

# Developing a Performance Assessment Framework of Development Partners (“DPs’ PAF”) in Ghana

Richard Gerster<sup>1</sup>

## 1. Introduction

A decision was taken during the Government of Ghana (GoG)/Multi Donor Budgetary Support (MDBS) Retreat and its ensuing High Level Meeting (HLM) of 28 October 2009 to develop a Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) for the Development Partners (DPs)<sup>2</sup>. In May/June 2010 the annual “Consultative Group” (CG) meeting and the MDBS annual review are planned to take place and it is envisaged to jointly adopt the DPs PAF on this occasion. This introductory paper is to (1) describe the background, (2) draw on experience, (3) outline an overall concept, (4) present selected key features, (5) design a roadmap on how to reach the agreed goal.

## 2. Background

*The idea of mutual accountability:* In the understanding of traditional aid relations the recipient is unilaterally accountable to monitor and fulfil its obligations as a precondition for further disbursements. The mutual accountability approach views aid relations as a more balanced partnership with reciprocal obligations, and these are matched by symmetrical mechanisms of accountability.<sup>3</sup> The idea of mutual accountability is still rather new and the design of appropriate mechanisms is to a large extent uncharted territory. There are a number of experiences and lessons learned emerging from the international and the country level. Both, recipient as well as donor countries are primarily accountable to their home constituencies (parliament, civil society, citizens). The quality of mutual accountability mechanisms in aid relations depends on the quality of domestic accountability in donor as well as partner countries. It should be noted that accountability of recipient governments to donors is, of course, integral part of mutual accountability but is disregarded for the purposes of this introductory paper on the development of a DPs’ PAF.

*Mutual accountability at the international level:* There are quite a number of international mechanisms to promote and practice mutual accountability.<sup>4</sup> Most of them are rather weak, with blurred targets, unclear monitoring, and limited recipient voice.<sup>5</sup> Among the more effective and prominent ones the African Peer Review

---

<sup>1</sup> Gerster Consulting, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup> GoG/World Bank/Switzerland, Communiqué on the MDBS High Level Meeting, 28 October 2009

<sup>3</sup> See OECD 2009A, p. 1

<sup>4</sup> See OECD/OPM 2008A

<sup>5</sup> „Many mechanisms monitor the overall performance and progress of donors as a whole, or sub-groups of them. Much less frequent is high quality, regular monitoring of the performance of specific, individual actors. More rare still is monitoring on the performance of specific donors in specific countries.” OECD/OPM 2008B, p. 6

Mechanism (APRM), the Strategic Partnership with Africa (SPA) and the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) can be mentioned. Most important in this context are the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (PD, 2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA, 2008). The PD/AAA are based on the principles of ownership, alignment, harmonisation, results and mutual accountability. The PD defines the principle of mutual accountability “Donors and partners are accountable for development results”. More specifically, (1) donors commit to “provide timely, transparent and comprehensive information on aid flows so as to enable partner authorities to present comprehensive budget reports to their legislatures and citizens”<sup>6</sup>, and (2) partner countries and donors commit to “jointly assess through existing and increasingly objective country level mechanisms mutual progress in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness, including the partnership commitments”<sup>7</sup>. Indicator 12 of the PD relates to mutual accountability and monitors the existence of a country level mechanism permitting joint assessments of progress in the implementation of the commitments on aid effectiveness. The AAA confirmed the will to put in place mutual assessment reviews in all countries having endorsed the PD by 2010, also using “credible independent evidence” and drawing on “stronger parliamentary scrutiny and citizen engagement”.<sup>8</sup>

*Mutual accountability at the national level:* Mutual accountability at the country level stands for the effort to redesign aid relations and transform them into a more collaborative compact pursuing shared aid effectiveness and developmental objectives.<sup>9</sup> According to PD targets, by 2010 all partner countries are supposed to have a mechanism for mutual accountability in place. However, progress has been rather modest so far.<sup>10</sup> There is no blueprint emerging. Partner countries approach mutual accountability monitoring differently<sup>11</sup>. A number of national initiatives have been taken which can be tapped as learning ground how to measure DPs progress. An early example is the Independent Monitoring Group (IMG) in Tanzania being a child of a crisis in Government – donor relations. A unique case is Vietnam where the government jointly with its DPs agreed on a contextualised and national version of the Paris Declaration<sup>12</sup>. Joint monitoring through progress reports and surveys is widely practiced in many partner countries. However, DPs’ commitments usually only play a marginal role. Quite a number of countries use performance assessment frameworks to follow up government progress. Four countries (Burkina Faso, Mozambique, Rwanda, Vietnam) developed additionally a comprehensive DPs’ PAF matrix. Benin and Zambia integrate in their PAF to measure government performance also some indicators (Benin: 6; Zambia: 3) to monitor DPs obligations. In some of these countries the DPs’ PAF refers to budget support donors only.

*The practice of mutual accountability in Ghana:* Ghana has endorsed the PD and the AAA. The GoG has underlined its determined commitment at the international level by participating in the DAC’s Joint Venture on Monitoring the PD, by hosting the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in 2008, and by participating in the OECD Working

---

<sup>6</sup> PD Art. 49

<sup>7</sup> PD Art. 50

<sup>8</sup> AAA Art. 24

<sup>9</sup> See OECD/ODI 2009

<sup>10</sup> According to the 2008 Survey, in 2007 only 13 (24%) out of 55 countries reviewed had such mechanisms. OECD 2009B, p. 96

<sup>11</sup> See OECD/ODI 2009, pp. 30 - 35

<sup>12</sup> Hanoi Core Statement on Aid Effectiveness, Hanoi 2005

Party on Aid Effectiveness. At the national level, however, “dialogue between GoG and DPs on aid effectiveness issues has been relatively poor”<sup>13</sup>. The Ghana report on the 2006 Survey of the PD refers to the Aid Harmonisation and Effectiveness Matrix agreed at the 2005 CG-meeting, confirming the existence of such a mutual accountability vehicle, albeit rated as “moderate” and a “first step only”.<sup>14</sup> Progress to do further steps and develop such a mechanism has been limited. The GoG states in its recent draft Ghana Aid Policy 2010 - 2015: “There is significant asymmetry in the accountability of aid in Ghana. GoG is accountable to DPs through numerous reporting arrangements. However, no formal mechanism exists to ensure DPs are also accountable to GoG”<sup>15</sup>. The draft Aid Policy goes a step further in saying that “cooperation is based on the principle that mutual accountability is genuinely led GoG and based on this aid policy”<sup>16</sup>. And: “Government would begin the process of developing a Progress Assessment Framework (PAF) for analyzing the manner in which Development Partners engage with the Government in Ghana”<sup>17</sup>.

### 3. Drawing on experience

There is a wealth of experience related to the GoG PAF used in the MDDBS framework in Ghana. As indicated above, Burkina Faso, Mozambique, Rwanda and Vietnam do not only use a PAF to monitor development progress by government. They have pioneered a DPs’ PAF to monitor aid effectiveness as well and practice mutual accountability. References made here to experiences of other countries are limited to elements which matter in view of the elaboration of a DPs’ PAF. Overall, it is worth mentioning that across various partner countries experience highlights the importance of DPs’ ownership to put agreed principles into practice. Making DPs’ commitments operational is key to track progress. While trust is a prerequisite for a productive mutual accountability process, good relations of Government with DPs and soft relations among DPs may prevent an open debate. The experience made in Vietnam will be similar in other countries: “The Government places a high premium on maintaining good bilateral relations with its donors, making it reluctant to press them hard on aid-effectiveness issues. Likewise, donor-donor dialogue is too diplomatic in nature to allow for effective peer pressure.”<sup>18</sup> They offer a number of lessons learned which are of particular relevance.

*Burkina Faso*<sup>19</sup>: Inspired by Mozambique, a PAF matrix for the DPs was developed in 2006 with a baseline for 2005. The DPs’ PAF measures the performance of nine budget support donors. The partnership including the DPs’ PAF is subject to an independent evaluation on an annual basis. The matrix for 2007 consists of nine indicators, and an extension as well as disaggregation to 20 indicators has been proposed by the independent evaluation. Lessons learned: (1) Independent monitoring facilitates to put critical issues on the table; (2) combine individual profile

---

<sup>13</sup> Cox/MacCarthy 2009, p. 44

<sup>14</sup> DAC 2007, pp. 14-1 & 14-12

<sup>15</sup> MOFEP 2009, Art. 1.37

<sup>16</sup> MOFEP 2009, Art. 3.72

<sup>17</sup> MOFEP 2009, Art. 1.38

<sup>18</sup> Cox et al 2007, p. 12

<sup>19</sup> Source: personal interviews with government and donors when preparing an independent evaluation; see Gerster/Somé 2008

of DPs and collective performance assessment; (3) introduce multi-annual targets into the DPs' PAF to stimulate progress; (4) review the conformity of bilateral agreements with the GBS framework memorandum.

*Mozambique*<sup>20</sup>: The DPs' PAF was developed as early as 2004 with a baseline for 2003, and consists of 21 weighted indicators in the 2008 version. It is monitored by an independent assessment on an annual basis. Coverage of DPs is limited to budget support donors but the so-called Programme Aid Partners group comprises as many as 19 DPs. Lessons learned: (1) Transparency and peer pressure enhance effectively the implementation of aid effectiveness principles by DPs; (2) The assessment results are used by DPs country offices to put pressure on headquarters to improve performance in future; (3) The DPs' PAF is used as an opportunity to enhance relevance of specific issues by anchoring them in the matrix; (4) Opportunities to use the DPs' PAF as negotiating tool by the partner government remain untapped because of reluctance to intervene in donor affairs.

*Rwanda*<sup>21</sup>: In Rwanda stakeholders endorsed in 2008 a mutual review process which included a donor PAF, with a baseline for 2007 assessed in 2009 for the first time. Exercising a self-assessment, 14 DPs completed the questionnaire to monitor 32 indicators, including six applicable to budget support donors only. Lessons learned: (1) make sure to work on consistent definitions to avoid discussions post analysis; (2) ensure that the timing of the review coincides with the Government own PAF assessment; (3) make the DPs PAF comprehensive and ensure that headquarters get to know the importance and impact of the results; (4) consider having a separate section for Budget support donors.

*Vietnam*<sup>22</sup>: In the Hanoi Core Statement (HCS) on Aid Effectiveness the Government and the DPs endorsed reciprocal commitments on ownership, harmonization, alignment, mutual accountability and managing for results. A matrix of 14 indicators with 2010 targets was agreed; the independent monitoring report 2007 disaggregated the HCS commitments into 29 elements. The 2006 baseline study included 34 donor agencies. Lessons learned: (1) A lack of consensus on definitions of key concepts can hamper dialogue and progress; (2) Greater devolution of authority to country offices facilitates the agreement on context-specific approaches; (3) To impact on behavior and development results, it is important to have in-depth collaborative reviews going beyond formal monitoring exercises; (4) For the Government of Vietnam it is a weakness that the monitoring is not done in a disaggregated way for individual DPs.

#### **4. DPs' PAF outline**

The process to establish a DPs' PAF in Ghana will take care of the recently identified policy implications by the OECD/ODI research done on mutual accountability at the country level<sup>23</sup>: (1) Experimentation matters as there is no blueprint available; (2) Tap

---

<sup>20</sup> Source: personal interviews with donors, government and independent evaluator; IESE 2009

<sup>21</sup> Source: personal information by UNDP Kigali; OECD/ODI 2008A

<sup>22</sup> Source: OECD/ODI 2008B; Independent Monitoring Reports (Cox 2007; Kotoglou 2008)

<sup>23</sup> OECD/DAC 2009, pp. 50 - 52

and exchange experience for learning; (3) Document experience to enhance the evidence base; (4) strengthen political and technical capacity. These policy implications should guide the elaboration process and its different steps on its way forward.

*Objectives of the DPs PAF:* In the spirit of the principle of mutual accountability, the DPs' PAF draws inspiration from the need for the GoG to take the lead and drive the development process in the country. More specifically, the tool of a DPs' PAF pursues the following objectives:

- The DPs PAF should serve as an instrument to stimulate the improvement of the performance of development partners as a group and individually to implement the principles of international statements such as the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action (AAA), but also the Ghana Aid Policy and the Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy (G-JAS);
- Additionally, the DPs' PAF offers the opportunity to make the MDBS obligations of adhering DPs as a group and individually operational and monitor annualised targets, complementing and ensuring coherence with Paris Declaration and AAA monitoring.

*Core elements:* A mutual accountability mechanism is characterised by three core elements<sup>24</sup>: (1) a shared agenda; (2) a monitoring framework; (3) a process comprising dialogue and negotiation. For each of the three core elements a summary design is proposed:

- *Shared agenda:* The basis of a shared agenda are mainly the Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy 2006 – 2009 (GPRS II) and its successor Medium Term Development Plan Framework (MTDPF) 2010 - 2013, the Ghana Aid Policy 2010 – 2015, the Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy (G-JAS), the Ghana Partnership Results Matrix, and to a minor extent the Ghana Harmonization Action Plan (G-HAP). More particularly, the DPs PAF will be based on (1) the principles of the AAA and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness as enshrined in the G-HAP (for all DPs<sup>25</sup>), take care of (2) the Ghana Aid Policy, the G-JAS and the DPs Division of Labour (DoL), and on (3) DP obligations laid down in the MDBS Framework Memorandum (for MDBS partners), budget support being the preferred aid modality of the GoG. Shared goals are matched by reciprocal commitments. The risk of becoming jointly accountable instead of moving to mutual accountability should be avoided.<sup>26</sup>
- *Monitoring framework:* The matrix will consist of a number of indicators and measures, and cover the DPs' cooperation portfolios, ownership, harmonisation, alignment, coordination, predictability, capacity development, and subject to agreement other topics of relevance. The indicators are meant to be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART). Any sector level indicator would have to be determined and agreed by the sector working groups to ensure a coherent approach. The matrix will be linked to the base year (2008 or 2009) and cover a multi-annual prospective period with rolling objectives, initially set for 2010, 2011, and 2012. Available data from the G-JAS mid-term review, the PD monitoring or other related processes will be re-used to the extent possible. A well developed ODA database is an asset and facilitates the monitoring effort.

---

<sup>24</sup> OECD 2009, p. 1; OECD/ODI 2009, pp. 19 - 41

<sup>25</sup> All DPs who endorsed the PD

<sup>26</sup> Evans 2007, p. 7

One requirement for the indicators is that they ought to be within the power of the DPs to achieve. It should be noted, however, that donor performance as measured by some indicators will be contingent also on government performance as e.g. alignment is linked to the strength of government systems.

- *Process of dialogue and negotiation:* Every year the GoG and the DPs will assess progress against the DPs' PAF. The annual calendar of the aid partnership is to provide adequate space for dialogue on the DPs' PAF assessment and its update. It is proposed to discuss the performance of DPs in the annual Consultative Group Meeting. On the occasion of the MDDBS Annual Review, the performance of MDDBS DPs and their subset of MDDBS specific indicators and measures can be discussed. The CG discussions and the results including the revised and updated DPs' PAF matrix will be taken note of in the minutes. Results and discussions on the MDDBS specific parts of the matrix are summarised in the MDDBS AR "Aide Memoire". The forthcoming elaboration process of the first DPs' PAF should allow a meaningful participation of stakeholders to ensure awareness and ownership in the GoG and among DPs.

*Success factors:* A predictable national context in economic and political terms is an asset for moving towards mutual accountability. Five critical factors of success for a mutual accountability mechanism were identified<sup>27</sup>:

- *Confidence:* A relationship of trust between the government, DPs and other stakeholders should prevail, and is in return reinforced by an effective mutual accountability dialogue;
- *Leadership:* A strong government leadership is conducive for all DPs to understand and work towards the agenda of mutual accountability;
- *Capacity:* Adequate capacity is needed on all sides to produce the information required, to monitor progress, to engage in dialogue, and to manage change;
- *Credibility:* The aid partnership should be positively rooted in public opinion in Ghana as well as in the DP countries;
- *Complementarity:* Lines of domestic and mutual accountability should be linked, build on each other and be mutually reinforcing.

*Coordinating agency:* GoG and the DPs agreed that the MOFEP (MDDBS secretariat) assumes the role of a coordinating agency for the DPs' PAF. The bilateral DP co-chair in 2009/10 (Switzerland) will support and facilitate relations on DP side. A clear-cut and strong institutional lead within the GoG is of utmost importance.

## **5. Selected key features**

The DPs' PAF is not an end in itself but it ultimately serves to improve aid and development effectiveness notably by stimulating an open dialogue on donor performance in Ghana. It is also a vehicle to ignite and intensify discussions between DPs' country offices and headquarters on internal constraints influencing aid effectiveness. The discussions and actions it prompts are as important as the extent to which the indicators truly capture every aspect of performance. With that in mind, a number of key features should be examined and adopted.

---

<sup>27</sup> See OECD/ODI 2009, p.9-10, 41-45

*Independent review process:* The Ghana Harmonisation and Aid Effectiveness Action Plan, endorsed at the Consultative Group Meeting in 2005, provides a verification of progress through an independent assessment mechanism. Its implementation has been delayed, however. The annual progress reports<sup>28</sup> on the Ghana Harmonisation Action Plan note that an agreement on the creation of such an independent monitoring mechanism<sup>29</sup> is pending. The annual assessment of DPs' progress is preferably entrusted to an independent expert/institution in order to ensure credibility. The mandate goes beyond a mere quantitative assessment of the DPs' PAF but covers the context of government-donor and donor-donor relations as well. It is a well founded experience from the PEFA process and from other countries (Burkina Faso, Mozambique, Rwanda, Vietnam) that "independent monitoring mechanisms are bringing an impartial perspective on complex issues that might otherwise remain unspoken"<sup>30</sup>. Therefore such an independent monitoring is of utmost significance for a credible assessment of DPs' performance but equally be of significance in case of disputes for the assessment of GoG performance.<sup>31</sup>

*Transparency:* The baseline report as well as the annual progress assessment reports and the follow up notes should be part of the public domain to facilitate information access by interested parties and to give a greater chance to effective peer pressure processes. This is fully in line with the recent moves of the GoG and the MDDBS DPs to improve external communication, including making key documents publicly available. In all countries with a comprehensive DPs' PAF (Burkina Faso, Mozambique, Rwanda, Vietnam) the monitoring reports are available, and in some of them the Aide Memoire of the budget support annual review as well. Transparency is a prerequisite for an informed public and this again is conditional for public support of development assistance.

*Inclusive approach:* The participation of domestic stakeholders like the parliament, civil society and the private sector in the monitoring process is a major concern of the AAA. The active involvement of other stakeholders in the aid partnership processes is an important point on the joint agenda of the GoG and the MDDBS DPs.<sup>32</sup> Broad participation and country ownership adds legitimacy and contributes to aid and development effectiveness. In the case of the DPs' PAF, such an inclusive approach should include interviews with other stakeholders by the independent assessment team. The presence and active participation of members of parliament, civil society and private sector representatives in the annual dialogue at the APM and the MDDBS annual review strengthens an informed debate up to challenging the aid partnership. Non-state actors from donor countries may play a critical role as well. It is obvious that all these stakeholders require sufficient knowledge and capacity to take advantage of such new opportunities. The DPs' PAF contributes to transparency and

---

<sup>28</sup> E.g. World Bank 2008, p. 19

<sup>29</sup> Such a mechanism could consist of an annual independent monitoring report submitted to the GoG and the DPs (as proposed in this paper, similar to Burkina Faso, Mozambique, Vietnam), or of a permanent independent aid monitoring panel (as proposed by Evans 2007, similar to Tanzania), or of a combination of the two.

<sup>30</sup> OECD/ODI 2009, p. 8

<sup>31</sup> The Ghana Aid Policy makes an explicit reference: "The use of policy and process conditionality by DPs has undermined mutual accountability in considerable ways when conditionality is subjected to DP interpretation." And: "The GoG is committed to undertaking a joint assessment through the APR process and where disputes arise, to engage a third party to undertake an independent assessment." MOFEP 2009, Art. 1.37 & 3.73

<sup>32</sup> GoG/World Bank/Switzerland, Communiqué on the MDDBS High Level Meeting, 28 October 2009

creates a complementary, non-competing stream of accountability of donors to the domestic stakeholders

*Capacity building:* Capacity is a key condition for a productive monitoring process and policy dialogue which offers opportunities for mutual learning. Adequate capacity to monitor the DPs and to stimulate dialogue is required within GoG but also with other national stakeholders, particularly civil society organisations. The process to elaborate the draft DPs PAF jointly with a national consultant is to contribute to capacity building in Ghana's national development community. The forthcoming consultations and the workshop will again strengthen the capacity to monitor the performance of DPs.

*Coverage of DPs:* The draft Ghana Aid Policy clearly states that the development of a DPs' PAF will be "applied to all Development Partners including MDBS DPs, non-traditional donors such as those of the BRICK countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Korea) and vertical fund donors such as the global fund".<sup>33</sup> There are 11 signatories to the MDBS Framework Memorandum,<sup>34</sup> and 16 DPs endorsed the Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy.<sup>35</sup> It is worth noting that some of the non-traditional donors like Brazil<sup>36</sup>, Russia, China, South Korea and the Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria have endorsed the Paris Declaration, including the principle of mutual accountability. International NGOs are not included as donors for the purpose of the DPs PAF. Experience demonstrates that the inclusion of non-traditional DPs will be a major challenge and constitutes a risk. It is crucial that the GoG processes an early information and invitation to participate to all traditional and non-traditional DPs. Possibly addressing non-traditional donors will require an additional effort to associate them in this undertaking. It is understood that the process and timeframe outlined in this note will be adhered to even if a number of non-MDBS DPs opt out in the sense that they are not willing to cooperate and do not provide the data required. As indicated above the DPs' PAF in Rwanda and Vietnam apply to all DPs (with partial success only) whereas in Burkina Faso and Mozambique its outreach is limited to budget support donors.

*Individual and collective assessment:* The DPs' PAF is to be constructed and monitored in a transparent manner which permits to formulate collective targets for the group of donors as well as individual targets for each participating DP. The experience in Burkina Faso and Mozambique shows that such a double level approach improves performance through peer pressure and is a helpful instrument of information for the partner government. It is not a "naming and shaming" approach but the DP profiles with individual strengths and weaknesses and interagency comparisons can be used by DPs' country offices in negotiations with headquarters. Also Rwanda's approach comprises both levels whereas in Vietnam the government is keen to get a disaggregated picture in future.

---

<sup>33</sup> MOFEP 2009, Art. 1.38

<sup>34</sup> African Development Bank, Canada, Denmark, European Commission, France, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Switzerland, United Kingdom, World Bank

<sup>35</sup> 13 of them are active participants in aid effectiveness processes in Ghana: The above mentioned MDBS signatories plus United States and the United Nations, see Cox/MacCarthy 2009, p.2. Italy, Spain and IFAD signed the G-JAS in 2007 but did not actively pursue aid effectiveness concerns.

<sup>36</sup> Confirmation pending, see OECD

[http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,3343,en\\_2649\\_3236398\\_36074966\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,3343,en_2649_3236398_36074966_1_1_1_1,00.html)



*Enforcement.* The DPs PAF is an instrument to enhance behavioural change of donors towards shared goals. The exposure of donors in a DPs' PAF provides an incentive to follow up targets. While the donors can withhold their disbursements in case the partner government does not fulfil its agreed obligations, the partner government is in a much weaker position to sanction violations of agreed obligations on the DPs side. Donors run some reputational and relational risks but enforcement of obligations remains an unresolved challenge even with a DPs PAF making agreed principles and targets transparent. The ultimate step of the partner government to stop the aid flow from a non-performing DP is an option, albeit a costly one, and therefore to date rarely applied in practice. However, it is a widespread misconception to underestimate the negotiating power of aid recipients.

*Legal base:* While the aid effectiveness principles and other DPs' obligations are formally anchored in a multitude of declarations, memorandums and agreements, there is no formal provision for the specific vehicle of a DPs' PAF in Ghana. Given the explicit will of the GoG and the DPs to elaborate a DPs' PAF, this is not a barrier to establish such a mechanism. Mozambique has been practicing a DPs' PAF for budget support donors since 2004 and anchored it formally in the Memorandum of Understanding of 2009 only to acknowledge its relevance. Having practical experience, it can be advisable to anchor the DPs' PAF in the relevant documents beyond the Ghana Aid Policy at a later date.

## **6. The way forward**

- December 2009: (1) Agreement on way forward by GoG and MDDBS DPs, based on a first concept note (done)  
(2) Sharing of all relevant documents (Ghana Aid Policy, G-JAS and DPs Division of Labour, MDDBS related including bilateral BS agreements, AAA/PD related, other) with the international consultant (done)
- January 2010: (1) Establishment of a list of DPs (including individuals to be contacted, phone numbers and e-mail address) to be invited to participate in the process (by the GoG)  
(2) Letter of information and invitation to all DPs considered for participation (signed by the GoG)  
(3) Identification and contracting of a qualified and independent national consultant (contracting by MDDBS co-chair, based on agreement with the GoG);  
(4) First mission of the international consultant to Ghana 18 – 27 January 2010: a. to meet and consult with GoG and DPs (MDDBS and beyond, individual meetings to the extent indicated and feasible), b. to meet and involve the national consultant, c. to develop the questionnaire for the baseline study, d. to collect and review data available (including Paris Declaration monitoring data for base year), e. to discuss April Workshop format, programme, logistics and moderation.

- February 2010: (1) Draft baseline report (data and analysis based on interviews and questionnaires filled by DPs) and first draft of DPs' PAF by 19 February 2010; invitation for comments by GoG and DPs to be received within two weeks, 5 March 2010
- March 2010: (1) Revision of draft baseline report and second draft of DPs PAF by 22 March 2010  
(2) Invitation to and preparation of joint GoG/DPs Workshop in April 2010
- April 2010: (1) Second mission of the international consultant to Ghana 20 – 27 April 2010 to participate in the Workshop on the second draft  
(2) Joint GoG & DPs Workshop on 22 April 2010 to discuss the revised baseline report and the second draft DPs' PAF  
(3) Summary note on workshop discussion and results  
(4) Based on Workshop outcomes, elaboration of third draft of DPs PAF for submission to the Consultative Group Meeting/ MDBS Annual Review by 6 May 2010
- May/June 2010: Annual Consultative Group Meeting & MDBS Annual Review discusses, amends and adopts the final DPs' PAF, including its follow up; the participation of the international consultant is judged as not being necessary.

## **Bibliography**

CDD-Ghana/ODI 2007, Evaluation of Outputs, Outcomes & Impacts and Recommendations on Future Design & Management of Ghana MDBS, Accra/London 2007

Cox Marcus/MacCarthy Mavis 2009, Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy (G-JAS). Mid-Term Review, 30 November 2009

Cox Marcus et al 2007, Independent Monitoring Report on the Implementation of the Hanoi Core Statement on Aid Effectiveness, Hanoi 2007

DAC 2007, 2006 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration. Country chapter Ghana, Paris 2007

European Commission/World Bank 2008, Ghana Partnership Results Matrix, Presentation at the Annual Partnership Meeting, Accra 2008

Evans Alison (with Simon Burrall), Mutual Accountability: Review of Experiences and Options for Ghana, ODI (for DFID) 2007

Gerster Richard/Somé Abel Seglaro 2008, Rapport d'évaluation indépendante du cadre général d'organisation des appuis budgétaires en soutien à la mise en œuvre du cadre stratégique de lutte contre la pauvreté (CGAB-CSLP) au Burkina Faso en 2007, Ouagadougou/Richterswil 2008

G-JAS 2007, Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy 2007 – 2010. Commitments by partners to work toward GPRS II goals and harmonization principles, Accra 2007

Government of Ghana/World Bank/Switzerland, Communique on the MDBS High Level Meeting, Accra 28 October 2009

Hanoi Core Statement on Aid Effectiveness (2005): Ownership, Harmonisation, Alignment, Results, agreed at the mid-term Consultative Group meeting, 2-3 June 2005

IESE 2009, Mozambique: Programme Aid Partners Performance Review 2008, Institute of Social and Economic Studies (IESE), Maputo 2009

Kotoglou Katarina et al, Independent Monitoring of the Implementation of the Hanoi Core Statement at Sectoral and Sub-National Level in Vietnam, Hanoi 2008

MacCarthy Mavis 2008, Review of Development Partner Division of Labour in Ghana, Report May 2008

MOFEP 2009, Ghana Aid Policy 2010 – 2015. Towards Middle-Income Status (Phase One), Accra 2009

OECD 2009A, Mutual Accountability, Issues Brief 1, June 2009

OECD 2009B, Aid Effectiveness: A Progress Report on Implementing The Paris Declaration, Paris 2009

OECD/ODI 2009, Mutual Accountability at the Country Level. A Concept and Emerging Good Practice Paper, London 2009

OECD/ODI 2008A, Mutual Accountability at the Country Level: Rwanda Country Case Study, London 2008

OECD/ODI 2008B, Mutual Accountability at the Country Level: Vietnam Country Case Study, London 2008

OECD/OPM 2008A, Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: Study of Existing Mechanisms to Promote Mutual Accountability (MA) between Donors and Partner countries at the International Level: Background Paper – Review of Individual Mechanisms, Oxford 2008

OECD/OPM 2008B, Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: Study of Existing Mechanisms to Promote Mutual Accountability (MA) between Donors and Partner countries at the International Level: Final Report, Oxford 2008

World Bank 2008, Ghana Harmonization Action Plan. Progress Report 2008, Presentation at the Annual Partnership Meeting, Accra 2008

World Bank 2006, Public Finance Management Performance Report and Performance Indicators, Volume II – 2006 External Review of Public Financial Management, Report No. 36384-GH