



# OECD / DAC Peer Reviews

SEVAL, 10 September 2010

Jolanda Profos



## You will hear about...

1. **The DAC**
2. **DAC peer reviews: objectives**
3. **Process**
4. **Methodology**
5. **Peer review experience**
6. **When are DAC peer reviews effective?**





## 1 - Development Assistance Committee (DAC)

- an OECD Committee
- 24 members
- donor governments; multilateral observers
- 120 m USD (2009) in ODA
- Goal: reduce poverty - quantity & quality of aid
- How: analysis, statistics, guidance, policy coordination, exchange of experiences
- Peer Reviews



## 2 - DAC Peer Reviews: objectives

### What do Peer Reviews do?

- monitor policies and their implementation
- assess progress against national / international objectives
- make recommendations
- Identify good practice

### To what end?

- Accountability (against commitments)
- Learning (good practice, guidance)
- Advancing reforms, improving aid system – a tool for change
- Ultimately: « make poverty history »



### 3 - Process


- Identical for each member: Information Note
- Regular: every 4-5 years
- Well-defined roles
  - DAC – collective body
  - Reviewed country
  - 2 examiner countries
  - DAC secretariat

*political*


*analytical / technical*

**PR Team** {

- Well-defined choreography: 5 stages



### 3 - Process



preparation, planning

fact-finding, analysis, report writing

Peer Review meeting

publication (& launch)


follow-up (mid-term review)

HQ consultations

1-2 field missions

Part 2 (technical)

Part 1 (polit.)





## 4 - Methodology

### a. Content Guide

- Common analytical framework
- Lists questions (divided in 6 chapters)
- Guided by (and lists):
  - principles / commitments (hard)
  - good practice documents (soft)

### b. Report

- Part 2
  - Secretariat Report: technical, analytical, with 'future considerations'
- Part 1
  - Committee's Report: Key Findings and Recommendations, political, with 'recommendations'



## 5 - The Peer Review Experience

### a. Reviewed member

- Need full engagement (broad, government-wide, senior)
- Offers «mirror», learning
- A rare opportunity for frank discussion and reflection on their work

### b. Examiners

- Learning: rewarding - if engaged and well prepared
- Time commitment (4-5 full weeks)
- A way of putting their experience to use

### c. DAC Secretariat

- High responsibility - quality, objectivity, precision.
- Must counterbalance political pressures to guarantee intellectual / political independence
- continuity and consistency





## 6 - What makes peer reviews effective? (1)

- a. **A competent team that inspires confidence**
- b. **Credibility of process**
- c. **A clear framework & yardstick**
- d. **Realistic recommendations**
- e. **Regular reviews and follow-up**
- f. **Publicity**



## 6 - What makes peer reviews effective? (2)

### ***Conform with the 4 DAC principles of evaluation***

- **Impartiality and independence** : key role of secretariat throughout the process
- **Credibility** : depends on expertise and independence of peer review team.
- **Transparency** : publication of evaluation reports and organising seminars to disseminate results and recommendations.
- **Participation** : All stakeholders (administrations, agencies, parliament, SCOs, governments of partner countries, other donors) must be consulted.





## Further discussion...

- Faux pas: what to avoid
- Positive / negative / perverse effects
- Pressure, contentious issues

A large, semi-transparent magnifying glass graphic with a black handle, positioned on the left side of the slide, overlapping the white and orange background.

**Thank you**

[jolanda.profos@oecd.org](mailto:jolanda.profos@oecd.org)

[www.oecd.org/dac/peerreviews](http://www.oecd.org/dac/peerreviews)

The OECD logo, consisting of three stylized 'W' shapes, is positioned to the left of a white circle. Below the circle, the letters 'OECD' are written in a sans-serif font.