles and indicators among two of the major Finnish stakeholders. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA) emphasizes ownership, alignment and harmonization whereas the Ministry of Finance of Finland (MOF) underlines managing for results.

Finland has made only slight changes to its development policies over the past two decades. The PD principles can be said to have featured in Finnish policy well before

the PD itself. However, the PD has truly influenced Finnish aid administration and aid delivery; the PD principles have been used increasingly in a very systematic manner in decision-making on Finnish aid. Finland is on the right track in terms of PD implementation.

However, some contractors, MFA staff members and politicians/decision-makers see one major problem in the present PD framework and in the direction in which the PD implementation appears to be taking development cooperation, namely in that the PD focuses purely on how public sector aid is channelled, but it remains silent on the founding questions of development, on the role of non-state stakeholders, and on the content or substance of aid. The latter has been left to the Partner Countries (PCs) to be decided through their national political processes. The same stakeholders perceive the PD as a way to improve and increase public sector aid flows, and thereby effectively limiting, although perhaps unintentionally, broader debate on development. They seem to think that while PD implementation may be on the right track, the track is leading us in the wrong direction.

The results of the 2006 Survey on Monitoring the PD Implementation stirred up discussion and an assessment of the fact that Finland received a below average ratio for the predictability of aid. The results of the 2006 Survey should indeed be systematically analysed, e.g. in the Aid Effectiveness Working Group of the MFA. Subsequently, the necessary decisions should be taken to overcome the identified bottlenecks and to improve Finland's performance.

Leadership

Finland is committed to the principles of the PD. The political support for respecting the ownership of partner countries as well as to act in a coherent manner at all times is strong. Ownership as well as other PD-related issues have been understood and debated in Finland for many years. The alignment of Finnish assistance is on-going but challenging at the same time. In the name of increased aid effectiveness and more harmonized cooperation, Finland is prepared, to a certain extent, to re-direct its assistance. The predictability of Finnish aid has been much debated after the 2006 Survey on Monitoring the PD.

Evaluation recommends that well and carefully prepared high-level consultations between Finland and development partners should be continued as a forum both for discussing all forms and modes of aid and for reaching agreement on them. In addition, the impacts gained by the assistance should be discussed with the respective partners. The planning and design of Finnish aid should continue to be realistic and take into consideration the situations in the PCs in order to allocate aid timely.

Capacities

In-depth knowledge about the PD in Finland is limited to the MFA staff who work directly on PD-related issues. There are knowledge gaps at various levels in the MFA, and especially outside the MFA among other Finnish stakeholders. There are formal training arrangements for MFA staff but they are either insufficient or they

are not reaching those who need the training. The lack of easily available statistical information on PD implementation is also an impediment to increased knowledge. The statistical system of the Ministry on development cooperation does not include PD-specific markers, nor is the use of a marker system obligatory in recording commitments and/or the use of funds.

The Ministry should organize on a systematic basis departmental or regional training/events for exchanging experiences within the MFA on important policy and procedural topics with special reference to PD implementation. Organize, for example, annual seminars around topical training packages for non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and consultants/contractors. The MFA should consider introducing obligatory markers in its statistical system with special reference to selected key PD-specific markers.

The decentralization of aid administration and management through the delegation of bilateral development cooperation administration to embassies has been piloted for two years. It is now time to learn the lessons and draw conclusions on a more permanent solution.

The MFA should consider the permanent delegation of bilateral development cooperation administration to embassies, based on the lessons learned from the pilot project, and to remove the remaining bottlenecks relating to limited decision-making powers. The respective instructions or guidelines should be prepared and issued.

Incentives

In Finnish public administration, especially within the MFA, there is tradition of acting on the basis of policies and formal decisions without the need for incentives as a means to encourage or secure the achievement of the expected results. Consequently, there has been no systematic thinking within the MFA about introducing incentive systems that would reward good performance by the PCs. The MFA's new Results-based Management System (RMS) is a good and positive development. Linking good performance in the RMS with possible incentives merits careful thinking.

Innovative and unprejudiced internal discussion on the introduction of incentives and linking them with the MFA's RMS should take place within the MFA and between the MFA and the MOF. Similarly, the possibility of introducing incentives in financing agreements with PCs should be discussed.

Coherence

There are varying interpretations on coherence both among MFA staff and other stakeholders in Finland. Consistent development policies in Finland have helped to increase coherence in implementation, and coherence has been given high importance in Finland. In the multilateral framework, Finland aims to act in a coherent manner. Finland's goal is to get PD issues taken fully on board by all multilateral institutions.

The different dimensions (internal, intra-governmental, and inter-governmental) of coherence should be borne in mind. Coherence should be understood as a tool, not as a means in itself, to implement effectiveness. Finland should continue to put emphasis on coherence within multilateral fora.

Coherence in development matters is primarily the responsibility of the MFA. It is a demanding task for the Finnish administration to act in a coherent manner at all times and occasions. To ensure coherence, there are a number of processes and management mechanisms, and inter-ministerial as well as inter-departmental working groups. However, there is lack of information/knowledge about the PD and its contents in other ministries apart from the MFA.

New working groups, both within the MFA and inter-ministerial, are required to ensure coherence in issues such as climate change, the use of natural resources, and agriculture. The working groups should operate in general in a more formal and structured manner. There should be well-formulated instructions, guidelines and training to enhance common approaches to coherence.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Evaluation Context

The PD on Aid Effectiveness (2005) included a provision for an evaluation process on the implementation of the Declaration. The OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation (EvalNet), in consultation with the relevant parties, decided to initiate such an evaluation. The evaluation includes, on a voluntary basis, evaluations of PCs and development partners (DPs), multilateral agencies, International financing institutions (IFIs), and other organizations engaged in development assistance. Finland is one of the development partners that volunteered to participate as a case study in this global evaluation.

The declaration commits the signatories to reach specific targets relating to twelve indicators under an overall frame of five principles:

Ownership: PCs exercise effective leadership over their development policies and strategies and coordinate development actions.

Alignment: DPs base their overall support on PCs' national development strategies, institutions and procedures.

Harmonization: DP actions are more harmonized, transparent and collectively effective.

Managing for results: managing resources and improving decision-making for results.

Mutual accountability: DPs and PCs are accountable for development results.

The *purpose of the overall evaluation* is to achieve an independent view on whether the steps taken to implement the PD are conducive to increased aid effectiveness and ultimately to achieving enhanced development effectiveness.

The *objective of the overall evaluation* is to assess whether the implementation of the PD is on track, and to offer an independent opinion on possible areas requiring readjustment.

1.2 Finland-specific Evaluation Context

Finland, as an active member of the OECD/DAC and strong supporter of PD implementation, volunteered to be one of the development partners whose performance in the implementation of the PD would be assessed in the first phase of the joint evaluation. The Finnish evaluation was organized by the National Evaluation Coordinator (NEC) of Finland (the Unit for Evaluation and Internal

Audit, MFA), in close cooperation with the established international management and coordination system for the joint evaluation.

For Finland, the evaluation was challenging because during the PD evaluation the Finnish Government, elected in March 2007, was in the middle of drafting the Government's four-year development policy. Similarly, the first draft of the OECD/DAC 2007 peer review on Finland was issued during the course of the Finnish PD evaluation. The scope of the present evaluation was limited to assessing the implementation of past and present policies, not on speculating about new development policy.

1.2.1 Development Policy and Cooperation Setting in Finland

The first strategy for development cooperation was drawn up and adopted in 1993 (*Finland's Development Cooperation in the 1990s: Strategic Goals and Means*, MFA of Finland, 1993.) This was the first attempt to create an overall development cooperation strategy. The document was approved by the MFA. The next strategy paper (*Decision-in-Principle on Finland's Development Cooperation*, Government of Finland, 1996) was approved at Government level, and was followed by *Finland's Policy on Relations with Developing Countries*, 1998; and the subsequent Decisions-in-Principle of 2001, *Operationalisation of Development Policy Objectives in Finland's International Development Cooperation; Development Policy, 2004*, and; the latest *Development Policy Paper, 2007*. All of the three latter white papers were approved by the Government.

Finnish development policies have established a systematic and continuing policy trend, and since the inception of the first development cooperation strategy in 1993 there have been few radical changes. Successive policies have built on the previous policy. Even before the formal policies were drawn up, when policy guidance was included in the annual budget texts, some of the key elements (e.g. ownership) of the PD were already included and underlined.

Development policy is a part of Finland's foreign policy of and thus is implemented by the MFA. There are three ministers attached to the MFA: the Minister for Foreign Affairs is in charge of foreign policy; the Minister for Trade and Development is responsible for development policy and cooperation and trade; and the Minister for Nordic Cooperation, who is responsible for Nordic relations. Development issues are fully integrated in the MFA's structure.

The Department for Development Policy deals with all development policy questions, advice and thematic questions. The Department is led by a Director General. In addition, there is an Under-Secretary of State specifically for development policy issues. The geographical departments led by the respective Director Generals cover the entirety of bilateral relations including wider political, trade and development issues. These departments are in charge of the implementation of bilateral development cooperation. The Department for Global Affairs is responsible for multilateral cooperation and policy setting. It is also in charge of humanitarian cooperation.

The Development Policy Committee (DPC) is an advisory body appointed by the Government. The new DPC was appointed in October 2007. The Committee is composed of a cross-section of Finnish society including parliamentarians, trade unionists, employers' organizations, NGOs, and academics. Expert members appointed from the civil service serve the committee in an advisory role. Its mandate is to monitor the level of public funding and the quality and effectiveness of development cooperation including the implementation of policy coherence.

Parliament approves the annual budget for development cooperation and monitors progress through the work of three committees: the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Grand Committee and the State Finance Committee. There is no single specific development committee. The MFA prepares the Annual Report of the Government on Finland's Development Cooperation for Parliament every year.

1.2.2 Case Finland - Evaluation of the Paris Declaration

For the Finnish PD evaluation, separate terms of reference (ToR) were drafted by the NEC, although the Finnish terms of reference (FToR) were founded on the generic ToR of the joint global evaluation of the OECD/DAC's EvalNet. Each of the evaluation case studies was allowed to have a specific sub-theme in the evaluation. Therefore, in the evaluation of the Implementation of the PD in Finland, the dimension of coherence was included in addition to the generic themes of commitment, capacities and incentives. (see ToR in Annex 1).

The first phase of the joint evaluation complements the on-going monitoring of the implementation of the PD and thus the purpose, according to the FToR was: *"to assess the extent to which the concepts of the PD have been taken into account in the policies of the Finnish government, in development aid policy, and at the level of organizational aid delivery, including guidelines and planning tools, reports and the overall accountability framework at the HQ in Helsinki, and, to the extent necessary, also at the country level in the diplomatic missions of Finland."* Furthermore, the purpose was to study whether there is coherence in policies and actions between the various development policy implementers and aid delivery channels, which in Finland include other ministries, research institutions and NGOs.

As study objectives, the ToR listed:

- the provision of an independent opinion on whether the implementation of the PD is on track, from a political and practical implementation perspective;
- extracting lessons for the further development of the implementation of the PD to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of Finnish aid; and
- adding to the understanding on how the results of the PD monitoring surveys could best be used to improve planning and implementation.

The Finnish evaluation is largely based on the implementation of the Development Policy of 2004. The new Policy of 2007, which was approved during the evaluation, is referred to only in terms of assessing the continued political commitment (see Chapter 3.1). The evaluation was conducted at HQ level, concentrating on the assessments carried out by the MFA in Helsinki, and in other relevant ministries, and with selected political decision-makers. The Finnish embassies located in the Republic of South Africa (RSA), Vietnam, and Zambia were also consulted in the evaluation, because these three PCs are the only long-term PCs among the ten PCs that volunteered for the joint evaluation. Likewise, the contractors responsible for the country-level implementation of Finnish bilateral development aid (ODA) and the Finnish NGOs active in these three countries were also included by the Team in the evaluation process.

In late summer 2007, the NEC organised an open tender competition for the implementation of the Finnish evaluation in order to ensure independence for the Evaluation Team. The selected evaluation team (Team) commenced its assignment at the very end of August 2007. The methodology proposed and used by the Team is presented in Chapter 2.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Sampling

The sampling of information for the present evaluation is based on the following principles:

- Policy documents, guidelines, etc: those in effect and under preparation (subject to availability) at the moment of the evaluation.
- People interviewed: guided by the NEC (i) all the MFA management, down to director level, with a role in development cooperation, (ii) officers in charge of the RSA, Vietnam and Zambia, (iii) all advisers with roles relating to PD issues, (iv) other staff who have recently had PD-relevant roles, (v) the minister in charge of development cooperation, and (vi) Chairperson of the DPC.
- People consulted through email questionnaires (see below under 2.2).

2.2 Data Collection Instruments

Data was collected through four means:

- Reviewing existing policy documents, reports and other written information
- Carrying out a broadly distributed E-mail survey
- Face-to-face interviews with key informants

- Stakeholder workshop

2.2.1 Existing Policy Documents, Reports and Information

The team collected, reviewed and analysed major policy documents and strategy papers, including sector policy documents of the MFA, and relevant reports and other information sources.

The MFA could not provide PD-specific statistics on Finnish development cooperation because the statistical system of the MFA does not include PD-specific markers. In addition, the use of markers that would allow the commitments and/or the use of funds to be classified and a basic analysis on the use of funds for various purposes, are not obligatory features of the MFA's statistical system. The 2006 Survey on Monitoring the PD and Overview of the Results give some statistical reference data.

2.2.2 Face-to-Face Interviews

Face-to-face interviews were carried out with key informants in two stakeholder groups:

- MFA management and selected advisers
- Selected politicians

A list of the people interviewed is presented in Annex 2.

2.2.3 E-mail Survey

An E-mail questionnaire survey was planned and organized, which was targeted at five stakeholder groups:

- Selected MFA staff at HQ and the embassies in Vietnam, the RSA and Zambia.
- Selected staff of other ministries and government institutions involved in development cooperation.
- Finnish politicians and decision makers involved in development cooperation, such as the members of the DPC.
- Development NGOs in Finland with projects in Vietnam, the RSA and Zambia receiving financing from the MFA.
- Contractors of development cooperation projects in Finland with projects in Vietnam, the RSA and Zambia receiving financing from the MFA.

The list of respondents is presented in Annex 3. The questionnaires sent to these five target groups are presented in Annex 4. The total number of questionnaires sent

out was 80 (Table 1). Non-respondents were reminded twice. However, the reply rate was quite low (15%) which may be indicative of the complexity of the issues and questions in the survey. The survey questionnaires were probably over-ambitious and therefore off-putting to the recipients, according to the feedback received particularly from the NGOs. Feedback received from the MFA staff also indicated that the MFA-targeted questionnaire was too focused on bilateral cooperation. However, the evaluation Team finds that the replies received provided valuable inputs for the evaluation.

The E-mail survey results on questions relating to capacities and incentives are analysed and summarized in Annex 5. The low reply rate was compensated for by face-to-face interviews.

Table 1 Questionnaire Survey, Summary of Reply Rate

Group	No. of questionnaires sent	No. of replies	Reply rate (%)
MFA staff	37	7	19
Other ministries	9	0	0
Politicians	4	0	0
NGOs	23	2	9
Contractors	7	3	43
All	80	12	15

2.2.4 Stakeholder Workshop

A stakeholder workshop was organized in the middle of the evaluation. The evaluation team presented the initial key findings based on the initial reading of policy papers, other relevant documents, and the interviews and replies to the E-mail questionnaire that were available at that point in time. The workshop was used to air tentative ideas and to receive feedback from stakeholders. The programme of the workshop and the list of participants are presented in Annex 6.

2.3 Analysis

Detailed conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter 7. They are based on the analysis of the information collected through the instruments described in section 2.2. The information and a summary presentation of the analysis are in sections 3, 4, 5 and 6.

2.4 Management of the Finnish Evaluation

The NEC contracted Indufor Oy to carry out the Finnish case evaluation through a competitive bidding process.

The evaluation was carried out by a two-person team, Mr. Jyrki Salmi (Team Leader) and Ms. Merja Mikkola (Evaluation Specialist), from Indufor Oy. The Team was supported by a development theory specialist (Dr. Jussi Raumolin) who acted as a coach to the team. In addition, Indufor provided extensive research assistance support to the Team.

2.5 Limitations

The present evaluation is the first of its kind in Finland, and therefore the evaluation process had to be partially designed and adapted while the evaluation was in progress, and, for example, a specific evaluation matrix was designed for this purpose (Annex 8). The topic and the evaluation issues were considered by many stakeholders who were consulted to be quite complex and fairly abstract. In-depth knowledge of the PD is clearly limited to a fairly small number of civil servants working directly on aid effectiveness and harmonization issues. The level of knowledge is very superficial elsewhere within the MFA. The narrowness of the knowledge base sets limitations on any attempts to generalize some of the findings and conclusions (e.g. relating to ownership and capacities).

The fourth dimension of the Finnish case evaluation, coherence, is not mentioned in the PD, which complicated the evaluation task. During the evaluation exercise it became clear that coherence is understood in various ways by various stakeholders. Some stakeholders saw it merely as a tool to increase the effectiveness of development cooperation and others saw coherent development policies as a goal.

The ToR of the assignment limited the evaluation to the HQ level. Thus, the consultants were not able to validate their findings at the PC level. The findings and conclusions need to be looked at from the following perspective: they are essentially reflecting the realities and understanding in Helsinki, but they may not fully reflect the realities at the PC level when it comes to the implementation of the PD by Finland and by Finnish stakeholders.

Another limitation of the present evaluation became evident during the course of the interviews and the survey. Its scope in relation to the three plus one themes of leadership/ownership, capacity, incentive systems and coherence, and its focus on “trends and directions rather than definite results” caused problems for many stakeholders because of this abstract nature to its focus and scope, which prevented many from fully contributing to the evaluation. Many of the stakeholders interviewed wanted to discuss more broad and fundamental issues of development policy.

3 ASSESSING LEADERSHIP

3.1 Political Commitment

The policy of 2004 highlights the MDGs and global responsibility as its points of departure. Its main principles include the concept of comprehensive financing for development; partnerships for development; a rights-based approach; and respect for the integrity and responsibility of developing countries and their people. It means that states themselves bear responsibility for their own development, and Finland's contributions are directed towards supporting each country's own efforts. Furthermore, Finland aims to increase coherence and predictability with regard to development policies and their concrete implementation. The transparency aspect of assistance is also emphasized. Information on actual contemporary assistance is available on the MFA's website.

The Government of Finland, elected in March 2007, published its development policy in October 2007. Finland has maintained a clear continuum from one development policy statement to another. Similarly, it can be said that there is a continuum from the previous Development Policy of 2004 to the new one. When presenting the new policy, Minister Vayrynen said that: *"Poverty and sustainable development are not opposite to one another, as sustainable development is a pre-condition for eradicating poverty."* Furthermore, he emphasised that the new programme distinguishes development policy from development cooperation, because the former encompasses the actions of industrialized countries as well. The Annual Report on the implementation of the Development Policy of Finland constitutes an important means for increased involvement by the Finnish Parliament in development policy and its implementation.

The new policy, entitled *"Towards a just and sustainable policy for humanity"* (Official English translation still pending), was hotly debated by Finnish stakeholders during the preparation phase. The policy, which is available on the website of the MFA, emphasizes environmentally and ecologically sustainable development. While maintaining a high priority on poverty reduction, the main focus concerns how Finland can best support developing countries to manage their natural resources and take environmental concerns into account. The three pillars in poverty reduction are sustainable economic, environmental and societal development. Social sustainability based on democracy, good governance and a well-functioning judicial system is emphasized.

The new policy leaves the implementation measures to be defined as a next step; a separate plan for implementing the programme is not foreseen by the Minister. Future Finnish aid will be targeted towards the needs of PCs that can be effectively and efficiently addressed by the expertise and resources provided by Finland.

Any practical changes to development cooperation, if any, will take time since Finnish development aid is based on multi-year agreements. The current development aid programme of Finland builds on the 2004 development policy.

In Finnish development policy, political support for respecting the ownership by PCs is strong. Finland is among those countries that have tried to achieve deeper international awareness of and consideration towards ownership questions. This has a direct link to alignment and mutual accountability which are also strongly present in Finnish development policy.

3.2 Ownership

Ownership has been a feature of Finnish development policy and cooperation since well before the PD; Finland's first development cooperation strategy acknowledged the necessity of a "development will" among PCs as a prerequisite for cooperation. This concept of the early 90s has been refined into ownership and leadership. Development cooperation practitioners and planners know that without true ownership, development assistance is neither sustainable nor efficient. The process that led to the PD and the PD implementation in PCs has led to more systematic formulation of PC-owned development strategies. The priorities are clearer and the DP group's understanding of them has improved. Finland is keen to respect and contribute to the formulation of these strategies.

In practical cooperation, ownership is used as the starting point in the formulation of and agreement on cooperation with long-term PCs. The long-term PCs are: Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Zambia and Tanzania in Africa; Vietnam and Nepal in Asia; and Nicaragua in Central America. Finland conducts high-level bilateral consultations with PCs typically every second or third year. In some countries such consultations are not carried out because Finland participates in Joint Assistance Strategy (JAS) processes. Preparations for the Finnish negotiation position are conducted utilizing studies, analyses and relevant background information. The ownership issue is central in these consultations. The framework to development cooperation between Finland and a PC is established through programme negotiations and the cooperation framework emerges as mutual consent.

Ownership is also respected in cooperation with other PCs, even if it is more difficult to scrutinize, for example, in Afghanistan. Finnish cooperation is, as a rule, based on the PCs' poverty reduction strategies or their equivalent general development policy strategies. Finland aims at supporting the formulation of such strategies, to the extent possible and feasible, within and in cooperation with a broader development partner community.

An in-depth knowledge and improved understanding of the policies and strategies of PCs is easier in countries where Finland has permanent representation. As a part of the MFA's decentralization efforts, the embassies in the long-term PCs have been strengthened.

During the evaluation it became obvious that MFA staff consider it important to have a thorough understanding of the policies and strategies of a development partner. There were many interviewees who also said that it is crucial to analyse where these strategies and policies have emerged from, who has influenced them and in which direction. It is essential that these strategies and policies are democratically

formulated. It is also understood by many of the interviewees that in many PCs the development partner community has a strong say on the formulation of the strategies and priorities at the local level.

Based on the analysis of the past and present development policies, Finland is committed to PC ownership.

3.3 Putting the Commitment into Practice

Along with ownership and alignment, programme aid is much discussed and debated in Finland. The present Minister of Trade and Development has expressed caution over increasing direct budget support without learning more about its impacts and the capacity of PCs to effectively manage this type of aid. Some of the interviewees consider that the channelling of Finnish aid more in the form of budget support or through sector programmes is the biggest change since the adoption of the PD. Their argument is that in order to truly align Finnish support with the PCs' development strategies and procedures, support should be provided as programme aid. However, some interviewees were of the opinion that project-based support and technical assistance (TA) could/should be aligned better with the systems in the PCs. Some of the respondents commented that more work is still needed among the DPs in cooperation with PCs. The Finnish opinion on budget aid is not unanimous. Supporters emphasize its value as a genuine tool to support ownership by the PCs.

The MFA participates to some extent in the joint annual reviews, evaluations and annual financial audits of the sector, and in budget support in the long-term PCs. It was stated by a number of interviewees that in DP cooperation, the MFA concentrates too much on issues relating to financial management and monitoring, and the transparency of the budget or sector support, and too little on matters of substance. This view was challenged by some of the interviewees by saying that Finland is very active in discussions in specific sectors in certain long-term PCs.

Finland has decided to concentrate its aid and to enhance DP complementarity and the division of tasks. An example of this is the concentration of Finnish bilateral support to a limited number of countries. Furthermore, Finland has decided to concentrate support to specific sectors in these countries, and these sectors include education, health, rural development, water and sanitation. Since the education and health sectors are typically the sectors in which there are many active DPs, it is important that the PC and the DP community contemplate the need to re-direct some aid to sectors receiving less support. According to many interviewees, Finland's respect for PC ownership would be demonstrated by reconsidering the support to highly "competed" sectors. However, in some of the long-term PCs it might be difficult to switch Finnish assistance to new sectors in the short term. Finnish assistance to Zambia (Box 1) is a good example of how to respect ownership.

The new government policy calls for increased concentration on thematic cooperation. Thus, in the future Finnish cooperation should focus on sectors or themes relating to natural resources or regional development. In geographic terms,

thematic cooperation may be extended more broadly than the current cooperation area.

As a part of the PD agenda and clear requests from PCs, Finland is considering re-directing its assistance. However, it is clear that the expected effectiveness of aid delivery and also the measurability of outputs and impacts will influence the choice of interventions to be financed.

Many of the interviewees emphasized that the aid architecture in the PCs has changed rapidly after the PD. There is, for example, more jointly financed programme support (sector programmes, general budget support). The PD is viewed by the interviewees mainly as:

- a process towards more harmonized procedures among all development partners
- an administrative concept for more efficient and effective working methods to improve aid effectiveness
- a path towards increased programme aid
- placing greater emphasis on PCs' own strategies and procedures.

Programme aid will play an important role in future Finnish cooperation; its share of Finnish ODA may not grow at the same speed as the discussion on its allocation and impacts. The alignment of Finnish assistance is on-going but challenging at the same time.

Finland has been participating in programme support in a number of its long-term PCs, for example, in Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia, Vietnam, Nepal and Nicaragua. Although Finland is a relatively small DP in absolute terms, it aims to be an important DP in the sectors it operates in.

Box 1 Example of Zambia

Zambia is one of the long-term PCs of Finland. Cooperation between the two countries started as far back as in the 1970s. Cooperation in the education sector was initiated at the very early stages of the cooperation and continued until 2007.

As a joint response to Zambia's Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP) for 2006-2010, the Cooperating Partners formulated the Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia (JASZ). The preparation of the JASZ was undertaken simultaneously with the preparation of the FNDP. The government noted that there was an over-representation of partners in some sectors, and better coverage was needed in others. Accordingly, one of the key objectives of the JASZ is "Improved aid delivery by achieving a more effective division of labour and allocation of cooperating partners'

resources”.

An assessment of DP strategies and the comparative advantages of partners was carried out between the government and the DPs. This led to the reformulation of the presence of DPs in sectors and thematic areas. With regard to Finland's presence, it was seen as appropriate to gradually phase out from the crowded education sector, and to strengthen its presence in the environment and natural resources sectors as well as in private sector development.

The JASZ is an excellent example of the implementation of the PD. The division of tasks between various agencies was agreed in the JASZ. While most of the DPs have signed the JASZ, it still leaves out one of the PD's signatories, namely China, which is an increasingly important partner in Zambia.

Due to the commitments of the Government of Zambia to fight poverty, reform public financial management, pursue sound macro-economic policies, and pursue good governance, including the fight against corruption, Finland has joined the cooperating partners providing budget support for poverty reduction in Zambia.

Many of those interviewed, or who replied to the survey, stated that typically Finnish aid is planned jointly with PCs in country negotiations. Agreements are made on using the local systems and observing local procedures. However, in practice there are problems from time to time; slow implementation hampers cooperation. The following reasons for the slow implementation were mentioned: too frequent turnover of staff in partner governments, insufficient monitoring mechanisms, persistent corruption, unreliable and underdeveloped procurement systems. One member of the MFA staff wrote: “There are parallel implementation units in some PCs because it is an easier and faster way of assuring timely disbursements and concrete results than working through their own permanent structures, which may require long-term capacity building support”. All such problems make everyday alignment challenging. The challenging aspects were mentioned especially by those implementing cooperation in the field, i.e. NGOs and contractors.

Finland considers it important, and participates actively, for the PD issues to be taken fully on board by multilateral institutions. The United Nations (UN) Development Cooperation Forum is considered especially vital in this. The MFA staff pointed out in the interviews and workshop that the formal PD process is formulated by the industrialized countries' organization, the OECD, and thus it needs to be taken to a more global negotiating table, such as to the UN. It is also recognized that the PD is not the sole answer to make development assistance more effective. Finland seems to be among those DPs that are rather practical in PD implementation and advocacy. At the same time, it is understood that the PD is an important element in the broader global development agenda and processes which include e.g. the MDGs and their monitoring as well as global partnerships.

4 ASSESSING CAPABILITIES

Both the previous (2004) and the new (2007) development policy include statements on strengthening the capacities of both Finland and the PCs to achieve aid effectiveness. Although the 2004 Development Policy Programme was drawn up before the PD, the statements on strengthening capacity are not explicitly linked to the PD in either of the policies. The new policy emphasizes the importance of capacity issues by bringing the capacity of the Finnish administration and its resources under a major heading, with sub-headings on development (of the administration and resources), skills, information dissemination and development education, and financing and other resources.

The assessment of capacities needed to implement the PD is divided into six elements:

- Knowledge
- Human resources
- Coordination
- Decentralization
- Specific guidelines or directives
- Training

4.1 Knowledge

According to the interviews, the level of information on PD issues, with special reference to alignment and harmonization, has improved among MFA staff. However, in-depth knowledge is still limited to those who work daily on broader development policy issues. The low reply rate to the survey could be interpreted as an indication that the PD is a rather unknown topic. The recipients were possibly reluctant to spend their time on an issue that they felt insecure answering. However, knowledge on the importance and opportunities of cooperation and common arrangements has grown. Many stakeholders were of the opinion that aid effectiveness had improved because of this (see Annex 5, Section 1.1, 2.1 and 3.1). It can be assumed that in-depth knowledge about the PD in Finland is limited to the MFA staff who work directly on PD-related issues. Most of the MFA staff is thought to be well aware of the PD. Secondary evidence indicates that politicians, except those who have a direct involvement in development cooperation, and ordinary citizens are not aware of the PD and its principles. This lack of awareness prevents broader policy debate in Finnish society on the PD and, therefore, debate on the key delivery mechanisms of development aid. This inability to carry out a broad discussion on the fundamentals of development cooperation cannot be conducive to society's long-term commitment to development cooperation.

Easily available statistical information on PD implementation is lacking, which constitutes a major problem in the MFA. The statistical system of the Ministry on development cooperation does not include PD-specific markers, and there is no obligatory marker system in use for recording commitments and/or the expenditure of funds. For example, the statistical system does not include markers that would link certain financing with a recipient country's national priorities (e.g. the intervention is included in the recipient country's Poverty Reduction Strategy and/or state budget), or that a certain intervention is channelled through the recipient country's public financial management system, or that the country procurement system is used.

The analysis strongly suggests that another major knowledge transfer problem in the MFA is staff rotation and the tradition of frequently using short-term staff contracts, although the situation recently appears to have improved slightly. A career in the MFA, particularly outside the Department for Development Policy, takes staff to posts involved with development cooperation as well as posts not related to development cooperation. Institutional memory is harmed and/or it is left to assisting staff. Having an understanding of and participating in policy dialogue in any developing country, in order to make informed decisions on budget support or sector support, is not a simple issue and requires a fairly detailed understanding of the realities in the country.

Another weakness concerning the comprehension of the PD identified by the present evaluation is the poor information dissemination on PD issues to politicians, the public, NGOs, contractors and the media. Many interviewees and the vast majority of all the respondents to the survey considered information dissemination to be inadequate. Many stakeholders are of the opinion that an understanding of the PD and its aims and targets is very limited except for the civil servants who deal with these issues on a daily basis. NGOs would prefer concrete country-specific cases to be published that would be easily understandable for all and would illustrate PD issues, such as alignment and harmonization and why they are important, and what is being done to address these issues, and what progress is being made and what problems have been encountered so far. Similarly, some MFA staff members pointed out that ordinary people in the PCs are not familiar with the PD or its principles. There is little awareness among citizens in either DPs or PCs on the fact that the whole aid architecture has already changed as a result of the PD.

4.2 Human Resources

The MFA does not have specific staff working on PD implementation. However, the Unit for General Development Policy and Planning has two advisers who work mainly on PD-related issues, especially on harmonization. Finnish embassies have also been strengthened through sectoral and/or economic advisers who mainly work on PD-related issues, such as sector programmes or budget support work to ensure alignment, harmonization and general aid effectiveness. The recruitment of such advisers started before 2005 when the PD was drawn up. There is wide consensus both within and outside the MFA that the embassy-based advisers have been crucial in the operational implementation of the PD at the country level. This does not

mean that other staff is less important, rather it demonstrates that the advisers have brought about the necessary additional staff inputs and expertise.

As regards the need for specific and additional resources, there is an interesting difference in the opinions of the management (interviews) and staff (questionnaire survey): management broadly thinks that there is no need for specific and/or additional staff (or other) resources for PD implementation, whereas operational staff thinks that current staff resources are not sufficient. Locally contracted staff are widely used in the embassies.

4.3 Coordination

In terms of specific coordination mechanisms, the MFA has three major groups:

- Development Policy Steering Group
- Quality Assurance Group
- (Informal) Aid Effectiveness Working Group (fin. *avun tuloksellisuusryhmä*)

The Development Policy Steering Group is a horizontal strategic policy and operational discussion forum headed by the Director General of the Department for Development Policy, with representatives from all the regional departments that implement development aid programmes. The Quality Assurance Group considers and gives its recommendation on funding proposals before they are submitted for formal approval. The Aid Effectiveness Working Group was previously the most important in terms of PD coordination and discussion (e.g. harmonization issues, preparation of the MFA's Budget Support Guidelines, etc.), but its work was disrupted by the Finnish Presidency of the European Union (EU) and the Working Group has not really been operational since then.

4.4 Decentralization

The execution of the decentralization of aid administration and management to the embassies was raised as a major issue related to PD implementation. Traditionally, the administration of Finnish development cooperation, specifically decision-making, has been highly centralized. Since 2005, the delegation of bilateral development cooperation administration in Finland's long-term PCs has been piloted e.g. in Vietnam and Nicaragua. However, the current regulations governing development cooperation do not allow for the decentralization of decision-making authority for ODA funds to the country level, and this also includes negotiating agreements or making financial transactions.

The only standard exception to this are the funds for local cooperation, which are independently administered by Finnish embassies in the embassies in developing partner countries, and which are guided by internal norms issued on these funds, taking into consideration the multi-annual strategies of the embassies. The Ministry appropriates the necessary funds. Tasks related to the preparation, implementation

or monitoring of development cooperation commitments which do not entail the use of the decision-making authority can, on the other hand, be delegated, as long as any presentation of the formal proposals as a basis for decision-making remains at the HQ level (see also Chapter 4.5).

4.5 Specific Guidelines or Directives

The MFA does not have specific PD Implementation guidelines. However, some new guidelines and directives have been issued to facilitate the operationalization of the PD principles, and other guidelines are being revised. Project implementation guidelines have not been updated to reflect the PD principles, e.g. the Standard Terms for Payment of Fees and Reimbursement of Costs include different benefits for local and international personnel, which is difficult to justify under the harmonization principle.

The guidelines or directives that have been recently issued or revised and that could be considered to be fully in line with the PD priorities are the following:

- Guidelines for Budget Support Cooperation
- Guidelines for Sector Support
- Procurement Legislation, and related Procurement Strategy and Procurement Guidelines
- Evaluation Guidelines (the test period of one year is on-going)

Finland is also committed to observing various Nordic Plus best practices and guidelines that aim to increase administrative flexibility in development cooperation along the principles of the PD.

Furthermore, the embassies that are piloting decentralization (see Chapter 4.2) have produced Quality Management Handbooks as a tool for embassy staff to ensure a high quality of administration, including the implementation of the PD. There are no guidelines regarding the decentralization of tasks to embassies.

There is a wide consensus that in Finnish development cooperation the PD principles should be mainstreamed in all general guidelines and directives rather than issuing separate PD guidelines.

4.6 Training

Training in the MFA is arranged through three main programmes:

- A formal training course for the prospective career diplomats (“KAVAKU”)
- Preparatory training before working abroad (“VALKU”)

- Ad hoc internal staff training

Both the KAVAKU and VALKU training programmes include an introduction to PD issues, although not in a comprehensive manner. The management level staff (interviews) of the MFA were generally of the opinion that the available training relating to the PD is adequate, whereas the operational staff (questionnaire) were clearly of the opinion that more training should be available. The present evaluation found knowledge gaps at various levels, and there appears to be some bottlenecks in information dissemination within the MFA as far as expertise on the PD is concerned.

A good practical example of a successful training event/exchange of information was the one organized last spring by the Department for Africa and the Near East for its staff in Johannesburg. That event focused to large extent on PD implementation issues. One of the topics discussed was the predictability of aid, an indicator for which Finland received a below average ratio in the 2006 Survey on Monitoring the PD (OECD 2007a, p. 100). The MFA started analysing the poor rating after the Johannesburg event. The present evaluation has received a lot of good feedback on that event. Similar events have not yet been organized elsewhere.

There is no formal training organized for NGOs or contractors on the PD. Responses from NGOs indicate that the knowledge base among NGOs is limited. The two NGOs that filled in and submitted the survey questionnaire, and several other NGOs, replied by saying that they knew too little on the topic and therefore did not wish to reply. In fact, the NGOs have requested special training or information sessions to be organized. Similar training could be also targeted at other contractors/consultants.

5 ASSESSING INCENTIVES

5.1 Tradition and Awareness

The Finnish public sector traditionally works towards agreed policy and strategy targets driven by a strong sense of duty and responsibility. In Finnish public administration, including within the MFA, there is no tradition of incentives or specific rewards as a means to encourage or ensure the achievement of expected results. The same ethos is frequently expected from others, including the civil service of PCs, NGOs and contractors. Consequently, the very idea that incentives could be used at any level (individual, unit, department, embassy, recipient country, recipient organization, NGO, contractor) is commonly thought to be inconceivable. One senior level MFA officer even equated incentives with corruption. In Finnish public sector administration, work is carried out on the basis of orders or instructions rather than on the expectation of benefits. This tradition underlines the importance of guidelines and instructions (see Chapter 4.5).

However, incentives have recently been introduced in some Finnish public sector institutions, such as universities, where the financing of departments partly depends on the number of degrees completed and the number and rating of research publications. The incentive structures have been introduced in the Finnish public sector institutions using lessons from similar institutions elsewhere in Europe, such as universities in the United Kingdom (UK).

The European Commission has introduced an incentive system to its budget support whereby the final payments of the budget support are conditional on meeting certain achievement indicators. In the EU's Generalized System of Preference (GSP) another type of incentive structure is used to encourage PCs to progress towards sustainable development and good governance. The special incentive arrangement for sustainable development and good governance (the "GSP+") provides additional benefits for countries implementing certain international standards in human rights and employment rights, environmental protection, the fight against drugs, and good governance.

Neither the previous Development Policy of 2004 nor the new one of 2007 includes any mention of incentives. This is indicative of the fact that incentives are not customary in Finnish Public administration.

The combined interview and survey results of the present evaluation indicate that there has been little systematic discussion on possible incentive structures in development cooperation in Finland, especially with regard to such discussion within the MFA or between the MFA and the MOF. The top management within the MFA views the potential of incentives more positively than medium-level management. Among advisers, economists are more sympathetic to incentives than non-economists. Many MFA staff members were of the opinion that the best reward/incentive for them is acknowledgement of a job well done.

5.2 Performance Assessment Framework

In the interviews it was clear that many MFA staff members did not make the link between the MFA's staff Performance Assessment Framework (PAF), which is the regular system of annual performance and development discussions ("TAKE") and the related salary adjustment, with the "productivity" of their own work. The discussions and possible salary adjustment (from a good performance rating) were associated more with personal career development and general qualifications, such as language proficiency. The new salary system (UPJ) with its personal salary adjustments was, somewhat surprisingly, frequently not associated as being an incentive system.

5.3 Results-based Management System (RMS)

The RMS as a general government policy has been gradually introduced in the MFA during the past few years. It is based on the Ministry's strategy and put into effect through the annual budget preparation ("TAE") process and through the related setting of annual strategic priorities that are translated into three-year rotational

Operational and Budget Plans (TTS) and related Annual Agreements at the department and embassy level. 2007 is the first year when all the embassies have prepared such agreements. The departments and embassies are expected to produce their annual reports in line with the agreements, i.e. to self-monitor the achievement of the results according to the agreements. The system is still so recent that its full impact on the administration cannot be assessed yet. However, based on the interviews, the RMS appears to have achieved its target of focusing the thinking and operations on results to some extent. Linking the system to the PD's principle on managing for results could be useful, although that particular principle is primarily meant to encourage PCs to develop and use the results frameworks. The present evaluation concludes that the DPs could introduce a results-based approach in their administrations, and that the MFA's RMS is a good and positive development in this direction.

However, presently the MFA's RMS does not have a clear and systematic monitoring and evaluation framework that would reliably provide feedback on good or bad performance in terms of implementing the annual agreements. Similarly, there is no thought of linking any kind of incentives with good performance in the RMS. Innovative and unprejudiced internal discussion would be needed within the MFA and between the MFA and the MOF in this regard (reference is made to the non-existing culture of considering, and even hostility towards, incentives within the civil service). Such a discussion could give air to various options, such as a provision/allocation to well-performing departments, embassies, units for (i) additional development and/or planning funds, (ii) additional staff resources, and (iii) salary bonuses for heads or the staff of departments, embassies, units, etc.

5.4 Incentives and Partner Countries

According to the interviews and the survey among MFA staff, incentives to recipient countries for good performance received a fairly sympathetic response. However, in this context several of the staff members interviewed had strong reservations about incentives on the basis of either of the following two reasons: (i) such incentives would be unfair from the point of view of the poor who happen to be suffering from poor governments/civil service (needs-based argument), and (ii) the recipient countries/organizations/civil servants should carry out their development efforts as a duty to their citizens, without any reward or incentive (moral argument). Some staff members pointed out that there already are incentive structures within some projects or programmes, whereby good performance leads to additional funding and continued support.

Some interviewees pointed out the dilemma that countries which successfully reduce poverty and generate economic growth see aid inflows decline because they are graduating out of the least-developed country category. Thus, good performance is in a way punished.

Many of the MFA staff members interviewed who had a positive attitude towards possible incentives for recipient countries were of the opinion that such incentives should be linked with good performance in governance, including PD principles,

such as good national development strategies, reliable country systems for procurement and public financial management, the development and successful use of results frameworks, and the mutual assessment of progress. Others thought that possible incentives should be linked to performance in poverty reduction and other Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) targets of the country. Capacity development/strengthening in the recipient country was seen by many as an important incentive.

The two NGOs that replied to the survey favoured incentives for recipient countries and linking incentives to good governance issues, such as transparency and accountability.

The three contractors to respond were of the opinion that there should be incentives for contractors. However, the proposed incentives were not (directly) financial but rather emphasized (more) active collaboration as well as dialogue and training opportunities. Indirect financial incentives were proposed in terms of increased assignments e.g. in joint missions and in process support in relation to sector programmes and budget support processes.

The issue of introducing incentives into the financing agreements with PCs merits internal policy discussion within the MFA. A detailed analysis and assessment of the various options should precede any policy discussion.

5.5 Disincentives

Concerning disincentives to PD implementation, many MFA staff members pointed out the insufficient degree of decentralization/delegation of decision-making powers to the embassies. The budget support and sector programme processes are time consuming but often require the ability to make quick decisions (otherwise the progress is delayed and all the other stakeholders are made to wait). Efficient and effective planning and follow-up work on budget support and sector programmes require a strong presence in the capital of the recipient country through the embassy, and adequate decision-making powers at the embassy level as well as increased operational flexibility.

Another interesting opinion on disincentives was that there is an increasing sense of development cooperation administration work becoming more insipid and uninteresting because of an increasing disconnection with field projects.

The three contractors to respond presented the opinions that the major disincentives are (i) slow decision-making in the PCs and among the DPs resulting in a lot of red tape for the contractors as well, (ii) unclear or poorly defined responsibilities between partner organizations and consultants in the case of projects/programmes that are (partially) integrated into the organizational and financial systems of the recipient country, (iii) corruption and excessive bureaucracy in the recipient countries with which the consultants increasingly need to deal with as a result of using the recipient countries' procurement systems, and finally (iv) a general trend towards a reduction

in the volume of assignments for consultants due to budget support and sector programmes in which the use of international TA services is minimized.

5.6 Transaction Costs

Many of the MFA staff members interviewed pointed out that originally one of the justifications for some of the PD targets (e.g. the use of local public financial management systems, common arrangements, etc.) were justified by reduced transaction costs, and that a reduction in transaction costs could be seen as a major incentive to both the DPs and the recipients. The MFA does not have comprehensive statistics or analyses on the transaction costs of its aid, and consequently, possible changes in the costs are not known. In the interviews and survey, the opinions or estimates of MFA staff vary significantly: about one-third think that transaction costs have increased, another third think that they have decreased and the remaining one-third do not know or think that there has been no change. Two of the contractors that responded think that the costs have increased, and one thinks that there has not been any change. Some of the interviewees said that the increased transaction costs should be seen as an investment cost that will pay itself back in the future, i.e. designing new ways of doing things costs more now but there will be savings in the future. There is a need to study and monitor the aid delivery costs of the MFA on a systematic basis.

6 ASSESSING COHERENCE

6.1 Political Framework

The main thrust of Finnish development policies has remained fairly similar for more than a decade. The core principles of the PD are, and have been, at the forefront of Finnish policies. Finnish governments, both the previous and the present, have been very clear in setting coherence among the key issues to improve the quality of development policy and cooperation. There is unanimity on the fact that without coordinated efforts it will be impossible to attain the MDGs.

The Development Policy of 2004 stated that achieving the aims of development policy would require improved coherence in national policies, multilateral cooperation and EU policies. It called for the necessary policy changes to be identified in order to establish the mutual interests of Finland and developing countries and to adopt effective ways of promoting them. It also called for the identification of potential conflicts. The policy stated that awareness of the existing contradictions in national policies would create opportunities to deal with them and to draw up new operational guidelines. It also noted that the exchange of information, cooperation and interactive mechanisms among officials should be further strengthened. In the Policy, the MFA was requested to “investigate how the overall harmonization of development policy between official bodies could be achieved effectively without unnecessarily adding to the administrative burden.”

The Helsinki Process is an example of the Finnish contribution, at the highest political level, to increase policy coherence for development. The process was set up by the governments of Finland and Tanzania in 2002.

The outcome of the first phase of the Process was the report “Mobilising Political Will” (2005) which included recommendations on poverty and development, human rights, the environment, peace and security, and governance, with the emphasis on coherence at all levels. The second phase of the Process will produce an outcome for the UN.

Another good example of political awareness is the work done by the previous DPC (2003-2007). It put great emphasis on policy coherence for development. Based on interviews and documentation (DPC 2007), the DPC in its advisory role was active and successful in promoting coherence as a key issue in the Government’s development agenda. However, the DPC underlined the concept that coherence is not a target itself but a tool.

Coherence is high on Finland’s development policy and cooperation agenda, and Finland promotes policy coherence for development in its official development policy. Solid and stable development policies help create coherence in policy implementation.

6.2 Challenges for Coherence

Coherence is not mentioned at all in the PD. However, it is intuitively clear that coherence is an important dimension in the contemporary aid architecture. Without coherent policies and action, both among DPs and PCs, the PD principles would lose credibility.

One of the challenges is that coherence can, and is, understood differently by stakeholders. For example, coherence is not defined in the OECD/DAC Glossary. The EU’s (2006) definition of coherence has three dimensions:

- Internal coherence (in the different actions carried out within the framework of development policy)
- Intra-governmental coherence (in the interests of greater compatibility of all of the actions and policies of a single country in their contribution to development)
- Inter-governmental coherence (which compares the policies of different donor countries, multilaterals and PCs in terms of their contribution to development)

6.3 National Coherence

It became obvious during the evaluation that the interviewees and other consulted stakeholders understood coherence differently. Some thought only of the Finnish

intra-governmental aspect, others thought purely about the internal coherence of the MFA, while others had a broader understanding along the lines of the above EU definition. Further, many interviewees emphasized that coherence is merely a tool to achieve development objectives, and thus coherence should not be over-played in devising policies, strategies and development interventions. Others were clearly of the opinion that coherence is an aim in itself, and it should not be compromised. Such differences in understanding this basic concept cause Finnish actors, both within the MFA and outside, to act differently.

Based on the interviews and their analysis, there is need for additional ad hoc coordination or working groups. Some of the working groups are well established and up and running; some are more informal. There are inter-ministerial working groups active, for example, in the fields of immigration and international security. However, the strengthened emphasis on the environment and natural resources, for instance, in the new development policy calls for stronger coordination among Finnish actors and agencies e.g. in the sectors relating to the environment and rural and regional development.

The typical Finnish working method supports coherence because the administration aims to formulate clear instructions and seeks consensus in decision-making. Decisions are followed and put into practice as a part of everyday work. It is not typical of the Finnish culture to revisit or question decisions once made. At the same time, it is typical to restrict administrative decisions and actions made by one government body to its own area of competence. The information flow between administrative bodies is ensured if official mechanisms have been established, such as working groups.

To ensure improved coherence in the MFA, the Unit for General Development Policy and Planning under the Department for Development Policy has been appointed to be the focal point. Recently, the MFA appointed an advisor whose task is to increase and ensure policy coherence for development.

To improve coherence in bilateral cooperation, the MFA has produced a number of instructions and guidelines for ODA planning, budgeting and implementation (see also Chapter 4.5). All concrete development proposals are discussed and reviewed by the Ministry's Quality Assurance Board. The Department's Policy Steering Group can also discuss and instruct on coherence issues (see also Chapter 4.2).

The fact that the PD is limited to issues relating to ODA makes it more difficult for the embassies to act coherently in PCs. Issues such as trade, investments and human rights are left out of the PD but at the same time they are an important part of the development agenda of PCs. One of the challenges is the occasional lack of interest in PCs in cross-cutting themes.

According to MFA staff, there is a constant flow of information between the Departments for Global Affairs and Development Policy. The information flow is less constant between the Department for Global Affairs and the Regional Departments, hence making coordination more difficult.

Humanitarian assistance follows the ad hoc needs arising from the PCs. The coherence of Finnish and international actors can be assessed only on a case-by-case basis. Finland's aim is to respect internationally agreed procedures and to coordinate all its humanitarian assistance with international agencies in order to avoid unnecessary duplication and to ensure timely and well-targeted actions. Humanitarian assistance can be provided to countries and regions where Finland is not involved in day-to-day development cooperation. The present discussion in Finland focuses on how and where to proceed from humanitarian aid to more structured and coherent cooperation after a crisis situation is over.

Finland has recognised the need for better coordinated trade and development policies and policy implementation. In the MFA, an inter-departmental working group was established in 2005 to deal with trade and aid matters. In 2007, a senior MFA staff member in the Department for Development Policy was appointed to further advocate and increase coherence in aid and trade. The Ministry of Trade and Industry (currently the Ministry of Employment and the Economy) is the other central government body responsible for trade issues.

6.4 Coherence with the EU and in Multilateral Cooperation

Another challenge is the issue of policy coherence with other DPs. Coherence is normally considered as an issue concerning national policies, but there is also an international policy coherence dimension. Many interviewees questioned the need for policy coherence with other DPs altogether. At the same time, they pointed out that coherence is really a non-issue among like-minded groups of DPs, referring in particular to Nordic Plus and also the EU to a large extent. The Government's development policy is regarded as the point of departure when Finnish positions among DP groups are formulated. Coherence with PCs is discussed primarily as a part of the ownership and alignment agendas, although it is a cross-cutting principle.

There are official mechanisms to coordinate Finnish positions and actions. One concrete example is the coordination of Finnish positions in the EU. The positions are prepared in a structured manner. Finland, as a rather small member country, is aware of the need to coordinate its own actions and performance in various EU bodies to ensure better results in matters of importance. Another example is the decision-making related to international financial institutions, regarding which the MFA, the MOF, and the Bank of Finland form positions, coordinate and work together.

Multilateral cooperation is challenging for national coordination because of the participation of a number of government agencies in their respective fields. The Finnish positions in relation to multilateral agencies are formulated mainly in Helsinki. However, the formulation is partly undertaken by Finland's representations in international organizations and partly in the PCs.

In the multilateral fora, Finland's positions are coordinated as far as possible with the relevant reference groups. Within the international financial institutions the Finnish

reference group is the constituency/voting group to which Finland belongs. In other multilateral fora, such as the UN, the group is the EU.

EU positions are formed under the chairmanship of the current President. Finland held the rotating six-month EU Presidency for the latter half of 2006. In the development agenda, Finland prioritized coherence and matters relating to DP coordination and the division of tasks. According to the interviews, the process was successfully started by Finland and finalized by the next EU presidency of Germany.

Finland is an active member of the OECD/DAC. It has also been actively participating in the formulation of the PD and remains determined and active in ensuring that DAC policies follow the PD principles. Nordic Plus provides the framework for DAC work at all levels, thus ensuring a coordinated and coherent approach from the top down to the working level. Finland is committed to advancing policy coherence for development in the EU and OECD, and in other international and multilateral fora.

7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Leadership

Conclusion 1A: Finland is committed to the principles of the PD. The political support for respecting ownership by PCs and for acting in a coherent manner at all times is strong. Ownership as well as other PD-related issues have been understood and debated in Finland for many years. Finland has been among those countries which have tried to increase the level of international awareness and consideration regarding these questions.

Conclusion 1B: Programme aid will play an important role in future Finnish cooperation; its share of Finnish ODA may not increase at the same speed as the discussion on its allocation and impacts. The alignment of Finnish assistance is ongoing but challenging at the same time, e.g. there are still separate project implementation units in several projects. Finland is prepared, in the name of increased aid effectiveness and more harmonized cooperation, to re-direct its assistance to a certain extent. The predictability of Finnish aid has been much debated after the 2006 Survey on Monitoring the PD.

Recommendation 1: Well and carefully prepared high-level consultations between Finland and development partners should be continued as a forum for discussing all forms and modes of aid and for reaching agreement on them. In addition, the impacts gained by assistance should be discussed with the respective partners. The planning and design of Finnish aid should continue to be realistic and take into consideration the situations in the PCs in order to allocate aid timely.

7.2 Capacities

Conclusion 2: In-depth knowledge about the PD in Finland is limited to the MFA staff who work directly on PD-related issues. There are knowledge gaps at various levels in the MFA. There are formal training arrangements but either they are insufficient or they are not reaching those who need the training. Departmental or region-based special training or events for exchanging information could be useful in this regard.

Recommendation 2: Organize on a systematic basis departmental or regional training or events for exchanging experiences on important policy and procedural topics with special reference to PD implementation.

Conclusion 3: No formal training is organized for NGOs or contractors on PD issues, and obtaining information among these stakeholders has been left to their own initiative.

Recommendation 3: The MFA should organize e.g. annual seminars around topical training packages for NGOs and consultants/contractors. The NGO Unit organizes annual seminars but the PD has not yet featured on the agendas.

Conclusion 4: There is little easily available statistical information on PD implementation in the MFA. The statistical system of the Ministry on development cooperation does not include PD-specific markers, nor is the use of a marker system obligatory in recording commitments and/or the use of funds.

Recommendation 4: The MFA should consider introducing obligatory markers in its statistical system, focusing in particular on selected key PD-specific markers.

Conclusion 5: Staff rotation and the tradition of using a lot of short-term staff contracts continue to be a major problem with regard to institutional memory, although recently the situation appears to have slightly improved. There is wide consensus within and outside the MFA that the embassy-based advisers have been crucial in the operational implementation of the PD at the country level.

Recommendation 5: The MFA should continue its efforts to increase the duration of staff postings in country operations both at the HQ and the embassies.

Conclusion 6: The dissemination of information on PD issues to politicians, the public, NGOs, contractors and the media has been inadequate.

Recommendation 6: The MFA should mobilize its Department for Communication and Culture to carry out a broad-based information programme on the PD, its importance and implications.

Conclusion 7: The Aid Effectiveness Working Group of the MFA has been important in terms of PD coordination and discussion, but its work was disrupted by

the Finnish EU Presidency and the Working Group has not really been operational since then.

Recommendation 7: Revitalize the Aid Effectiveness Working Group.

Conclusion 8: Decentralization of aid administration and management through delegating bilateral development cooperation administration to embassies has been piloted for two years. It is now time to learn the lessons and draw conclusions for a more permanent solution.

Recommendation 8: The MFA should consider the permanent delegation of bilateral development cooperation administration to embassies on the basis of the lessons learned from the piloting, and to remove the remaining bottlenecks regarding limited decision-making powers. The respective instructions or guidelines should be prepared and issued.

Conclusion 9: PD issues should be mainstreamed in all general guidelines and instructions as a best practice. However, Project implementation guidelines and the Standard Terms for Payment of Fees and Reimbursement of Costs, for instance, are not in line with the PD principles.

Recommendation 9: Continue updating guidelines and instructions to include PD principles, e.g. update the project implementation guidelines and the Standard Terms for Payment of Fees and Reimbursement of Costs in the light of the PD principles.

7.3 Incentives

Conclusion 10: In Finnish public administration, especially with regard to the MFA, there is no tradition of incentives as a means to encourage or ensure the achievement of expected results. The present evaluation finds that DP agencies should introduce a results-based approach in their administrations. The MFA's RMS is a good and positive development in this regard. However, there are no plans to link any kind of incentives with good performance in the RMS.

Recommendation 10: Innovative and unprejudiced internal discussion regarding the possible introduction of incentive structures and linking them with the MFA's RMS should take place within the MFA and between the MFA and the MOF.

Conclusion 11: There has been no systematic thinking within the MFA about introducing incentive systems that would reward good performance by PCs. There are examples and lessons to be learned from other DP agencies.

Recommendation 11: The issue of introducing incentives into financing agreements with PCs should be discussed internally within the MFA. This type of policy discussion could be preceded by a detailed analysis and assessment of the various options.

Conclusion 12: The MFA does not have reliable information on aid delivery costs, not to mention the trends relating to those costs. This information would be needed for assessing the cost efficiency of various aid delivery instruments and the impact of the PD on them.

Recommendation 12: Finland's aid delivery costs should be studied and monitored on a systematic basis.

7.4 Coherence

Conclusion 13: Finland's consistent development policies have helped to increase coherence in implementation. Coherence has been given high importance in Finland. The confusion in seeing coherence as an aim in itself rather than as a tool for more effective aid has led to differences in actions which are causing some confusion.

Recommendation 13: It should be borne in mind that coherence is not a goal in itself but a tool to increase effectiveness.

Conclusion 14: Coherence in development issues is primarily the responsibility of the MFA. It is challenging for the Finnish administration to act in a coherent manner at all times and occasions. To ensure coherence, there are number of processes and management mechanisms together with inter-ministerial and inter-departmental working groups.

Recommendation 14: New working groups would be required to ensure coherence in issues such as climate change, the use of natural resources, and agriculture. The working groups should operate in general in a more formal and structured manner. There should be well-formulated instructions, guidelines and training to enhance common approaches to coherence.

Conclusion 15: There is lack of information/knowledge about the PD and its contents in other ministries apart from the MFA.

Recommendation 15: The MFA should ensure through efficient information that other Finnish stakeholders are aware of issues relating to the global development agenda. The everyday information flow is huge, so there is a need to communicate the core of the information in commonly understandable language.

Conclusion 16: In the multilateral framework, Finland aims to act in a coherent manner. Finland's goal is to ensure the PD issues are taken fully on board by all multilateral institutions.

Recommendation 16: It should be ensured that all Finnish actors tackle PD issues in a coherent manner in all multilateral occasions.

Conclusion 17: The transition from humanitarian assistance to reconstruction and further to development cooperation is a challenge as far as coherence is concerned.

Recommendation 17: Based on careful considerations, Finland should decide in which disasters or in which fragile states or regions it enters into development cooperation, and what the necessary and adequate terms and conditions are for the cooperation to be successful.

REFERENCES

Cedergren J 2007 *We're working on it: Development Partners' efforts for effective aid*. Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sweden. International Poverty Center.

Council of the EU 2006a *Complementarity and Division of Labour*. Issues-paper from the Presidency and the Commission for the GAERC Orientation Debate in October 2006.

Council of the EU 2006b *Complementarity and Division of Labour: Preparation for the Orientation Debate on Aid Effectiveness*. Conclusions of the Council and the Representatives of the Member States Meeting within the Council on EU Guidelines on Complementarity and Division of Labour.

Development Policy Committee 2007 *State of Finland's Development Policy III*. The DPC's Statement to the Government in 2007. Helsinki.

Embassy of Finland 2007 *Quality Management Handbook: Managing Development Cooperation in the Embassy*. Hanoi.

European Union 2006 *EU mechanisms that promote policy coherence for development – a scoping study*. Studies in European Development Cooperation Evaluation No 2.

Evaluation of the Paris Declaration Inception Workshop 18-20 June 2007. *Workshop Report*. Copenhagen.

Evaluation Services of the EU 2006a *EU Mechanisms that Promote Policy Coherence for Development: A Scoping Study*. Triple C-Evaluations No 8.

Evaluation Services of the EU 2006b *Evaluation of Co-ordination and Coherence in the Application of Article 96 of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement*. Triple C-Evaluations No 6.

Evaluation Services of the EU 2006c *Joint evaluation of co-ordination of trade capacity building in partner countries*. Triple C-Evaluations No 5.

Finn Trap 2007 *Aid Does Work, but Beware of Great Expectation*. University of Copenhagen. International Policy Center.

Government of Finland 2007 *Kehityspoliittinen ohjelma 2007 - Kohti oikeudenmukaista ja kestävää ihmiskuntapolitiikkaa*. Valtioneuvoston periaatepäätös.

MFA 2001 *Decision in Principle on the Operationalisation of Development Policy Objectives*. Helsinki.

MFA 2004a *Budget Support Cooperation in Finland's Development Cooperation*. Department for Development Policy, Helsinki.

MFA 2004b *Kehityspoliittinen Ohjelma*. Valtioneuvoston periaatepäätös 5.2.2004. Helsinki.

MFA 2004c *Finland's Rural Development Strategy for International Development*. 28.1.2004. Helsinki.

MFA 2005a *Piloting the Delegation of Bilateral Development Cooperation Administration in Finland's Long-Term Partner Countries: Implementation Plan For Vietnam*. Department for the Americas and Asia. Helsinki.

MFA 2005b *Sektorituki Suomen kehitysyhteistyössä*. Kehityspoliittinen viestintä. Helsinki.

MFA 2006a *Suomen Kehitysyhteistyö 2006*. Kehityspoliittinen viestintä, Helsinki.

MFA 2006b *Education Strategy for Finland's Development Cooperation*. Helsinki.

MFA 2007a *Humanitarian Assistance Guidelines: Finland's National Plan for Implementing the Good Humanitarian Donorship Principles*. Development Policy Information Unit, Helsinki.

MFA 2007b *Kehityspoliittinen ohjelman vuosiarviointi ohjelmakaudelta 2004-2006*. Helsinki.

Moore M, Gould J, Joshi A & Oksanen R 1996 *Ownership in the Finnish Aid Programme*. Evaluation Report 1996:3.

Nordic Plus 2006a *Barriers to delegated cooperation, Joint assessments of policies and administrative practices of the Nordic Plus donors*.

Nordic Plus 2006b *Practical Guide to Delegated Cooperation*.

OECD 2005 *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness*. DCD/DAC/EFF (2005)1/Final. Working Party on Aid Effectiveness and Donor Practices, DAC.

OECD. 2006 *DAC Evaluation Quality Standards* (for test phase application). DAC Evaluation Network.

OECD 2007a 2006 *Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration: Overview of Results*.

OECD 2007b *Review of the Development Co-operation Policies and Programmes of Finland*. Draft Secretariat Report (for official use).

Scanteam Analysts and Advisers 2007 *Support Models for CSOs at Country Level: Synthesis Report* (Draft). Norad, Oslo.

Scanteam Analysts and Advisers 2007 *Support Models for CSOs at Country Level Zambia*. Country Report (Draft). Norad, Oslo.

Valtioneuvosto 2007 *Kehityspoliittinen Ohjelma 2007 – Kohti oikeudenmukaista ja kestävää ihmiskuntapolitiikkaa*. Valtioneuvoston periaatepäätös 2007.

World Bank 2006 *Paris Declaration at a Glance*. Operations Policy and Country Services (OPCS).

<http://www.formin.fi/Public/default.aspx?contentid=69859&nodeid=15319&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>

<http://www.formin.fi/public/default.aspx?nodeid=15335&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>

http://www.oecd.org/glossary/0,3414,en_2649_33721_1965693_1_1_1_1,00.html

ANNEX 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
Department for Development Policy
Unit for Evaluation and Internal Auditing

ANNEX B

TERMS OF REFERENCE EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PARIS DECLARATION - CASE FINLAND (89845201)

Introduction

The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness concluded in March 2005 in Paris (*Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, Paris 2 March 2005*) contained the requirement of organizing an independent cross-country evaluation process to enhance the overall understanding of how the implementation of the Declaration is contributing to the overall aid effectiveness and to meeting the set development objectives.

The OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation (EvalNet), in consultation with the Joint Venture on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness and partner countries, decided to launch a joint-evaluation of the implementation Paris Declaration. The first phase of the evaluation shall contribute to the High-level Forum of OECD, to be held in September 2008 in Accra, Ghana.

The evaluation will include evaluations of partner countries and development partners (donor countries), multi-lateral agencies, IFIs, and other organizations engaged in development assistance. The Paris Declaration stipulated that the evaluation should be accomplished without imposing unnecessary additional burden on the partners. Thus, the evaluations are organised on voluntary basis. A total of 10 partner countries have volunteered, and a number of donor countries, Finland being one. The organisation of the evaluations will be done individually by the countries concerned. However, there is the international management and coordination system in place already to ensure compatibility of each case evaluation.

The subject of this evaluation is the Implementation of Paris Declaration. The declaration offers specific targets on aid effectiveness through the implementation of activities tied to five key concepts, namely

ownership, meaning that the developing partner countries take leadership in their own development policy and development planning;

alignment, meaning that development partners (donors) plan their own development interventions to support the partner countries' development policies, planning and implementation;

harmonisation, meaning that development partners (donors) coordinate their own activities and economise the transaction costs of delivering development aid;

managing for results, meaning that both parties to this declaration, partner countries and development partners (donors) organise their activities towards achievement of the targeted results;

mutual accountability, makes both parties, the partner countries and the development partners, accountable *to each other* for the progress in managing development assistance in the best possible way and in achieving the desired development results.

How this five-concept framework links together is illustrated in the Framework Terms of Reference appended herewith as Annex 1. Further background and the entire evaluation framework are contained in Annex 1 to these terms of reference (*Framework Terms of Reference for the First Phase Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration, 25 April 2007*).

OVERALL EVALUATION OF PARIS DECLARATION

1. Rationale, purpose and objectives of the evaluation

Rationale

The evaluation will be implemented in two distinct phases, the first of which will take place prior to the 2008 Accra High-Level Forum, and the second phase contributing to the 2010 High-Level Forum meeting. The High-Level Fora of OECD guide the implementation of the Paris Declaration.

The evaluation is devised to complement the on-going monitoring of the implementation of Paris Declaration and to offer an additional dimension to the surveys done on the implementation, the latest of which was published in May 2007 (*OECD: The 2006 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, 2007*).

In the first phase of the evaluation, the basic questions relate to observing relationships between discernible trends and directions rather than definite results. The evaluation endeavours to assess processes in terms of their potential towards enhanced aid effectiveness. Moreover, the evaluation will also observe the unintentional dimensions of effects of activities undertaken within the framework of Paris Declaration. The first phase of the evaluation will focus much on the input-output level, and only the second phase of the evaluation will be able to assess more explicit impacts on aid effectiveness and development effectiveness (pls see also Annex 1 to the ToR).

Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to achieve an independent view on the question of whether the steps taken to implement Paris Declaration are conducive to increased aid effectiveness to ultimately achieve enhanced development effectiveness.

The major users of the evaluation results will be the aid administration, internationally, among the partner countries and the development partners, responsible for development policy, planning and implementation.

Objective

The objective of the evaluation is to assess whether the implementation of Paris Declaration is on track, and to offer independent opinion on possible areas of readjustment needs. This objective is of particular importance as some basic assumptions of Paris Declaration are being debated by development experts concomitantly to the advancing process of implementation of Paris Declaration.

2. Structure of the Evaluation

The Management Structure for the entire Evaluation of the Paris Declaration is contained in Annex 2 (*Management Structure for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration*) to this terms of reference. The Management includes a wider global reference group and a small management group which includes both partner country representatives and the development partner representatives. Each country evaluation will also have a National Evaluation Coordinator, and the reference group and management structure for their respective evaluations.

The generic terms of reference for the Development Partner (donor) evaluation of Paris Declaration are contained in Annex 3 of these terms of reference (*First Phase of the Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration . Generic TOR for Development Partner HQ Evaluations*).

3. CASE EVALUATION – FINLAND, Headquarter`s level

In Finland, the Unit for Evaluation and Internal Auditing of the Department for Development Policy of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs will serve as the National Evaluation Coordinator (NAC). To assist the NAC in the management of the evaluation and in the overall participation in the global evaluation process of the Paris Declaration, a Management Support person has been engaged for this purpose. The management of the Development Partner headquarters evaluation is explained in Annex 4 of these terms of reference (*Joint Evaluation of Implementing the Paris Declaration. Guidance for Management of Development Partner HQ Level Evaluation, 25 April 2007*).

3.1. Purpose and objective of the evaluation in Finland

Paris Declaration and its five concept areas and 12 indicators constitute an important part of the overall planning and accountability framework of Finland`s development policy and aid administration. The targets of the Paris Declaration together with those of Millennium Development goals constitute central yardsticks in the internal performance assessment framework of the development aid of Finland. Results-based management system has been introduced in the planning and administration of Finnish Development assistance.

The timing of this evaluation is particularly opportune, as the government, elected in March 2007, is in the process of finalising the development policy for the next four-year period. Finland is also currently being peer reviewed by OECD/DAC.

The purpose of this evaluation (Finland) is to assess the extent to which the concepts of Paris Declaration have been taken into account in the policy of the Finnish Government, in development aid policy, and at the level of the organizational aid delivery machinery, including guidelines and planning tools, reports and the overall accountability framework at headquarters in Helsinki, and

to the extent necessary, also at the country level, in the diplomatic missions of Finland. The purpose is also to explore the dimension of coherence of actions between different aid delivery channels, which in Finland include other ministries, research institutions and non-governmental organisations.

The evaluation will concentrate on the input-output levels and focus on the relevance of the actions and inputs as well as their effectiveness in terms of promoting the five fundamental concepts of Paris Declaration. The specific purpose is to assess current practices in the implementation of Paris Declaration.

The users of the evaluation results will be, in addition to contributing towards the global evaluation of Paris Declaration, also the Finnish administration involved in planning and implementation of development assistance and the higher management of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

The objective of the current evaluation (Finland) is to offer an independent view on the modalities and practices of implementation of Paris Declaration in Finland, from the political to the practical implementation level. The objective is also to extract lessons for further development of implementation of Paris Declaration, and for better effectiveness and efficiency of the Finnish aid. The evaluation will add to the understanding of how the results of the monitoring surveys of Paris Declaration could best be used to improve aid planning and implementation.

The study of Finland will also contribute to the overall global evaluation of the Paris Declaration coordinated by Denmark on behalf of the DAC evaluation network.

3. 2. The scope of the evaluation in Finland

The evaluation will be focused on the implementation of Paris Declaration in the Finnish aid administration at the headquarters level. The major machinery is the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, yet, also other ministries, non-governmental organizations and research institutions are involved in the delivering of aid. As explained in Annex 3 to this ToR, there are three main dimensions of scope for the Development Partner (donor) evaluations, namely *commitment, capacity building, and incentive systems pertinent to the alignment to the Paris Declaration*. These three dimensions will constitute the conceptual scope of this evaluation on Finland

An additional sub-dimension will be *coherence*.

Commitment, Capacities and Incentives

Finland places great importance to the implementation of Paris Declaration. Already prior to approval of Paris Declaration, the Finnish development policy of 2004, has underlined that Finland, whenever possible, aligns herself with the national development plans of partner countries. Finland is also part of the Nordic+ Joint Action Plan on harmonisation. After the adoption of Paris Declaration in 2005, Finland has instituted measures to implement it at different levels. A public seminar to launch the implementation of Paris Declaration was organised in the autumn of 2005.

Ownership has been one of the central dimensions of development policy for many years, and the partner countries' will to develop, be responsible and to lead their own development, was stressed already in the very first development cooperation strategy of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs already in 1993 (*Finland's Development Co-operation in the 1990s*). Finland support the own development plans and poverty reduction strategies and the relevant programmes of all principal partner countries. Since 1993, the subsequent government policy papers have articulated further the importance of this dimension. In late 1990s, the Unit for Evaluation and Internal Auditing commissioned an evaluation on the ownership concept, and how it expressed itself in the development cooperation.

Finland participates in the joint assistance frameworks and sectoral groups in partner countries, whenever possible. During last years, embassies in the principal partner countries have been strengthened with sector-specific special advisers in order for Finland to be better able to contribute to the sectoral support and programmatic support programmes.

After its adoption, the Paris Declaration and its harmonisation agenda has been very actively promoted in Finland and within the constituency responsible for development aid implementation. Finland has also actively promoted the related agenda on effectiveness of aid at the international and at national level. The accountability framework of the Ministry's development cooperation has been developed into results-based-management system.

3.3. The Focus of the evaluation in Finland

The case evaluation of Finland will focus on the *input* level of the three dimensions of scope, commitment, capacity building and incentive systems, with regard to the commitments of the Paris Declaration at the headquarters level, to some extent involving also the Finnish embassies.

The sub-focus on coherence in the policies and players in the development assistance machinery will also be looked at. There is a recent case study on Finland on coherence, within the framework of the EU's 3Cs evaluation, in which the Development Policy Committee of Finland was studied as an example of a horizontal policy coherence mechanisms. The Government Policy paper of 2004 states clearly that in the achievement of the aims of development policy, improved policy coherence in national policies is required. Similarly, coherence needs to be increased also at the level of practical implementation of development aid, including through better cooperation among authorities involved.

3.4. Special concerns

The evaluation at the level of Headquarters of the Finnish development aid will not be able to offer final answers in terms of the assumed relationship between the development impact and the aid effectiveness. This evaluation will offer an initial entry point, which will further be elaborated in the second phase of the evaluation aiming at 2010.

The evaluation will concentrate on the Ministry for Foreign Affairs' at capital level, however so that a number of other organisations participating in the

implementation of development cooperation, will be included in the study. The embassies in those partner countries, in which Finland has diplomatic representation, may be included through questionnaires. In two or three of the participating partner countries (Vietnam, Zambia and South-Africa), Finland might also be included in the respective partner country evaluations as one of the donors present there.

4. Evaluation Questions

There are two major questions in this evaluation: *Are we doing the right things (relevance)?* and *Are we doing things right (effectiveness)?* The evaluation shall address, not only the positive ways in which the implementation of Paris Declaration has been enhanced, but also include highlight of the obstacles and difficulties encountered. The evaluation questions and thus, assessments, are geared around the three focus dimensions of alignment: leadership, capacity development and incentive system, and assess these dimensions also through the coherence point of view.

Annex 3. lists the generic basic evaluation questions of development partner evaluations, which should be addressed.

In addition the evaluation will consider the following question, yet not to be restricted only to these questions, but consider any other issue the expert team deems necessary to bring to the attention of the Ministry:

Leadership/ownership:

- the overall Government Policy and the specific Development Policy of the Government, thematic policy framework papers and guidelines, how do these documents address the Paris Declaration, and in particular the weight put on ownership and leadership in development by the partner countries, alignment, joint action etc? Mechanisms to enhance country leadership? Programming practices?
- bilateral and multilateral sectors of Finnish aid and how these two reflect respectively the implementation requirement of the Paris Agenda? Coherence between the two aid sectors? Policy coherence at the level of the EU action of Finland?
- coherence at policy level and between the other implementing bodies within the Finnish administration? do they acknowledge the principles of ownership, demand-driven approach, alignment etc.? mechanisms to promote and ensure coherence in the implementation of Paris Declaration at this, horizontal level?
- inclusion of Paris Declaration in the planning, budgeting, monitoring, and reporting, a.i. the overall performance assessment and accountability framework; featuring of the indicators of the Paris Declaration indicators?

Capacity

- assessment of the administrative systems and staff resources devoted to the implementation of Paris Declaration at the headquarter`s level and in the field (embassies)?
- how Paris Declaration features in the overall development information dissemination, and constituency building in Finland? Information sharing towards politicians, ordinary citizens, media, NGOs?
- assessment of how Paris Declaration is taken into account in the practical implementation of development aid at the level of the regional departments and units (some *ad hoc* samples of recent Project Documents, mid-term reviews, guidelines or alike), and at the level of the implementing constituency (consultants, NGOs – a sample of a few to be interviewed)
- featuring of Paris Declaration in the training programmes offered by the Ministry internally, externally to departing experts, and at the country level
- mechanisms of interaction between the Ministry and the diplomatic missions at the country level; specific coherence measures? Coordination and coherence between the Development Policy Department and the regional departments?
- degree of decentralization of authority to the embassies?
- capacity and resource development at the diplomatic mission level in relation to the implementation of Paris Declaration? at the Ministry`s level? Mechanism to ensure capacity development at the level of outsourced services relevant to development cooperation?
- transaction costs of aid delivery – cost-benefit measures and monitoring systems?

Incentive systems

- are there specific incentives offered in the Ministry for compliance to the Paris Declaration?
- any priority setting in regard of work related to Paris Declaration?
- any disincentives perceived by the Ministry or other stakeholders?
- use of conditionalities?

The evaluation questions will be further adjusted and developed after the selection of the consultant, at the inception of the actual evaluation work. At that point an evaluation matrix will be finalised. There will also be contact to the overall Management Unit of the Evaluation to secure the precision of the evaluation TOR with the overall framework of the evaluation. The precisions will take place at the outset of the evaluation.

6. Required Expertise

The team of experts may consist of two (or more) persons with specific long-term knowledge and understanding of international development aid agenda and aid effectiveness policy development and processes. Thorough knowledge of the process and implementation of Paris Declaration is required, with considerable field experience and understanding of the local context at the level of partner countries. There should be good back-up and quality assurance facilities behind the selected experts.

The precise description of the expertise needed is included in the letter of invitation to tender.

7. Time schedule and conduct of work

The Developing Partner (Finland) evaluation of the implementation of the Paris Declaration shall start immediately after conclusion of the consultancy contract, which is foreseen to take place around third week of August 2007. Meanwhile, collection of relevant material and in-house preparations will be done. The Management Support to this evaluation is available from end of July 2007 on. The Management Support

person will be a close contact to the evaluation team and assist the team in practical matters and on the overall management of the evaluation together with the National Evaluation Coordinator.

The draft report of the evaluation is planned to be available in mid-October and the final report around the end of October 2007.

The draft report will be discussed in the internal reference group to this evaluation, which will be constituted in early August 2007 to be able to participate in the precision of the work plan of the consultant(s). The national Management Group of this evaluation will constitute the National Evaluation Coordinator and the Management Support.

The evaluation will focus on perusal of document material, and conduct interviews of relevant stakeholders. Also questionnaires and seminars may be used to reach out the wider constituency.

The inception report of the consultant will include description of the evaluation methods and an elaborated evaluation matrix with specific questions, indicators and methods to be used. The inception report will emerge in early September 2007.

8. Result of the evaluation

The concrete result of the evaluation will be a development partner report of Finland on the Implementation of Paris Declaration. The report will be an expression of expert views of independent external evaluators, who will include in the report their responses on the questions contained in the ToR and the annexes. They will also include in the report any other views or recommendations, which through their excellence and expertise the team may deem necessary for the benefit of the final outcome of the evaluation.

At the contents level, the evaluation will enable better understanding of the situation and status of implementation of Paris Declaration in the Finnish development aid system. It will also offer lessons learned for improvement of the implementation.

The report shall not exceed 30 pages in total.

9. Mandate

The evaluation team is expected to consult to the extent necessary the relevant stakeholders to this evaluation. They are not, however, entitled to make any commitments on behalf of the Ministry.

Helsinki, 2 June 2007

Aira Päivöke

Director

Annexes:

1. Framework terms of reference for the first phase. Evaluation of the implementation of the Paris Declaration
2. Management structure for the evaluation of the Paris Declaration
3. First phase of the evaluation of the implementation of the Paris Declaration. Generic ToR for Development Partner HQ evaluation.
4. Joint evaluation of implementing the Paris Declaration. Guidance for Management of Development Partner HQ level evaluations.

ANNEX 2 LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Airaksinen Helena, Director, Unit for East and West Africa, Department for Africa and the Middle East, MFA

Castrén Tuukka, Unit for General Development Policy and Planning, Department for Development Policy, MFA

Honkanen Selma, Unit for Southern Africa, Department for Africa and the Middle East, MFA

Hukka Pekka, Director Africa, Unit for Development Financing Institutions, Department for Global Affairs, MFA

Kauppinen Markku, Department for Development Policy, MFA

Kronman Gunilla, Chair of former Development Policy Committee (CPD)

Kääriäinen Matti, Deputy Director General, Department for Development Policy, MFA

Luostarinen Päivi, Deputy Director General, Department for the Americas and Asia, MFA

Martikainen Ossi, Special Adviser to the Minister for Foreign Trade and Development, MFA

Oksanen Riitta, Unit for General Development Policy and Planning, Department for Development Policy, MFA

Olasvirta Leo, Director, Unit for Non-Governmental Organizations, Department for Development Policy, MFA

Rasi Marjatta, Undersecretary of State, International Development Cooperation and Policy, MFA

Rytkönen Antti, Unit for General Development Policy and Planning, Department for Development Policy, MFA

Saxén Anu, Advisor to the Director General, Department for Africa and Middle East, MFA

Schalin Johan, Director, Unit for Asia and Oceania, Department for Americas and Asia, MFA

Stude Ann-Sofie, Unit for General Development Policy and Planning, Department for Development Policy, MFA

Suvanto Jorma, Director, Unit for Southern Africa, Department for Africa and the Middle East, MFA

Tanner Teemu, Director General, Department for Africa and the Middle East, MFA

Treuthardt Leena, Unit for General Development Policy and Planning, Department for Development Policy, MFA

Vuorinen Anneli, Director General, Department for Global Affairs, MFA

- REPORT 2002:9 Evaluation of the Development Cooperation Activities of Finnish NGOs in Kenya
ISBN 951-724-392-8, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2002:8 Synthesis Study of Eight Country Programme Evaluations
ISBN 951-724-386-3, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2002:7 Review of Finnish Training in Chemical Weapons Verification
ISBN 951-724-378-2, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2002:6 Kansalaisjärjestöjen Kehyssopimusjärjestelmän arviointi
ISBN 951-724-376-6, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2002:5 Evaluation of the Bilateral Development Co-operation Programme between Kenya and Finland
ISBN 951-724-373-1, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2002:4 Evaluation of Bilateral Development Co-operation between Nicaragua and Finland
ISBN 951-724-372-3, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2002:3 Evaluation of the Bilateral Development Co-operation between Ethiopia and Finland
ISBN 951-724-370-7, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2002:2 Evaluation of the Bilateral Development Co-operation between Mozambique and Finland
ISBN 951-724-367-7, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2002:1 Evaluation of the Development Co-operation Programme between Nepal and Finland
ISBN 951-724-368-5, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2001:9 Evaluation of the Bilateral Development Co-operation between Finland and Zambia
ISBN 951-724-365-0, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2001:8 Evaluation of the Bilateral Development Co-operation between Vietnam and Finland
ISBN 951-724-361-8, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2001:7 Evaluation of Diesel Power Plants in Four Countries: Tanzania
ISBN 951-724-356-1, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2001:6 Evaluation of Diesel Power Plants in Four Countries: Peru
ISBN 951-724-355-3, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2001:5 Evaluation of Diesel Power Plants in Four Countries: Nepal
ISBN 951-724-354-5, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2001:4 Evaluation of Diesel Power Plants in Four Countries: Indonesia
ISBN 951-724-353-7, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2001:3 Evaluation of Diesel Power Plants in Four Countries: Summary
ISBN 951-724-352-9, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2001:2 Evaluation of the Development Co-operation Programme between Egypt and Finland
ISBN 951-724-344-8, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2001:1 Finland's Support to Water Supply and Sanitation 1968-2000. Evaluation of Sector Performance
ISBN 951-724-343-X, ISSN 1235-7618
- Blue Series 2000:2 Eight Development Credits for Zimbabwe in 1980-1991
ISBN 951-724-322-7, ISSN 1239-7997
- Blue Series 2000:1 Evaluation of Consultant Trust Funds Affiliated with the International Financial Institutions
ISBN 951-724-321-9, ISSN 1239-7997
- REPORT 2000:1 Country Programming Process: The Namibian-Finnish Experience
ISBN 951-724-306-5, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 1999:8 Evaluation of Finland's Support to the Asian Institute of Technology
ISBN 951-724-295-6, ISSN 1235-7618

Evaluation report 2007:3
ISBN 978-951-724-663-7 (printed)
ISBN 978-951-724-664-4 (pdf)
ISSN 1235-7618

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
Department for Development Policy