

LESSONS LEARNT FROM THE JOINT REVIEW 2005

FINAL VERSION

The recently concluded Joint review 2005 had many **POSITIVE** improvements from the previous year which should be noted. This is summarised below:

- Well structured;
- Manageable work load for Working and Thematic groups;
- Better participation from the government;
- More responsibility taken by Working groups and good quality sectoral and cross cutting policy dialogue achieved,
- good quality inputs to the text provided;
- Clearer distinction between political and technical levels and the space for the two to come together;
- Better alignment with sector reviews;
- Less transaction cost/burden compared to last year on the technical level.
- Progress on dialogue with the IMF at the political level
- Involvement of civil society was an important first step (although not yet perfect), especially as it provides a good base for their involvement in the PARPA II process.
- First independent review of the PAPs including classification by ranking

However, there is **SCOPE FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT**, which is summarised below:

I. CONTENT

- 1. Need for discussions to be more focussed on strategic issues** rather than get bogged down by drafting only. More strategic discussion needed on substantive issues like liquidity/flow of funds from Ministry of Finance to the sectors and PAP performance 2004.
- 2. Better clarity, prioritisation and ownership of recommendations**
It was felt that there were too many recommendations and little prioritisation. Need to clarify and underline the significance of recommendations and sequencing them in order of priority.
- 3. More time for discussing PAPs performance**
More dialogue needed between the government and PAPs on issues like predictability and donor performance. Too little time was spent on reviewing PAPs performance. The PAPP report should be produced earlier.
- 4. More inter sectoral debate needed**
The PAF CoG debate lost momentum towards the end of the review process. Cross cutting issues needs to mainstreamed into the Working Groups.

II. LEVEL OF DIALOGUE

5. Role of civil society

The role and format of consultations should be defined more clearly.

6. Mainstreaming the local perspective

Involvement from municipalities, provinces and districts in the Joint review process needs to be discussed further with due consideration of government capacity and application of LOLE (Leis dos Órgãos do estado).

7. Clear demarcation between technical and political inputs in the AM.

III. PROCESS, ORGANISATION AND TIMING

7. Better dialogue between IMF/GoM/Donors on timing, co-ordination and where representation from G17 would be desirable. This has been an outstanding issue from last year's assessment. Dialogue needs to be initiated now on a tripartite basis.

8. Need for better sector representation in the PFM thematic group, especially in the BAG group

Need for representatives from the ministry of Finance, Planning, donors and sectors to be present at the same time

9. Delegation of tasks and burden sharing

The Chair was found over burdened. Need for better delegation and sharing the process work load better amongst the donors.

9.2 Separation of tasks between the Drafting committee and Steering committee. Re think composition of drafting team to allow members to have more time for reflection on strategic issues. Perhaps involve thematic team leaders.

10. Total time involved in the Joint Review

The government felt that the review lasted for 45 days. We need to be precise and clear on what the JR actually is and on the separation of technical task (i.e. preparation) and the actual Joint Review process (i.e. drafting etc).

11. Clearer ToRs for the Working Groups

The Working groups would like more detailed guidelines on providing drafts for the Aide Memoire.

12. Clearer role for the thematic groups and leaders

13. Re think the composition of the thematic group on private sector and business environment as well as the Justice working group

The former has very little internal coherence, therefore a re organisation is necessary. Get a broader private sector perspective in all working groups.

14. Strengthened government participation in 3 working groups- Justice, Private Sector, MoU/Aid Effectiveness

15. Continue to work on improving alignment of sector reviews with the Joint Review process

This is an outstanding area from the previous year.

16. Need for a shorter ceremonial event

The event needs a clear purpose and a more punchy agenda.

17. Focus on external communications

Improve the website and engage with the media.

18. Better joint management of information flows between the government and donor working groups, thematic areas and secretariats.