

**DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE**

DAC Network on Development Evaluation

**Draft Summary Record: 22nd meeting of the DAC Network on Development
Evaluation**

28-29 June 2018, OECD Conference Centre, Paris

The draft summary record of the 22nd meeting has been circulated to members for comments and is submitted for approval at the next meeting of the DAC Evaluation Network, scheduled for 27-28 February 2019.

Hans LUNDGREN, hans.lundgren@oecd.org, + (33-1) 45 24 90 59
Kim BARBA FRANCKEN, kim.barbafrancken@oecd.org + (33-1)85 55 60 31

JT03436660

Summary Record: 22nd meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation

Thursday 28 June 2018

ITEM 1. OPENING SESSION

1. The Network Chair, Per Øyvind Bastøe (Norway), opened the meeting by welcoming members and invited new participants to introduce themselves. The draft agenda was adopted and members approved the summary record of the 21st Network meeting.

ITEM 2. FUTURE STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS OF THE DAC – WITH THE DAC CHAIR

2. The Network Chair, noted the importance of the current moment for the DAC, with its renewed mandate, and the need for close interaction between the DAC and its networks. He invited the DAC Chair, Charlotte Petri Gornitzka, to present the new mandate and vision and how she saw EvalNet engaging.

3. The DAC Chair stressed that the new mandate shows a very clear and new direction. It is building on DAC's core competences with the overall framework being the SDGs and the financing for the SDGs. This implies a different way of working with more engagement and broader partnerships. She shared core elements of the new mandate: a stronger focus on impact, more work on development finance and, increased outreach out to actors beyond the membership. She underlined the importance of EvalNet and encouraged the members to use evaluation knowledge to inform the implementation of the new agenda and to improve evaluation practices with a focus on impact and results.

4. During the discussion, members emphasised the role of the Network for peer learning and exchange and the need to better leverage the knowledge from evaluation into policy decisions. The importance of finding a balance between professional networking and informing the current policy agenda was noted. It was highlighted that the Network has been responsive to important policy challenges, such as providing lessons from evaluations in "Responding to refugee crises in developing countries" and following up on the High Level Meeting encouragement to explore the adaptation of the DAC Evaluation Criteria. Hans Lundgren (OECD) outlined the mandate renewal process for the network to members and informed them that, following the meeting, a draft version would be circulated for feedback prior to submitting it to the DAC.

ITEM 3. FOCUS SESSION: LEARNING AND USE OF EVALUATION

5. Melissa Patsalides (USAID) provided a brief summary of the changes that USAID has introduced to improve the uptake of learning from evaluations. She highlighted some of the main findings of recent studies, as well as challenges they had to face, such as poor dissemination, no clear post-evaluation processes or tracking, and the fact that recommendations from external evaluators were not always actionable. USAID updated its policy in September 2016. Among the main policy changes were the inclusion of a dissemination strategy during the evaluation planning, a mandatory post evaluation action plan, and external evaluators are no longer required to provide recommendations. In addition to the policy changes, various tools were introduced to help staff such as: a post evaluation action plan, an evaluation statement of work (TOR) template, a broader set of possible deliverables beyond the report, and co-creation of recommendations to move from findings to action.

6. David Heath (Canada) presented Canada's approach to learning and the use of evaluation under the principle "If you want to reach more, target fewer". The presentation revolved around the importance of building the foundation for learning, and a demand-driven approach with a focus on fully meeting the needs of a few key users. Canada is implementing a learning strategy involving information sharing and explicit conversations about how evaluations will inform upcoming policy questions or address persistent programming problems. It also includes the use of Slidedocs for all evaluation products. The evaluation unit is also actively building key relationships with decision makers.

7. Bridget Dillon (DFID, UK) shared insights on how DFID strives to increase the use of evaluations and learning. She highlighted the challenges and constraints in DFID's decentralised evaluation system. Based on a review of a sample of evaluations, key factors affecting the use of evaluation reports were found to be: timing, external factors, stakeholder agreement, credibility and quality, and other process factors mainly related to accessibility. She mentioned several flagship programmes such as the Global Learning and Adaptive Management programme (GLAM), in partnership with USA; nimble RCTs; and the Centre of Excellence for Developing Impacts and Learning (CEDIL). She outlined the progress so far and some learning practices such as targeted seminars, "learning journeys", and face-to-face peer reviews.

8. Ingrid Van Aalst (New Zealand) described the recent trends in New Zealand's bilateral aid and noted that although progress has been made, evidence generated by evaluations is not used enough. Evidence-based learning is embedded from the start through the TOR and a dissemination plan, and learning opportunities are considered throughout the evaluation process using a range of products and dissemination activities. The evaluation report is being re-designed with the end user in mind and a new unit has been created: Insights, Monitoring and Evaluation, which has an integrated approach to the use of evidence.

9. During the discussion, members stressed that the active involvement of stakeholders from the beginning, and that "selling" the value of evaluation are key to ensure the success of evaluation. It was generally agreed that further efforts are needed, including tailored dissemination and shortening of evaluation reports.

10. Participants commented on the challenge of finding a balance between accountability and learning and on how evaluation can contribute to decision making processes on the policy and political level. It was stressed that personal interactions and meeting the different information needs of people are key to helping them engage with evaluation. The use of learning during the evaluation process was also highlighted.

11. Chantal Verger (OECD) introduced the work of the DAC Results community, which includes bi-annual workshops and analytical studies. The results team is currently reviewing evaluations on results-based management systems, with a view to developing guiding principles based on experience and evidence. The results team welcomes further reports and input from members. A Results workshop and an in-depth seminar will be held on 29-30 October.

12. The discussion on learning and use was continued in the beehive session.

Members are invited to send relevant evaluations or reviews on RBM systems to Chantal.VERGER@oecd.org and interested members are welcome to participate in the Results workshop and in-depth seminar to be held on 29-30 October 2018.

ITEM 4. DAC EVALUATION CRITERIA

13. Hans Lundgren (OECD) outlined progress since the 21st EvalNet meeting when a first discussion on exploring the adaptation of the criteria was held. Steps taken so far include: the recruitment of Julia Betts as consultant to support the work; the Network workshop in March, to which both members and external experts were invited to progress the dialogue; discussions on the criteria in various fora, including with ECG and UNEG; the launch of the member survey; preparations for the launch of the joint website with IEG; and the development of the stakeholder survey.

14. Julia Betts (consultant) presented preliminary findings from the member's survey and invited members who had not yet filled it in to do so. So far, responses seemed to be overall in line with the discussions at the March workshop. In terms of implementation experience, the criteria identified as most satisfactory by members were relevance and effectiveness, and the least satisfactory were impact and sustainability. In terms of definitions, the criteria identified as most adequate were effectiveness and efficiency, whilst there were mixed opinions regarding relevance, impact and sustainability. Although more responses may come in, results so far seem to indicate that most respondents are looking for a remodelling of what is currently in place, as well as clearer guidance.

15. Caroline Heider (IEG, World Bank) launched the Stakeholder Consultation website and the launch video was screened. The consultation is co-sponsored by EvalNet, UNEG, IDEAS, and IEG. In this broader consultation, evaluation professionals are encouraged to share their views and experiences and to take the survey. An active twitter campaign supported the launch at the meeting. Caroline pointed out that this consultation will be very important for learning about what evaluators beyond the Network think and encouraged members to get actively involved in further discussions to help reach out to stakeholders.

16. Members pointed out that the DAC evaluation criteria are widely used beyond the membership of the DAC and that many evaluations would be impacted by changes to the existing criteria. In the discussion, certain challenges in applying the criteria to evaluations at the policy level were mentioned, while it was also emphasized that the DAC criteria should not be applied mechanistically.

17. The Chair concluded the discussion, noting the importance of raising awareness of the ongoing consultation process. He also encouraged the Network to be open to listening to the different experiences and views from evaluators beyond the Network.

18. A follow-up discussion on the DAC Evaluation Criteria took place in the beehive session.

Following the closure of the members' survey on 6 July, the broader stakeholder consultation will be open until 31 October 2018. Based on an analysis of the results of the various consultation processes, a draft version of the criteria will be shared for comments ahead of the next meeting of the Network.

ITEM 5. DISABILITY INCLUSION/LEAVE NO ONE BEHIND

19. The session was opened with a presentation by Jan Pettersson (EBA, Sweden) of the report “Do anti-discrimination measures reduce poverty among marginalised social groups?”. The study covers people with disabilities and several marginalised groups, and focuses on the political arena, education and labour markets. Scarce evidence related to the inclusion of people with disabilities was found in the report. He remarked that discrimination is multidimensional and that there is competition within and between marginalised groups. Consequently, it was suggested that a study addressing the distributional effects within groups should be carried out.

20. Arild Hauge (UNDP) shared insights from the report “Disability-inclusive development at UNDP”. The four key principles of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) are core to UNDP’s strategy: non-discrimination, participation and inclusion, accessibility and accountability. UNDP has been innovative in promoting multi-sectoral interventions in support of CRPD, but a more focused attention is required to achieve the principle “leave no one behind”. The study also found that that UNDP has taken some positive steps to create an enabling work environment, but more needs to be done to establish an internal culture that welcomes people with disabilities.

21. Leo Carroll (Australia) presented Australia’s recent evaluations on disability inclusion. He highlighted the importance of actively involving people with disabilities. Disability inclusion is central to SDGs 4, 8, 10, 11 and 17 and it is a priority for Australia’s aid programme. In 2017, DFAT released an evaluation of Australia’s global advocacy work on disability inclusion. The report found that Australian advocacy has been effective but advocacy and partnerships need to be sustained. The Australian aid programme is currently completing a related evaluation report which will assess the disability-inclusiveness of individual aid investments and consider what factors enable and improve disability inclusion.

22. The Evaluation of the BMZ Action Plan for the Inclusion of persons with disabilities was presented by Lena Ahrens (DEVAL, Germany). The study found that the action plan provided a boost and sent a signal regarding disability inclusion in German development co-operation. However, the overall goal of systematic disability mainstreaming in German development cooperation was achieved only to a very low degree and the allocation of personal and financial resources was not adequate. Several recommendations were made, including for mainstreaming across divisions in BMZ, making additional funds available, and setting principles for co-operation and actions to promote inclusion.

23. During the discussion, members emphasised the importance of involving people with disabilities in evaluation work. Laura Aghilarre (Italy) expressed interest in the work of the WP-Stat, which introduced a policy marker in CRS to track the development finance that promotes the inclusion of people with disabilities. Danielle Dunne (DFID, UK) informed that DFID has commissioned scoping reports on disability inclusive evaluations and systems and is finalising an evidence map on what works for people with disabilities in middle income countries. Cvetina Yocheva (ICAI, UK) informed members of the recently published review “DFID’s approach to disability in development” and noted that mainstreaming is a challenge for programming. The discussion highlighted policy and institutional aspects, as well as factors influencing success on both the project and programme level.

24. An overview of the DCD development co-operation report was presented by Ida McDonnell (OECD). This year it will focus on “Leave no one behind”. She stressed the need to have a holistic approach to include various dimensions. People with disabilities are increasingly a target group for development. She invited members to provide evaluation studies or case studies that could inform the report.

ITEM 6. BEEHIVE BREAKOUT SECTION

25. Members of the Network were divided into four smaller groups for discussions on thematic issues. The themes chosen by the members for the beehive discussions were: 1) Environment and climate change, 2) Continued discussion on the DAC Evaluation criteria, 3) Leveraging the private sector, and 4) Continued discussion on Learning. Guiding questions discussed the challenges that members are facing, practical steps that can be taken to overcome those challenges, and suggestions for collaboration and/or next steps.

26. In the beehive discussion on **Environment and climate change**, the increasing focus on evaluation of climate change was apparent. The group identified a number of evaluation challenges. These included assessing impact, working with CRS data, and evaluating the impact of adaptation. Members shared experiences and challenges with evaluation in this area. Several members, including DEVAL, the Netherlands, and EBRD indicated their intention to start work in the area. The peer review learning process undertaken by OECD DAC Secretariat may provide opportunities for identification of gaps in evaluations.

27. In the continued discussion on the **DAC Evaluation criteria**, the value of neutrality and simplicity of the criteria was emphasised. The group discussed specific issues around the criteria. The group also entertained the idea of possible new criteria such as innovation and replicability, although there was no general agreement. It was found that the SDG framework was too broad, with 169 targets and 230 indicators, and it was suggested that the SDGs should somehow be embedded in the criteria. It was pointed out that some of the definitions were challenging.

28. During the beehive discussion on **Leveraging the private sector**, it was noted that it was quite a new area for many partners. Some of the challenges mentioned were the existing differences in logic and philosophy between the private and public sector, the information constraints and how to evaluate additionality. A more systemic lens for identifying questions and more joint evaluations between different ministries and corporate entities were proposed. It was suggested that evaluation should be further shared in this area.

29. In the continued discussion on **Learning**, participants shared their experiences and debated who beyond the evaluation unit has responsibility for learning. There was a discussion about making evaluations more digestible and accessible. It was emphasised that personal interaction is key in evaluation and in influencing change. A range of different ways of influencing were discussed. The value of peer reviews was noted as was the use of the DAC Network to push forward the learning agenda.

Friday 29 June 2018

ITEM 7. BLENDED FINANCE AND EVALUATION

30. Irene Basile (OECD) presented key findings from the report “Blended Finance Evaluation” issued in January 2018 and noted that blended finance can help bridge the investment gap for the SDGs. She noted that monitoring and evaluation practice on blended finance are diverse and hampered by a lack of common understanding. She drew attention to the blended finance principles and in particular number 5, which is related to transparency and results. Members were invited to engage and collaborate through participating in the workshop on Blended Finance Monitoring and Evaluation to be held on 22 October in Copenhagen, Denmark. Moreover, she invited interested members to engage with the development of policy guidance for principle #5 and with the OECD conference on “Private Finance for Sustainable Development” to be held between 14-18 January 2019. Nanna Hvidt (Denmark) noted that blended finance is an important and growing part of development funds and that the workshop would be a coalition of the interested. She indicated that they would be willing to fund a consultant to develop a paper on the conceptual issues in evaluation of Blended Finance.

31. Catherine Pravin (EU) shared the results of the study “Evaluation of Blending (2007-2014)”. Blended instruments were implemented using seven facilities. A big challenge was to obtain information from the financial institutions involved. Overall, the findings showed that blending was successful in creating results, as most projects worked well and were sustained but overall, additionality was not clear and poverty alleviation had

not been emphasised in project design. It was found that blending had added value for policy reform, project quality, co-ordination and visibility but also increased transaction costs. A further finding was that blending enabled loan projects to address special challenges and potentially increase the EU sphere of influence.

32. In summing up the discussion, the Chair suggested that members share and follow each other's work and that interested members contribute to further activities, including the workshop.

Members interested in participating in the workshop on Blended Finance on 22 October hosted by Danida in Copenhagen, should contact Irene Basile (Irene.BASILE@oecd.org).

ITEM 8. MULTILATERAL EFFECTIVENESS

33. Indran Naidoo (UNEG's Vice-Chair) presented UNEG's role in strengthening system-wide evaluation and provided a status report on UNEG/DAC peer reviews. He drew attention to the outputs produced in 2017-2018, including the peer review of the evaluation function of UNICEF and two working papers: "Background Note on the UNEG Peer Review Mechanism" and "Modalities for Evaluating, Reviewing or Assessing an Evaluation Function".

34. The Chair stressed the importance of UNEG/DAC peer reviews and also noted that participating in a peer review provides interesting insights and is a good way to interact with UN colleagues. EvalNet peer review work is being coordinated by Antonie De Kemp (the Netherlands), who indicated that when a peer review is coming up, an invitation is sent out to all members to participate on a voluntary basis.

35. Samer Hachem and Katie Vanhala (OECD) provided an update on MOPAN (Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network). They presented how MOPAN works and on the performance areas that are being assessed. Overall, the feedback on the MOPAN 3.0 approach was positive, with a more robust approach and embedded learning. Currently, revisions are being considered, including a review of the survey instrument and the results assessment component, as well as a differentiated approach by clusters of institutions.

36. The Chair asked "How it is to be MOPANed?" and Karen Rot-Munstermann (AfDB) shared their experience, having been assessed several times, most recently in 2016. At AfDB, a focal point from the evaluation department participated in the assessment. She felt that MOPAN's 3.0 approach was an improvement and provided more credibility, as it relies on multiple lines of evidence and assesses the strength of the evidence.

37. During the discussion, it was highlighted that MOPAN has considerable potential and it was clarified that there are different practices and uses of the reports by members.

ITEM 9. PREPARING FOR A WORKSHOP ON COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATIONS

38. Miriam Amine (DEVAL, Germany) presented the planned workshop on country programme evaluations to be held in Bonn on 19-20 November 2018 or 17-18 January 2019. She indicated that DEVAL was happy to take forward the initiative, building on the interest members had expressed at the previous Network meeting. Sven Harten (DEVAL, Germany) provided some additional information and drew attention to the [leaflet of the workshop](#).

39. During the discussion, many members expressed interest in attending the workshop or contributing to it. The Chair noted the high relevance of the topic for many members working on improving their country evaluation approaches and thanked DEVAL for their willingness to host the event.

Members interested in participating in the workshop should contact Miriam Amine (DEVAL) miriam.amine@deval.org.

ITEM 10. BRIEF HIGHLIGHTS AND LOOKING FORWARD

40. The DAC facilitator, Maria Oliveira Fernandes (Portugal), updated members on recent developments in the DAC, such as the recent approval of the Programme of Work and Budget PWB for 2019-2020, and on current DAC work. She emphasised her willingness to contribute to enhancing the communication between the Network and the DAC.

41. Members shared highlights of their current work programmes and recent developments in evaluation in their ministries and institutions.

42. Hans Lundgren (OECD) updated members on the latest news within the Evaluation team; notably, the birth of team member Ola's child, a future job vacancy in the division, which will be shared with members, and the dates for the next Meeting (27-28 February 2019). He additionally reminded participants of DEREc, which can be used as a tool for the dissemination of evaluation reports by members and for research.

ITEM 11. OTHER BUSINESS

43. Bastiaan de Laat (EES President) informed members about the 13th European Evaluation Society Biennial Conference in Thessaloniki, Greece on 1-5 October 2018. The theme of the conference is Evaluation for More Resilient Societies: Rethinking the Role of Evaluation in Turbulent Times. He invited members to participate and to consider sponsoring participants from developing countries.

44. The Chair thanked Caroline Heider (IEG, World Bank), who is retiring after having spent over 30 years in evaluation, for her active support and contributions to the Network over the years. He also thanked Jyrki Pulkkinen (Finland) for his contributions to the Network and congratulated him on his new position as Ambassador to Nigeria.

ITEM 12. INFORMAL MEETING SPACE

45. During the informal session, Nataša Adlešić Barba (Slovenia) and Barbara Mrówka (Poland) presented their work and challenges they face as small evaluation units with resource constraints. In the exchange following the presentations, members shared similar experiences and discussed the need to create awareness and understanding across the organisation of the evaluation function. They noted the pragmatism of the presentations with appreciation.

46. The Chair thanked participants and the Secretariat and closed the meeting. In preparation for the next EvalNet meeting, members will be invited to provide suggestions and ideas to the Bureau and Secretariat.