

## ANNEX 2: PAPs' Group Evaluation – 2006 PAF Matrix

Objectives	Activities	No.	Indicators	Target	Executed	Comments
Portfolio Composition	GBS	1	% of GBS in total PAPs aid flows disbursed to the GoM.	40%	34%	Need of a strategy to improve group portfolio. Individual donors need to set individual, progressive targets.
	Program Aid	2	% of program aid in total PAPs aid disbursed to the GoM.	70%	55%	Need of a strategy to improve group portfolio. Individual donors need to set individual, progressive targets.
Predictability	Commitment of funds	3	% of PAPs with multi-year agreements of not less than 3 years.	100%	5 agencies (28% of total) have programs of <u>less than</u> 3 years <sup>i</sup>	All 5 are preparing, or have prepared, new programs of 3 years or more
		4	Commitments of GBS for year n+1 within 4 weeks of the JR in year n	100%	1 agency <u>has not</u> <sup>ii</sup>	Need to set rules that minimize impact of political shifts
	Disbursement	5	Disbursement of confirmed GBS commitment in the fiscal year for which it was scheduled, according to precise quarterly disbursement schedule agreed with GoM	100%	(a) 2 agencies <u>did not</u> disburse what they committed to do in the fiscal year <sup>iii</sup> ; (b) 5 agencies <u>did not</u> disburse according to schedule <sup>iv</sup> .	Need to clarify: "underlying principles", response mechanism and peer review role in controlling PAPs behaviour.
Harmonization and Alignment	Consolidation and harmonization of conditionality	6	PAPs adhere strictly to GBS common conditionality.	95%	All say "Yes", but at least one did not. <sup>v</sup>	Need to clarify rigorously what is and what is not common conditionality
		7	(a) number of PAPs not having Annex 10 exceptions; (b) number of PAPs significantly reducing annex 10 exceptions with a view to eliminating such exceptions.	7(a) 13 7(b) 2	(a) 12 agencies have no Annex 10 exceptions <sup>vi</sup> ; (b) 2 agencies are reviewing exceptions with a view to eliminate them; <sup>vii</sup> (c) 4 agencies have exceptions with no clear road map to eliminate them. <sup>viii</sup>	Rules to join in the PAP group? New PAPs cannot bring in new exceptions. Need to update annex 10 and evaluate why exceptions persist. Some exceptions may need to become general rules instead.
		8	Strict harmonization between all new bilateral agreements and MoU	100%	Waiting for report	Ongoing process of analysis. What to do?
	Utilization of government systems and reporting	9	% of PAPs aid flows to the government reported to the budget	80%	67%	Need far more work on both sides: PAPS and GoM. Need of very significant improvement at sectoral level.
		10	% of PAPs aid flows to the government included in the Treasury payment system	45%	44%	Need far more work on both sides: PAPS and GoM. Need of very significant improvement at sectoral level.
		11	% of PAPs aid flows to government using public procurement systems	45%	52%	
		12	Implementation and evaluation reports required by	Review reporting	Agriculture has a new MoU. Health	

Objectives	Activities	No.	Indicators	Target	Executed	Comments
			the PAP from the government outside established normal government reporting systems are eliminated (excluding projects, which have their own reporting system; and audits).	requirements in Health, Education and Agriculture	and Education are finalising theirs. All are more harmonised and aligned with the PAPs MoU than before.	
		13	Significantly <i>reduce the overall number of missions</i> for evaluation and appraisal undertaken by officials of donor countries involving meetings with government officials, <b>AND significantly increase the share of those missions that are joint.</b>	No. of GBS missions outside JR & MYR < 7 No. of non-GBS missions < 160 Share of joint missions: 20%	GBS (excluding JR e MYR) = 10 Non-GBS = 203 % of Joint = 10%	Data on missions is extremely unreliable and the meaning of "mission" is still not very clear. Maybe, there is a need to set up group and individual donor ceilings.
		14	Analytical work at country level related to development, implementation and impact evaluation of government programs and policies <b>AND</b> involving government officials is undertaken jointly with other donors and in line with government priorities and strategies.	In line with GoM priorities: 80% Joint: 50%	65% of studies are related to policy issues; 35% are individual agency evaluations; and 54% of the total is joint.	Target is unclear and very open to interpretation. Important but as it stands makes little sense.
		15	Donors agree and implement "quiet period" with GoM.	Reach Agreement and Implement	No formal agreement has been set.	Unclear meaning of quiet period
Extension of predictability and alignment	Sector and Provincial Aid	16	Share of sector and provincial aid with a MoU moving towards the same rules of predictability and alignment as defined above.	MoU for Health, Education and Agriculture	Agriculture has a new MoU. Health and Education are finalising theirs. All are more harmonised and aligned with the PAPs MoU than before.	
Capacity Building	Technical cooperation	17	Reach agreement on guidelines for national capacity development support in line with government priorities and strategies, and subsequently adhere to it.	Reach Agreement	No agreement on guidelines	A section of the report details this issue
	Transparent flow of information	18	PAPs and GoM agree on a system and format of information about aid programs and flows to the GoM, which is feasible, accurate, timely and useful for statistical, analytical and policy work, and subsequently adhere to it.	ODAMOZ data base adjusted, and transition towards ownership and management by the GoM started.	ODAMOZ is now based at DIC	

<sup>i</sup> Finland, France, Germany, Sweden and ADB.

<sup>ii</sup> Canada.

---

<sup>iii</sup> Two agencies did not disburse in the fiscal year for which the disbursement was scheduled. These are Denmark.(arguing a case of breaching of underlying principles by the GoM) and Italy (disbursed in the previous year for reasons of cash flow management by the Italian Treasury).

<sup>iv</sup> Five agencies did not disburse according to the quarterly disbursement agreement. These are Spain (bureaucratic delays), Belgium (delays in signing new indicative cooperation program), Sweden (lack of response by GoM on one agreed trigger indicator), Denmark and Italy (see causes for both in previous footnote).

<sup>v</sup> The Danish case needs clarification.

<sup>vi</sup> Belgium, Spain, Denmark, Italy, Canada, Portugal, Norway, the Netherlands, Ireland, Finland, European Union and DFID.

<sup>vii</sup> Switzerland and the World Bank.

<sup>viii</sup> France, Germany, ADB and Sweden.