

DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

DAC PEER REVIEW REFERENCE GUIDE

This version of the reference guide replaces DCD/DAC(2014)52. It was adopted at the DAC meeting on 9 March 2017, following a peer review methodology meeting in December 2016. It particularly reflects new international agreements and commitments.

This reference guide will be applied starting with the review of Luxembourg in 2017. Experience with applying this revised framework in 2017 will feed in to a review of peer reviews as a tool in the context of the DAC reform process in 2018, with a view to applying changes to the 2019-20 cycle.

Karen Jorgensen, + 33 (0) 1 45 24 94 61, Karen.Jorgensen@oecd.org
Rahul Malhotra, +33 (0)1 45 24 15 07, Rahul.Malhotra@oecd.org

JT03410954

Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

DAC PEER REVIEW REFERENCE GUIDE

A. Background

1. The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD conducts reviews of the development co-operation efforts of each Committee member every five years. The Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD) provides analytical support, and develops and maintains, in close consultation with the Committee, the methodology and analytical framework within which the peer reviews are undertaken.

2. The objectives of DAC peer reviews are to improve the quality and effectiveness of development co-operation policies and systems, and to promote good development partnerships for better impact on poverty reduction and sustainable development in developing countries. DAC peer reviews therefore promote individual and collective behaviour change of DAC members to ensure their development co-operation policy framework and systems are fit for purpose. This is achieved through:

- I. holding DAC members accountable for the commitments they have made, and reviewing their performance against key dimensions of development co-operation and other domestic policies with an impact on developing countries; and
- II. learning from and sharing good practice.

3. DAC peer reviews assess the performance of a given member across government, not just that of its development co-operation ministry or agency, and examine both policy and implementation. They take an integrated, system-wide perspective on the development co-operation and humanitarian assistance activities of the member under review.

B. Purpose of the DAC peer review reference guide

4. The reference guide provides a solid, explicit and transparent analytical framework for reviewing performance of DAC members. In setting components and indicators, it refers to internationally agreed benchmarks¹, DAC good practice papers and guidelines, criteria for the admission of new DAC members and nationally selected commitments, wherever possible. It takes into account the changing development landscape, including recent international commitments (e.g. Busan Outcome Document, 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Addis Ababa Action Agenda, Paris Climate Agreement, Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction and Grand Bargain) and emerging issues (e.g. aid as a catalyst, total official support for sustainable development, resilience).

5. While the reference guide provides benchmarks and conditions that define a good and effective development co-operation actor, there is no “one size fits all” model. Therefore, each peer review is situated in its own context, which is presented at the beginning of the peer review report, and the reference guide applies in a flexible manner. Recommendations are adjusted to each specific situation with the view to support efforts made by the reviewed member to build quality development co-operation and humanitarian assistance policies and systems. The guide is applied bearing in mind the international commitments endorsed by individual members.

6. The two objectives of accountability and learning continue to apply equally to peer reviews.

1. Some of which apply to EU members only.

7. The reference guide should be read in conjunction with the *Information Note on the DAC Peer Review Process* [[DCD\(2013\)6](#)] which describes the review process and the roles and responsibilities of participants.

8. The purpose of the reference guide is, therefore:

- I. to serve as a reference for the preparation of the memorandum preceding a review (see the Guidance on DAC country memorandum [[DCD\(2013\)6/ANN](#)])
- II. to prepare both the examining team and the reviewed member for discussions at headquarters and in the field
- III. to provide a consistent approach to drafting the report, and
- IV. to facilitate the identification of lessons after individual reviews, and thematic or issue synthesis following a series of reviews.

C. Content and structure of the reference guide

9. The reference guide is organised according to seven key dimensions essential for delivering effective development co-operation and humanitarian assistance in various development contexts.



10. The reference guide reflects the changing development landscape and emerging topics, as expressed for example in the 2030 Agenda and the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. These aspects are translated into a focus on:

- commitments made through agreements on the sustainable development goals, financing for development, disaster risk reduction, climate and humanitarian assistance, and aid effectiveness
- a broad range of partnerships and modalities and a comprehensive capture of members' work at global, regional and country levels

- member systems and capabilities, across government, for delivering effective development co-operation

11. The content of the member's own development co-operation policy framework and the extent to which it is delivered remains the starting point to review DAC members' development co-operation policies and systems.

12. For each dimension, a series of components of analysis is proposed with corresponding indicators. Each chapter considers these issues from the perspective of headquarters and the field. Each chapter contains a series of references. Core references refer to those agreements that establish concrete recommendations or commitments. Other references generally refer to standards and good practices, including those emerging from the DAC subsidiary bodies.

13. The peer review process consults a wide variety of stakeholders. The perspective of partner countries will continue to be an important part of the process (in particular for dimensions related to development co-operation delivery, partnerships, results, and development finance). The examining team should bear in mind that information gathered should be cross referenced across these stakeholders to strengthen the evidence base of the review.

14. To understand changes in the system over time, it is important to know what steps have been taken to implement the DAC recommendations from the previous peer review.

15. For practical reasons, the DAC member being reviewed is referred to as the "member".

DAC peer review reference guide

Components of analysis	
Dimension	Components of analysis
1. Global efforts for sustainable development The member has a broad, strategic approach to global sustainable development, encompassing global challenges, policy coherence and awareness raising at home.	1.1. Efforts to support global sustainable development 1.2. Policy coherence for sustainable development 1.3. Global awareness
2. Policy vision and framework Clear political directives, policies and strategies shape the member's development co-operation and are in line with international commitments, including the 2030 Agenda.	2.1. Framework 2.2. Principles and guidance 2.3. Basis for decision-making
3. Financing for development The member's international and national commitments drive its ODA volume and allocations and its other financing efforts to support the 2030 Agenda.	3.1. Overall ODA volume 3.2. Bilateral ODA allocations 3.3. Multilateral ODA allocations 3.4. Financing for development
4. Structure and systems Organisational structures and management systems for development co-operation are fit for purpose, with appropriate capabilities.	4.1. Authority, mandate and co-ordination 4.2. Systems 4.3. Capabilities throughout the system
5. Delivery modalities and partnerships The member's approach to delivering in partner countries and through partnerships is in line with the principles for effective development co-operation.	5.1. Partnering 5.2. Country level engagement
6. Results management, evaluation and learning The member plans and manages for results, in line with the SDGs, building evidence of what works and using evidence to learn and adapt.	6.1. Management for development results 6.2. Evaluation system 6.3. Institutional learning
7. Humanitarian assistance The member contributes to minimising the impact of shocks and crises; and saves lives, alleviates suffering and maintains human dignity in crisis and disaster settings.	7.1. Strategic framework 7.2. Effective programme design 7.3. Effective delivery, partnerships and instruments 7.4. Organisation fit for purpose 7.5. Results, learning and accountability

1. Global efforts for sustainable development

Purpose: This chapter looks at how DAC members are demonstrating global leadership on issues important to developing countries and addressing global public goods and bads. It explores how the member ensures that its domestic policy, global action, and development co-operation objectives are coherent, in line with the 2030 Agenda. As public support is key to political action, it also asks how members are working to raise awareness of global development issues at home.

The member has a broad, strategic approach to global sustainable development, encompassing global challenges, policy coherence and awareness raising at home	
Components of analysis	Indicators
1.1. Efforts to support global sustainable development	
Leadership	The member supports and influences global processes that affect sustainable development and has a strategic approach to addressing global risks.
Support for global agendas and commitments	The member government supports the negotiation, application and monitoring of global frameworks for sustainable development.
Priority issues for global engagement	The member has identified a prioritised set of public goods and challenges that it is well placed to champion at a regional or international level, balancing its own interests with the interests of developing countries. The issues selected are aligned to the goals and processes set out in the 2030 Agenda and may include, inter alia: • International peace and security • Climate, environment and resilience • Financial stability and illicit financial flows • Access to global technology and knowledge • Global health
1.2 Policy coherence for sustainable development	
Commitment to policy coherence for sustainable development	The member is committed to coherent policies and legislation for sustainable development, consistent with international commitments and endorsed at the highest political level.
Priority issues for policy coherence	The member carries out analysis of the coherence between domestic policies and development objectives, using evidence of impact on developing countries (for example, of trade, security, finance, climate change, intellectual property and migration policies). A time-bound plan for addressing and monitoring policy coherence is developed and monitored through cross government mechanisms. The member can demonstrate examples of policy change or enforcement which benefit developing countries.
1.3 Global awareness	
Efforts towards raising global awareness and citizenship at home	The member has a wide-reaching communication, awareness-raising and development education policy directed to its citizens, private sector, local authorities and NGOs. The member promotes whole-of-society contributions to global public goods and sustainable development.

Core references

OECD (2008), "[Ministerial Declaration on Policy Coherence for Development](#)."

"[Recommendation of the Council on Good institutional Practices in Promoting Policy Coherence for Development](#)", OECD Council, 29 April 2010, Paris, France.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (2016), "[Paris Agreement](#)".

United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015), "[Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030](#)".

United Nations (2015), "[Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference Financing for Development](#)".

United Nations (2015), "Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", [A/RES/70/1](#).

United Nations (1992), United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, <https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/conveng.pdf>.

Other references

FATF (2012), "[International Standards on Combating Money Laundering and the Financing of Terrorism & Proliferation](#)".

OECD (2016), *Better Policies for Sustainable Development 2016: A New Framework for Policy Coherence*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2016), *Engaging with the Public: 12 lessons from DAC Peer Reviews and the Network of DAC Development Communicators*.

"[Recommendation of the Council on Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas](#)", OECD Council, 25 May 2011, amended on 17 July 2012, Paris, France.

"[Recommendation of the Council for Further Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions](#)", OECD Council, 26 November 2009, amended on 18 February 2010, Paris, France.

United Nations (1994), United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa, www2.unccd.int/sites/default/files/relevant-links/2017-01/UNCCD_Convention_ENG_0.pdf.

United Nations (1992), "[Convention on Biological Diversity](#)".

References to findings from peer reviews of the member by other OECD policy communities that impact developing countries, and to established OECD standards, as relevant.

2. Policy vision and framework

Purpose: A policy vision and framework for development co-operation articulates what a government is intending to achieve and why in the broader context of external action in support of sustainable development. This chapter examines the principles, priorities and approaches that underpin the development co-operation policy. It assesses the evidence and rationale that guide decisions.

Clear political directives, policies and strategies shape the member's development co-operation and are in line with international commitments, including the 2030 Agenda

Components of analysis	Indicators
2.1. Framework	<i>Clear policy vision aligned with the 2030 Agenda based on member's strengths</i>
Vision	The member has a clear, top-level statement of the purpose of development co-operation, including humanitarian assistance, and where development co-operation sits within the member's political and strategic context. The policy vision serves as an over-arching framework for all development co-operation activities across government and is aligned with the 2030 Agenda.
Scope	The member's policy framework has a focus on sustainability and supporting lasting development results in accordance with global and regional needs, countries most in need and partner country development priorities. The policy statement includes clearly-defined thematic and geographic priorities which draw on the member's strengths.
2.2. Principles and guidance	<i>Policy guidance sets out a clear and comprehensive approach, including to poverty and fragility</i>
Comprehensive approach	Recognising social, economic and environmental aspects of sustainable development, specific policy guidance is provided on issues such as gender equality and women's empowerment, good governance, human rights, resilience, environment and climate change - drawing on international guidance.
Poverty reduction and leaving no-one behind	The member's development co-operation policy sets out a clear approach to poverty reduction and leaving no-one behind, with a particular focus on the poorest, most vulnerable and furthest behind – those who are often the hardest to reach.
Fragility and risk	The policy articulates the member's approach to managing risk and fragility, and investing in peacebuilding and statebuilding, consistent with international commitments to reduce crises, disaster and conflict risks.
2.3. Basis for decision-making	<i>Policy provides sufficient guidance for decisions on channels and engagements</i>
Country, regional and global engagements and public goods	The member presents a clear rationale for deciding when to engage at country, regional, or global levels. These investments are consistent with the member's broader commitment to sustainable development. Funding allocations are guided by evidence and a stated commitment to effective development co-operation principles.
Partnerships approach	The member articulates a clear vision of the role of different actors - national governments, civil society organizations, knowledge institutes, parliaments and business - and presents a rationale to guide partner identification. The member recognises the diversity and complementarity of each actor. The member encourages collaboration between its partners, including through triangular co-operation.

Components of analysis	Indicators
Multilateral co-operation	The member has a multilateral development policy or strategy that is evidence-based and provides a rationale for engaging with the multilateral system and allocating aid to different organisations. Performance assessments of multilateral organisations and potential synergies between multilateral and bilateral assistance are factored into the decision-making process. The member participates in joint efforts to make the multilateral system and its individual multilateral agencies more effective.

Core references

High level forum of aid effectiveness (2011), *Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation*.

"SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (S.A.M.O.A.) Pathway", Outcome of the Third International Conference on Small Island Developing States (SIDS Conference), 4 September 2014, Samoa.

United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015), "Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030"

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (2016), "Paris Agreement".

United Nations (2015), "Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference Financing for Development", adopted at the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, 16 July 2015, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

United Nations (2015), "Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", [A/RES/70/1](#).

Other references

"Declaration on Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Development Co-operation", adopted by Development and Environment Ministers of OECD Member Countries on 4 April 2006, Paris, France.

International Dialogue (2016), "The Stockholm Declaration: Addressing Fragility and Building Peace in a Changing World", Stockholm.

OECD (2016), *Good Development Support in Fragile, At-Risk and Crisis Affected Contexts*. OECD Publishing, Paris

OECD (2016), *Handbook on the OECD-DAC Gender Equality Policy Marker*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2016), *Private Sector Engagement for Sustainable Development: Lessons from the DAC*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2015), *Multilateral Aid 2015: Better Partnerships for a Post-2015 World*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2014), *Mainstreaming Cross-cutting Issues: 7 lessons from DAC Peer Reviews*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2013), *Accountability and Democratic Governance: Orientations and Principles for Development*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2013), *Multilateral Aid Report*. OECD Publishing, Paris. (8 good practice lessons for good multilateral donorship on p. 56 and principles to reduce the proliferation of multilateral channels on p. 61)

OECD (2012), *Partnering with Civil Society: Twelve Lessons from DAC Peer Reviews*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2009), *Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Development Co-operation: Policy Guidance*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2002), *Integrating the Rio Conventions into Development Co-operation*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (1999), "DAC guidelines for gender equality and women's empowerment in development co-operation".

"Recommendation of the Council on Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas", OECD Council, 25 May 2011, amended on 17 July 2012, Paris, France.

"Recommendation of the Council concerning an Environmental Checklist for Possible Use by High-Level Decision-Makers in Bilateral and Multilateral Development Assistance Institutions", OECD Council, 22 February 1989, Paris, France.

"Recommendation of the Council on Measures Required to Facilitate the Environmental Assessment of Development Assistance Projects and Programmes", OECD Council, 23 October 1986, Paris, France.

"Recommendation of the Council on Environmental Assessment of Development Assistance Projects and Programmes," OECD Council, 20 June 1985, Paris, France.

United Nations (2002), "[Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development](#)", adopted at the International Conference on Financing for Development, 22 March 2002, Monterrey, Mexico.

World Bank and OECD (2013), [Integrating Human Rights into Development: Donor Approaches, Experiences, and Challenges](#). 2nd ed., Washington, D.C.

3. Financing for development

Purpose: This chapter looks at the official development assistance (ODA) figures, including the overall level and components of aid, the level of bilateral and multilateral aid, and geographic and sector allocations of bilateral aid. Most members set targets and undertake international commitments for the level of their aid. While national targets sometimes differ from international ones, it is important to examine whether, and how, the DAC member is meeting its own stated goal towards meeting international commitments. In line with the commitments of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, and the emerging total official support for sustainable development concept, this chapter will also look at the efforts that the DAC member is undertaking to mobilise finance additional to ODA for sustainable development.

The member's international and national commitments drive ODA volume and allocations and its other financing efforts to support the 2030 Agenda

Components of analysis	Indicators
3.1. Overall ODA volume	<i>The member makes every effort to meet ODA domestic and international targets</i>
ODA targets	The member has a clear statement of the ODA levels that it wants to achieve (total ODA, ODA/GNI, ODA to specific regions, country income groups, sectors or objectives). The statement is in line with the international commitments it has endorsed.
ODA trends and plans to meet targets	The actual volume of ODA reflects the statement of intent. Member has a clearly defined plan and timeline to meet its targets, and regularly evaluates its overall performance.
ODA reporting and forward looking information	The member complies with all DAC Recommendations on aid, and its statistical reports are in conformity with ODA rules. The member regularly provides three- to five-year indicative forward expenditure to its partner countries on a rolling basis and/or implementation plans, as committed in Busan.
3.2. Bilateral ODA allocations	<i>Aid is allocated according to the statement of intent and international commitments</i>
Geographic allocations	The member's policy commitments and strategic priorities, including on countries most in need (such as least developed countries, low-income countries, small island developing states, land-locked developing countries and fragile and conflict-affected states), are reflected in geographic allocations. The member promotes effective division of labour, based on an assessment of its comparative advantages.
Thematic allocations	The member's policy and thematic priorities (including cross cutting issues, fragility, disaster risk reduction and humanitarian) are reflected in sector allocations at partner country level and globally. These take into account partner countries' priorities, other partners' involvement, and the need for sector concentration based on actors' comparative advantages.
3.3. Multilateral ODA allocations	<i>The member uses the multilateral aid channel effectively</i>
Multilateral allocations	The member allocates multilateral aid in accordance with its goals and strategy, and good practice principles.
3.4. Financing for development	<i>The member promotes and catalyses development finance additional to ODA</i>
Financing for development	In line with the Addis Ababa Agenda for Action, the member effectively uses an array of official instruments (financial and non-financial) to support resource flows – including domestic resource mobilisation - that promote sustainable development.

Components of analysis	Indicators
ODA as a catalyst	The member promotes the role of aid as a catalyst to bring private investment to support development efforts in partner countries (e.g. help improve the enabling environment or support partnerships).
Tracking and reporting beyond ODA flows	The member tracks the totality of its official resource flows to promote sustainable development, regardless of whether these are reportable as ODA and makes this information available to all key stakeholders. It reports transparently on the leveraging effect and additionality of its official instruments.

Core references

High level forum of aid effectiveness (2011), *Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation*.

"[Istanbul Declaration: Renewed and strengthened global partnership for the development of least developed countries](#)", Outcome of the Fourth United Nations Conference of the Least Developed Countries, 13 May 2011, Istanbul, Turkey.

OECD (2014, 2016), "[OECD DAC High Level Meeting Communiqué](#)."

OECD (2011), "[Revision to the 1995 Aide Memoire on the Accession of new DAC members and full participants \(in Annex 1\)](#)."

"[Recommendation on Terms and Conditions of Aid](#)," OECD Council, 28 February 1978, Paris, France.

"[SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action \(S.A.M.O.A.\) Pathway](#)", Outcome of the Third International Conference on Small Island Developing States (SIDS Conference), 4 September 2014, Samoa.

United Nations (2015), "[Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference Financing for Development](#)", adopted at the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, 16 July 2015, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Other references

European Union (2015), *Annual Report 2015 to the European Council on EU Development Aid Targets*. Council of the European Union Conclusions.

OECD (forthcoming, 2017), "Clarifications of DAC reporting directives on in-donor refugee costs" (Working Title)

OECD (forthcoming, 2017), "Guidance and good practice: Comprehensive Programming in complex contexts of forced displacement", (Working Title)

OECD (2016), "[Annual Survey on Donors' Forward Spending Plans](#)", OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2016), *DAC Aggregates and Creditor Reporting System*.

OECD (2016), *Private Sector Engagement for Sustainable Development: Lessons from the DAC*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2015), *Multilateral Aid 2015: Better Partnerships for a Post-2015 World*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2013), *Multilateral Aid Report*. OECD Publishing, Paris. (8 good practice lessons for good multilateral donorship on p. 56 and principles to reduce the proliferation of multilateral channels on p. 61)

United Nations (2002), "[Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development](#)", adopted at the International Conference on Financing for Development, 22 March 2002, Monterrey, Mexico.

4. Structure and systems

Purpose: This chapter looks at whether the member's institutional arrangements support its objectives for development co-operation. It focuses on the system as a whole and assesses whether the member has the necessary capabilities in place to deliver its development co-operation effectively in support of sustainable development.

Organisational structures and management systems for development co-operation are fit for purpose, with appropriate capabilities

Components of analysis	Indicators
4.1. Authority, mandate and co-ordination <i>Responsibility for development co-operation is clearly defined, with the capacity to make a positive contribution to sustainable development outcomes</i>	
Authority and leadership	The member has a clear understanding of where leadership, responsibility and accountability for development co-operation sits in a whole of government context.
Co-ordination	The development co-operation system is well co-ordinated and led with clear, complementary mandates, as part of a whole-of-government approach – at headquarters and in partner countries, including fragile states.
4.2. Systems <i>The member has clear and relevant processes and mechanisms in place</i>	
Policy/programme approval mechanism	The member has clear and transparent processes and procedures in place to make decisions on programming, policies and partnerships.
Quality assurance	The member has systems to assure the quality of its development co-operation, including in relation to cross-cutting issues.
Transparency	The member has systems to provide adequate and timely information on its development co-operation programme and accountability for results, in line with its transparency commitments. The member consults relevant stakeholders on its policies and programmes.
Procurement, contracting and agreement-making	Systems for procurement, contracting and agreement-making support the member to implement its policies and commitments in a fair and efficient way. This includes reviewing the delegation of financial and programming authority.
Risk management	The member has adequate and relevant systems and processes in place to assess and adapt to risk (strategic, reputational, programming, security). Analysis of risks and opportunities informs control and due diligence mechanisms, including those relating to implementing the OECD recommendation for development co-operation actors on managing risks of corruption.
Innovation and adaptation	The leadership and internal system provide incentives to innovate and to adapt to changes in the development landscape.
4.3. Capabilities throughout the system <i>The member has appropriate skills and knowledge to manage and deliver its development co-operation, and ensures these are located in the right places.</i>	
Staffing levels, composition and location	The member ensures that its system as a whole has appropriate staff levels and capacity to deliver on its objectives, and that these are in the right locations. Depending on the member's development co-operation objectives, this includes capacity for: • Informed, responsive and flexible field presence in significant partner countries • Knowledgeable and influential engagement with multilateral organisations, the private sector, NGOs and knowledge institutions

Components of analysis	Indicators
	• Engagement with the member's other government agencies and other national actors, where relevant, in order to draw out expertise for the benefit of partner countries • Engagement with other development agencies to support learning, co-ordination and understanding of complementarities • Delivery against thematic and cross cutting objectives
Human resources	The member has human resources systems in place to support induction, retention of, and skills development for development co-operation staff, including for locally recruited staff. Staff receive specific training and incentives to be based in fragile or crisis contexts.

Core references

High level forum of aid effectiveness (2011), "[Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation](#)."

OECD (2009), *Better Aid: Managing Aid – Practices of DAC Member countries*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

"[Recommendation of the Council for Development Co-operation Actors on Managing the Risk of Corruption](#)", OECD Council, 16 November 2016, Paris, France.

Other references

International Aid Transparency Initiative (2015), *IATI Annual Report*.

OECD (2015), "[Human Resource Management in States affected by Fragility and Conflict](#)", OECD Development Policy Papers, No. 2, OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2012), "[Managing Risks in Fragile and Transitional Contexts: The Price of Success?](#)" OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2011), *Revision to the 1995 Aide Memoire on the Accession of new DAC members and full participants (in Annex 1)*.

OECD/UNDP (2016), "[Overview of the 2016 Global Partnership monitoring round](#)", in *Making Development Co-operation More Effective: 2016 Progress Report*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

5. Delivery modalities and partnerships, globally, regionally and at country-level

Purpose: This chapter looks at the principles which guide a member's partnership approach across its development portfolio and how it uses its financial, diplomatic and technical resources in partner countries. The approach and principles demonstrated should be consistent with the member's development co-operation policy and international commitments on development effectiveness agreed in Busan in 2011 (ownership, a focus on results, partnerships, and transparency and shared responsibility) and progressed through the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation and the New Deal for Engagement on Fragile States.

The member's approach to delivering in partner countries and through partnerships is in line with the principles for effective development co-operation

Components of analysis	Indicators
5.1. Partnering	<i>The member's approach to partnerships for development co-operation with a range of actors (national and local government, UN agencies, development banks, CSOs, foundations, knowledge institutions, media, private sector)</i>
Relevance to development needs	The member's partnerships are relevant to global, regional or country-level sustainable development needs, recognising links with other complementary policies, initiatives and processes.
Predictability and flexibility in programming and budgeting	The budgeting and approval process allows for multi-year predictability, while keeping some flexibility. Programming processes, including in fragile states, allow adequate flexibility to respond to changing contexts. Transaction costs are minimised and monitoring focuses on results, balancing financial accountability and learning.
Joint approaches	The member prioritises programme-based approaches and joint programming, can participate in delegated co-operation mechanisms, and seeks harmonisation when in multi-stakeholder partnership
Accountability and transparency	Its funding is clear and transparent and enables engagement with a wide range of partners, whilst delivering value for money for the taxpayer.
Tied aid	The member meets the DAC Recommendation on untying aid, and accelerates its efforts to untie aid to the maximum extent.
5.2. Country level engagement	<i>The member's engagement in partner countries is consistent with its domestic and international commitments, including those specific to fragile states.</i>
Mutual accountability and ownership	The member applies the principles of ownership and mutual accountability in all its work at country level. All support funded through the member's ODA reaching each partner country is tracked and information is made available to the partner government, parliament and civil society. The member promotes and uses country-led co-ordination arrangements to deliver more harmonised and aligned aid.
Effectiveness	The member demonstrates application of the principles of development effectiveness agreed at international level – including predictability, use of country systems and the New Deal. The member's performance in the Global Partnership monitoring exercise is improving over time.
Responsiveness and inclusiveness	Member's programming is based on context analysis and understanding, including crisis sensitivity in fragile states. The member has an appropriate mix of aid delivery instruments and partners so that it can adjust to partner countries' needs and capacity. The member supports

Components of analysis	Indicators
	locally-led change, including at sub national and local levels. The member uses participatory processes and institutions that ensure all relevant stakeholders can contribute to decision-making, in particular marginalised groups and individuals.
Conditionality	The member is transparent about conditions (publicly available). Conditions are used strategically to improve development outcomes and are agreed with the partner country, based on its national development strategy.

Core references

"DAC Recommendation on Untying Official Development Assistance (ODA) to Least Developed Countries and Heavily Indebted Poor Countries", OECD Council, 25 April 2001, last amended on 21 July 2014, Paris, France.

Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (2016), "[Nairobi Outcome Document](#)."

High level forum of aid effectiveness (2011), "[Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation](#)."

International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (2011) "[A new deal for engagement in fragile states](#)."

Stockholm declaration (2016), "Addressing fragility and building peace in a changing world"

Other references

Mexico High-Level Meeting Communique (2014), "[First High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation: Building Towards an Inclusive Post-2015 Development Agenda](#)."

OECD (2016), [Good Development Support in Fragile, At-Risk and Crisis Affected Contexts](#). OECD Publishing, Paris

OECD (2016), [Private Sector Engagement for Sustainable Development: Lessons from the DAC](#), OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2014), *Development Assistance and Approaches to Risk in Fragile and Conflict Affected States* OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2013), "Risk and resilience, from good idea to good practice" OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2012), [International Support to Post-Conflict Transition: Rethinking Policy, Changing Practice](#). OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2012), [Partnering with Civil Society: Twelve Lessons from DAC Peer Reviews](#), OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2009), "International Good Practice Principles for Country-led Division of Labour and Complementarity", Working Party on Aid Effectiveness, OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD/UNDP (2016), [Making Development Co-operation More Effective: 2016 Progress Report](#). OECD Publishing, Paris.

6. Results, evaluation and learning

Purpose: This chapter looks at how DAC members focus on results and use of results and evaluation for decision-making, accountability and learning, while assisting its partner countries to manage for development results.

The member plans and manages for results, building evidence of what works and using evidence to learn and adapt

Components of analysis	Indicators
6.1. Management for development results <i>A results-based management system is being applied</i>	
Results oriented policies and strategies	The member states the objectives of its development co-operation policies and programmes in terms that can be measured and makes explicit reference to the achievement of development results with a clearly articulated chain of expected results from activities to impacts. These objectives are consistent with internationally agreed goals, including the SDGs, and align with the objectives of its partner countries for sustainable development.
Approach to results measurement	The monitoring system provides quality and disaggregated information on overarching goals, along the results chain, from output to impact. It draws both on qualitative and quantitative information, including from evaluations, and on partner countries' own data, systems and results frameworks, minimising where possible the introduction of additional indicators, separate data collection and parallel reporting requirements.
Use of results information	The member's measurement of sustainable development results provides information that is used for learning and improving programme management, and for communicating transparently and credibly about the results of aid. The member's planning, budgeting and monitoring processes support this focus on results. Headquarters and field staff have the capacity, tools and incentives to use results information.
6.2. Evaluation system <i>The evaluation system is in line with the DAC evaluation principles</i>	
Evaluation policy and evaluation function	An evaluation policy is in place with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. There is an evaluation function with sufficient expertise to ensure quality in the evaluation process.
Independence of evaluations	The evaluation process is impartial and independent from the process concerned with policy-making and the delivery of development assistance.
Planning and budgeting for the evaluation of development assistance activities	An overall plan and a dedicated budget for the evaluation of development assistance activities is in place to ensure coverage and strategic selection of topics with appropriate evaluation types used to meet different needs (e.g. project and programme evaluations, thematic and policy evaluations, impact evaluations, and corporate evaluations). The evaluation plan is, inter alia, informed by a need-to-know.
Evaluation partnerships and strengthening capacity	The member completes evaluations in partnership with aid recipients and other development partners, and promotes capacity development and partner country-led efforts in this area.
6.3. Institutional learning <i>Evaluations and appropriate knowledge management systems are used as management tools</i>	
Learning from and using evaluation findings	There is systematic and transparent dissemination of evaluation results and lessons. The member has evaluation feedback mechanisms in place. These involve all parties concerned and link to the overall programme management and accountability systems to ensure follow up on recommendations, use of findings and learning from evaluation.

Components of analysis	Indicators
Knowledge management	The member has a knowledge management system and uses it as a forward-looking management tool, building on results and evidence (including research whenever possible) for learning and analysis. The member learns from both failure and success. The member effectively communicates what it has achieved and learnt.

Core references

High level forum of aid effectiveness (2011), "[Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation](#)."

OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation (2010), [Evaluating development co-operation – Summary of key norms and standards](#). OECD Publishing, Paris.

Other references

Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (2016), "[Nairobi Outcome Document](#)."

OECD (2016), [Evaluation Systems in Development Co-operation: 2016 Review](#). OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2014), [Measuring and managing results in development co-operation](#). OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2012), [Evaluating Peacebuilding Activities in Settings of Conflict and Fragility: Improving Learning for Results](#). OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD/UNDP (2016), [Making Development Co-operation More Effective: 2016 Progress Report](#). OECD Publishing, Paris.

7. Humanitarian assistance

Purpose: This chapter looks at efforts made by members to fulfil the Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship (GHD), endorsed by 42 donors, including all members of the DAC. The 2016 World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) reflected on the growing links between development, security and humanitarian assistance in crisis response. The chapter takes into consideration the outcomes of the WHS, including the relevant provision of the Grand Bargain (GB). The objectives of humanitarian action, as set out in the GHD principles are to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity during and in the aftermath of man-made crises and natural disasters, as well as to prevent and strengthen preparedness for the occurrence of such situation

The member contributes to minimising the impact of shocks and crises; and saves lives, alleviates suffering and maintains human dignity in crisis and disaster settings

Components of analysis	Indicators
7.1. Strategic framework	<i>Clear political directives and strategies for resilience, response and recovery</i>
Humanitarian policy and strategic framework	The member has cross-government policy for humanitarian assistance, respecting the GHD principles and other international agreements. This policy is anchored in relevant legislation and accompanied by a realistic implementation plan.
Coherence between humanitarian aid and development co-operation in crisis contexts	The member's strategic orientations, practices, programmes and timeframes support alignment of humanitarian and development planning tools when relevant. This includes providing for resilience building objectives for the most vulnerable in fragile states or protracted crisis situations.
Overall humanitarian budget and trends	The member provides the financial resources to match its strategic objectives in humanitarian assistance programming.
7.2. Effective programme design	<i>Programmes target the highest risk to life and livelihood</i>
Criteria for who, what and where to fund	The member bases its humanitarian funding on an objective determination of the severity of each crisis, taking into account the capacity of potential partners to address needs and deliver results (ie. early warnings leading to early action). Decision-making processes and criteria are transparent, and match the priorities set out in the humanitarian strategy.
Approach towards localising the response and affected communities participation	The member supports the multi-year investment in the institutional capacities of local and national responders, including disaster preparedness, response and co-ordination capacities. In doing so, the member uses funding tools which increase and improve assistance delivered by local and national responders and enable community engagement
7.3. Effective delivery, partnerships and instruments	<i>Delivery modalities and partnerships help deliver quality assistance</i>
Tools available for protracted crises and recovery	The member has an appropriate and flexible mix of instruments, including development funding, to save lives, support community recovery and resilience building, and respond to residual humanitarian needs in recovery contexts. This includes multi-year funding instruments and ensuring, where relevant, that recipients have consistent funding arrangements with their partners, with increased consideration of cash-based programming as a core instrument. The member works to reduce earmarking of humanitarian contributions.
Rapid response tools and mechanisms	The member has relevant mechanisms for rapid crisis response, including early warning and participatory mechanisms, emergency preparedness and civil protection.

Components of analysis	Indicators
Partnerships with the humanitarian community	The member improves the predictability, timeliness and flexibility of humanitarian funding. It simplifies administrative process for partners and harmonises the quality of reporting. Partnership with the humanitarian community includes regular dialogue and feedback mechanisms.
Co-ordination with other donors, UN and local systems	The member co-ordinates with other donors on policy issues. Responses are also co-ordinated through investing and participating in information sharing, undertaking joint analysis and ensuring that the long-term development vision is taken into consideration.. Co-ordination also takes place with the UN system and with national and local systems as relevant, with humanitarian principles maintained.
7.4. Organisation fit for purpose <i>Systems, structures, processes and people work together effectively and efficiently</i>	
Co-ordination across government	The member has a functioning whole-of-government mechanism to ensure coherence between humanitarian, development and security actors, as well as with other arms of government tasked with preventing or reducing crisis risk, with identification of a clear lead entity.
Approach to civil-military co-ordination	The member has a cross-government civil-military policy guiding the use of military, law enforcement and civil defence assets in sudden onset and protracted crises. Member works to increase awareness of humanitarian principles amongst key military and law-enforcement personnel.
Humanitarian staff and systems	The member has sufficient skilled staff in headquarters and in the field to cope with workload expectations throughout the programme cycle. The member provides staff with training on how to work effectively in fragile and crisis-affected situations, and provides capacity for monitoring programme implementation and results.
7.5. Results, learning and accountability <i>Results are measured and communicated, and lessons learnt</i>	
Monitoring own performance and the impact of programmes	The member monitors and reports on its objectives and strategies. The member has tools to monitor partner progress and the impact of programmes (joint monitoring where relevant) and can accept common standard data for some reporting purposes.
Communicating results	The member communicates objectives and results to major stakeholders (including taxpayers, lawmakers, partners and affected communities). The member publishes timely, transparent, harmonised and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding.

Core references

GHD (2003), "[Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship](#)", endorsed in Stockholm, 17 June 2003.

The Grand Bargain (2016), "[The Grand Bargain: a shared commitment to better serve people in need](#)", Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit, 23 May 2016, Istanbul.

Other references

Inter-Agency Standing Committee (2008), "[Civil-Military Guidelines and Reference for Complex Emergencies](#)" (2008),

OECD (2016), *Good Development Support in Fragile, At-Risk and Crisis Affected Contexts*. OECD Publishing, Paris

OECD (2012), *Towards Better Humanitarian Donorship: 12 lessons from DAC Peer Reviews*. OECD Publishing, Paris

OECD (2010), *Monitoring the Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations: Global Report*, OECD Publishing, Paris.