

Unclassified

DCD/DAC(2010)17/ADD

Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques  
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

26-Mar-2010

English - Or. English

DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE  
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

DCD/DAC(2010)17/ADD  
Unclassified

**MID-TERM REVIEWS : FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM REVIEWED MEMBERS**

**Addendum to Mid-Term Reviews : Lessons from the 2009 Pilot and Next Steps dated 17 March 2010.**

**DAC Meeting, 30 March 2010**

*This document presents the feedback on mid-term reviews received from Canada, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom and is submitted for DECISION under Item 2 of the Draft Agenda [DCD/DAC/A(2010)6].*

Contact: Chantal Verger - Tel. 33 (0)1 45 24 15 11 - Email: [chantal.verger@oecd.org](mailto:chantal.verger@oecd.org).

**JT03280855**

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine  
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

English - Or. English

**MID-TERM REVIEWS - FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM REVIEWED MEMBERS**

**ADDENDUM TO  
MID-TERM REVIEWS : LESSONS FROM THE 2009 PILOT AND NEXT STEPS  
(DCD/DAC(2010)17)**

<b>Canada</b>
---------------

***1. Results and benefits***

Although the mid-term review is a lighter, much lower profile process than the full DAC peer review, CIDA considers this report card to be important and very timely given new policy directions and organizational changes within the Agency.

The mid-term review process provided Canada with opportunities to reflect upon and highlight the substantial policy developments that have occurred since the full 2007 DAC peer review, and to demonstrate how focus, efficiency and accountability are central to increasing the effectiveness of our international assistance. The mid-term review process promoted continued communication and knowledge exchange between Canada and the DAC Secretariat. It also provided an important opportunity to document and share within the Agency, and with other government departments, the progress achieved to date, and to highlight areas that require further attention.

The outcome letter from the DAC review team serves as a useful benchmark of progress against the recommendations from the 2007 review.

The letter is useful as a tool for informing decision-makers moving forward, as it identifies several areas that remain to be addressed.

The overall key messages in the DAC letter were useful in communications to the Canadian public and Parliament. It also contributed to promoting a common understanding amongst the staff of the Agency and other government departments of the status of Canada's progress according to the DAC as an external examiner.

***2. Work involved***

The work involved to prepare for the mid-term review was two-fold: interdepartmental consultation for preparing the memorandum and table of progress; and logistics for the one-day meeting. Given the one day meeting for the review, this required that appropriate senior level representatives (from across CIDA and other government departments) were identified and invited to participate. Internal follow-up communications were also completed following the review in order to widely communicate the results and feedback on our mid-term progress.

**Recommendation:** Based on our experience, Canada recommends that the DAC formalize the mid-term peer review process.

<b>Netherlands</b>
--------------------

**1. Results and benefits**

For the Netherlands the Mid-Term Review was an excellent opportunity to take stock of the implementation status of the recommendations of the 2006 Peer Review, and to get a structured overview of the areas of progress and the challenges ahead. It provided us with the opportunity to discuss features of Dutch Development Co-operation Programme, introduced by the 2007 policy framework "Our Common Concern". Particularly working with country-profiles, moving forward with division of labour and sector reduction and the emphasis on the political economy of development were discussed with the team. The positive feedback received on progress made in the implementation of the 14 DAC recommendations was well appreciated. Furthermore, the review provided a good opportunity to discuss and assess the impact of the global economic crisis and recession on Dutch ODA as well as measures to broaden the strong and well-informed support base for development co-operation in the face of increasing media criticism and pressure for results and accountability. The framework of the meetings - common discussions at the ministerial and senior level on the broad developments and split sessions in the afternoon in order to at the same time address a larger audience and deepen the discussions on technical implementation aspects - worked very well.

**2. Work involved**

The preparation of the matrix and the narrative turned out to be quite a time-consuming process. Three full-time person-weeks were spent on that part of the preparation process. The meetings with the NGO's and parliamentarians could be prepared efficiently by phone and e-mail. For the meeting with the private sector one preparatory meeting with the Dutch employers' organization VNO/NCW was necessary. The meetings with the Minister for Development Cooperation and the Director-General for International Cooperation were prepared in writing. The total amount of time spent by the ministry to prepare the Mid Term Review added up to approximately 4 full time weeks.

<b>United Kingdom</b>
-----------------------

**1. Results and benefits**

The review was helpful in ensuring that focus remained on the priority areas identified in the review. This had benefits internally in leveraging change and externally in maintaining support for DFID's change agenda. Our only slight concern was that due to timing issues (which will sort themselves out once the system becomes established) it was not really "mid-term". This will become more important in future as the period between full reviews increases.

**2. Work involved**

The MTR produced little additional burden on the organisation, the matrix required was largely populated from parallel reporting processes that we use internally - a good sign. One day for the visit appeared to work well to cover the main aspects of the review team agenda again reducing the burden. We would be happy to support in fact an annual paper exercise to update progress against recommendations, to ensure continued momentum over a four or more year interim period.