

Unclassified

DCD/DAC/RD(2010)2/RD5

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

10-Feb-2010

English text only

DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

DCD/DAC/RD(2010)2/RD5
Unclassified

PEER REVIEW METHODOLOGY

Room Document 5

DAC meeting, 12 February 2010

This Room Document is submitted for INFORMATION under Item 6 of the Draft Annotated DAC Agenda [DCD/DAC/A(2010)2].

It draws from the DAC peer review methodology meeting of 8 January 2010. The draft minutes of this meeting are available on OLIS.

Contacts: Karen Jorgensen - Tel +33 (0)1 45 24 94 61 - Email: karen.jorgensen@oecd.org and
Chantal Verger - Tel. 33 (0)1 45 24 15 11 - Email: chantal.verger@oecd.org.

JT03278389

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

English text only

DAC meeting

12 February 2010

Peer Review Methodology

1. In response to the recommendations of the DAC reflection exercise report, the Secretariat prepared a paper which was discussed by the DAC at its meeting on 8 January 2010 (DCD/DAC(2009)38). The discussion focused on three aspects: i) opportunity of conducting country-based, thematic reviews; ii) ways to involve a broader range of stakeholders in peer reviews; and iii) ways to make peer reviews more standardized against key indicators and DAC guidelines, in line with the Task Team 3 findings.

2. The Secretariat's paper was seen as a positive development providing a good level of response to the DAC reflection exercise request. It brings clarification over roles and responsibilities and identifies ways to be more inclusive. In doing so, it strikes an appropriate balance between maintaining the basic characteristic of peer reviews and the need to be more inclusive. There was broad support to the measures already implemented and those suggested to make peer reviews more inclusive.

3. As regards country reviews, several members agreed that the reference to country focused and thematic reviews in the DAC reflection exercise report should be clarified. The Committee considered that, since the Paris Declaration was adopted, such reviews fall within the mutual accountability framework being developed by the WP-EFF as part of the follow-up to Paris and Accra. Two clusters of the WP-EFF are involved: cluster A on ownership and accountability and cluster D on Monitoring. INCAF will also be involved in such exercises.

4. As regards the use of DAC instruments in peer reviews, the Chair of TT3 reaffirmed that peer reviews are central to the DAC accountability function. The TT3 suggestions are in line with the points in paragraph 27 of the paper, in particular: i) clarifying the nature and status of the various DAC instrument; and ii) making more clear references to the selected guidelines in the content guide and including a reporting against these guidelines in the country memorandum. In addition, the DAC subsidiary bodies will be invited to develop performance frameworks with clear indicators and benchmarks for any new DAC directive. Remarks were made by several members on the need to maintain some flexibility to adapt to each context; the necessary reliance on qualitative indicators; and the need to keep the reporting light – with greater use made of subsidiary bodies in monitoring guidance.

5. While supporting broadly the Secretariat's paper, the DAC agreed on the following:

- i. Supporting inclusive peer reviews while maintaining the "Peer" characteristic which ensure their success; which means that there is no acceptance to partner country's participation in the examining team; and that any proposal from the examining countries to have non-government examiners should be subject to acceptance by the review team and the reviewed country based on their CVs;
- ii. Continuing to include observers in peer reviews in line with the DAC engagement strategy;
- iii. Being more inclusive and opening up further to a broader range of stakeholders as suggested in the document and through increased consultations but with an emphasis on quality of contribution rather than participation and with an eye on cost;

- iv. Helping examined countries to prepare better their partners to allow for more targeted and fruitful discussion during the field visits and revisiting the agenda of the visits to gain more from them;
- v. Continuing to consult with multilateral organisations' headquarters and at field level to get their contribution on the reviewed country performance – while the question of assessing the multilaterals will be dealt with in the DAC Evaluation network.
- vi. Agreeing that country-level reviews are embedded in the work of the WP-EFF;
- vii. Adjusting the frequency of peer reviews should be considered in light of available budget. As it stands now, with 5 reviews a year and 24 DAC members, each country will be reviewed every five years. The introduction of mid-term reviews would make this frequency reasonable.