

## Question and Evidence Matrix

As outlined in the terms of reference, the Australia review questions are comprised from three sources; update questions, Phase 2 Donor headquarter study questions, and Australia's own focus questions. They are amalgamated below into review questions 1-12, as follows:

- Questions 1-3 are the update questions set by the Core Evaluation Team
- Questions 4-11 are Phase 2 Donor headquarter study questions. Questions 4-8 below correspond with the Core Evaluation Team's core questions 1-5. Questions 9-11 correspond with core question 6 parts a, b and c.
- Question 12 parts a to c are the Australia focus questions

Australia Update Review Questions	Indicators	Sources of Evidence
1. What changes have been proposed and implemented following the Phase 1 Evaluation? 2. Did the Accra Agenda for Action provide further impetus to the Paris Declaration (PD) process and result in any specific changes? 3. What reporting has been made to domestic or international accountability structures on the implementation of the PD (with copies of the reports)?	Summary of evidence and findings from answering questions 4-7 below.	DAC Peer review, monitoring Survey, Annual Report, ARDE, Quarterly Effectiveness Update, ANAO report, DESC ToR, Country strategies, Program enabling policies, Budget, HR and OPS staff interviews, APPRs, Cairns Compact Reporting, OPS
4. What are the important factors that have affected the relevance and implementation of the Paris Declaration and its potential effects on aid effectiveness and development results? a) What are the key characteristics of the Australian aid program that have been most relevant to the implementation of the PD? b) Are Australian aid program polices coherent in their view on and approach to the PD? c) What is the range and sphere of the direct influence of the PD on government policies with implications for developing countries? d) Who are the key actors in Australia who take major decisions affecting aid, including decisions on priorities, activities, programs and projects? e) What are the most important national and international events that have affected the implementation of the PD and Accra priorities for Australia, and how? f) To what extent and where have the PD principles been implemented? (Brief overview)	a) Staff, Budget: Geographic spread of program; multi/bilateral share, and share provided to vertical funds. Aid modalities.  Percentage of budgets decided at field level; thresholds of expenditure for programs and projects b) Existence of a consultative framework where prospective policies can be discussed with regard to their possible impacts on developing countries. c) Volume of aid and other financial flows, where programmed (countries plus the perceived importance of the aid relationships with a particular country) d) Identify 'drivers of change/resistance' Who within AusAID 'owns' the PD/AAA agenda (is accountable)? Who reports on the performance of the PD and to whom?  Events and international and domestic policy processes referred to	DAC Peer review, monitoring Survey, Annual Report, ARDE, Quarterly Effectiveness Update, ANAO report, DESC ToR, Country strategies, Program enabling policies, Budget, HR and OPS staff interviews, ANAO staff survey, APPRs etc.

Australia Update Review Questions	Indicators	Sources of Evidence
<p>5. Assess the Australian aid program's commitment and leadership in relation to the PD principles.</p> <p>a) Has the implementation of the PD affected development partner development cooperation priority setting?</p> <p>b) How is the PD owned at Australian headquarters (AusAID) level? How is the PD acknowledged at governing body / parliamentary level and by civil society? What are the potential conflicts with other political / administrative systems, and what is being done to resolve these?</p> <p>c) Is Australia content that it is fulfilling its PD commitments including implementation of the DAC principles for good engagement in fragile states? (Explain possible concerns and reasons for these). Are there concerns about relevance and coherence of the Paris Declaration commitments and indicators? Are there ways in which these might be overcome?(NB slightly different wording to phase 1)</p> <p><i>Address leadership in terms of internal (political level, strategic/policy influence, operational implications) and external factors (peer pressure, impetus or constraints from civil society). Try to address limitations of Phase 1 study, including limited consideration of political level commitment and leadership.</i></p>	<p>a) Change in priorities, changes in staff profiles at country level and decisions making capacity.</p> <p>b) Existence of aid (management) guidelines and policies explicitly referring to the PD High level policy statement; parliamentary statement Existence of policy coherence body and analysis Civil Society PD related strategies / polices</p> <p>c) Staff perceptions, program reports, work of Fragility and Conflict group.</p>	<p>Parliamentary questions, media statements, DAC Peer review, monitoring Survey, Annual Report, ARDE, Quarterly Effectiveness update, ANAO report, DESC ToR, NGO/Civil society engagement policies, Country strategies, Cairns Compact reporting, HR, OPS, Corporate Reform &amp; Fragility and Conflict staff interviews, draft Workforce plan, Civil society engagement evaluation initial findings, SES Conference work program &amp; corporate reform processes</p>
<p>6. Assess the Australian aid program's capacity to implement the PD.</p> <p>a) What is the level of staff knowledge and understanding about aid effectiveness and its operational implications, particularly in the field?</p> <p>b) Have specific instructions, guidelines, operational directives, evaluation criteria been disseminated to staff to stimulate implementation of the PD implementation plan? Are the levels and skills of staff available to implement appropriate and adequate? (Note: Last part of 'e' is new for phase 2)</p> <p>c) How is delegated authority structured, and why? Have there been any changes to procedures to meet PD commitments? Is AusAID sufficiently decentralised (staff, resources, delegation of authority) to address field-based aid management in line with the PD?</p> <p><i>Consider capacity in terms of institutional (information, knowledge, resources, training, procedures and guidance, institutional set-up including decentralisation) and systemic capacity (factors that extend beyond the individual organisation or organisations that are responsible for the donor country's aid program e.g. the status of the organisation or the large number of agencies involved).</i></p>	<p>Use of a common survey questionnaire to capture understanding and knowledge within the aid program at field level and also between field and HQ staff.</p>	<p>ANAO staff survey &amp; report, DAC Peer review, monitoring Survey, Annual Report, ARDE, Quarterly Effectiveness update, DESC ToR, Country strategies, HR, OPS &amp; post staff interviews, draft workforce plan.</p>

Australia Update Review Questions	Indicators	Sources of Evidence
<p>7. Assess the incentives and disincentives to implement the PD within the Australian aid program.</p> <p>a) Are there specific incentives provided by the AusAID – e.g. for recruitment, performance assessment and training – for management and staff to comply with the PD objectives of ownership, harmonisation, alignment, results orientation and mutual accountability?</p> <p>b) Are there any perceived disincentives in respect of other Australian aid program priorities?(for example, excessive pressures for disbursement, AusAID’s fear of consequences of ‘problematic issues’ such as corruption, misuse of funds etc)</p> <p><i>Address at individual, agency and government levels, as outlined in the Core Evaluation Team’s Donor HQ Study Matrix guidance.</i></p>	<p>Perceived incentives and disincentives at individual, agency and government level</p>	<p>DAC Peer review, monitoring Survey, Annual Report, ARDE, Quarterly Effectiveness update, ANAO staff survey and report, DESC ToR, Country strategies, Cairns Compact reporting, Budget, HR and OPS and ministerial / SES staff interviews, APPR &amp; peer review process.</p>
<p>8. What is the impact of Australia’s efforts to implement the Paris Declaration on Australian partner countries’ development outcomes?</p> <p>a) Has the PD resulted in less duplication of efforts and rationalised, more cost effective donor/agency activities</p> <p>b) Can more collaborative donor/agency behaviour and reformed and simplified policies and procedures be observed?</p> <p>c) To what extent has the donor/agency provided more predictable and multi-year commitments on aid flows.</p> <p>d) Is the level of delegation to field staff adequate to ensure effective aid administration?</p> <p>e) What change in burden sharing?</p> <p>f) Country ownership over development – and donors “backing off”</p> <p>g) Sufficient integration of global programs</p> <p><i>While comprehensively addressing Q8, which addresses country outcomes, is beyond the scope of this update, comment will be made where existing evidence is relevant to the progress, or not, of implementation of the PD as relevant to the questions.</i></p>	<p>a) Articulation of relative strength/comparative advantage at global/country level? Evidence of reprogrammed aid according to statement of comparative advantage at corporate level (policy/principle/) Division of labour policy and experience, participation in (number of) formal Division of Labour arrangements across countries Proportion of programs/projects/to overall volume of aid Change in the practice of untied aid Monitoring Survey indicators 4, 9 &amp; 10 + new DOL report Refer to aid fragmentation concentration measure – sector and country (Country programmable Aid indicator) DAC</p> <p>b) Number of Australian lead arrangements and silent partnerships policy and experience Examples of delegated cooperation and JAS Extent to which action plans and reforms developed as part of Rome HLD have been implemented, policy and examples of harmonized arrangements</p> <p>c) Monitoring Survey indicator 7 Number of countries where aid is committed in multi-year frameworks Share/type of aid disbursed according to agreed disbursement schedules Commitment X/Spent Y over the ‘predictability horizon’</p>	<p>Relevant APPR and other evaluations, DAC Peer review, Monitoring Survey, Annual Report, ARDE, Quarterly Effectiveness update, ANAO report, Country strategies, Budget, HR, Post and OPS staff interviews, ODE commissioned studies including proliferation report, Working in Partner Systems guidance, Cairns Compact, PPDs.</p>

Australia Update Review Questions	Indicators	Sources of Evidence
	<p>Share / type of aid disbursed according to schedule Involvement in joint assessments</p> <p>d) Total number, diversity and gender expertise of technical staff at field level Share of aid committed at decentralised level</p> <p>e) (none suggested)</p> <p>f) Aid coordination groups led by Australia Participation by Australia Aid program strategy to increase alignment including process of preparing CAS Policy on re-allocation of resources as a result of changes to align to a county's NDS Corporate level policy on joint diagnostic reviews of country systems? Number of diagnostic reviews, joint and alone Joint indicators/conditions frameworks Corporate policy/strategy on capacity development of country systems?</p> <p>g) Global programs: Share of Australian aid budget provided through global programs; why – Strategies.</p>	
<p>9. What is the main problem facing Australia in fulfilling the PD commitment to managing for results?</p>	<p>Proportion of donor country plans which specify links between expenditure and results Proportion of donor results frameworks which reflect national results areas Joint initiatives for capacity development; Number of country capacity analysis undertaken/strategies developed; volume of support to capacity development objectives</p>	<p>DAC Peer review, monitoring Survey, Annual Report, ARDE, Quarterly Effectiveness update, ANAO report, DESC ToR, Country strategies, Cairns Compact reporting, staff interviews, including with ODE Performance Analysis Group and Fragility and Conflict group, ODE commissioned reports.</p>
<p>10. What arrangements or mechanisms for mutual accountability have been in place and how well are they working?</p>	<p>Regular reviews by parliament of donor policies, strategies, budgets and performance audit reports on use of aid publicly available, donor annual reports on aid flows and results Number of mutual assessments conducted based on partner country results reporting and information systems donor/agency strategies to tackle corruption Number of donor/agency investigations undertaken / completed Trend in corruption with aid money (from donor side)?</p>	<p>DAC Peer review, monitoring Survey, Annual Report, ARDE, Quarterly Effectiveness update, ANAO report, DESC ToR, Country strategies, staff interviews, including with ODE Performance Analysis Group and Fragility and Conflict group, ODE commissioned reports.</p>

Australia Update Review Questions	Indicators	Sources of Evidence
<p>11. What explains the lack of use of country systems even where these are considered relatively strong?</p>	<p>Diagnostic reviews on country systems/ reforms undertaken / used  shifts in donor country strategies / programs / expenditure reflect changes in government priorities  Is there a clear rationale for existing parallel PIUs?</p>	<p>DAC Peer review, monitoring Survey, Annual Report, ARDE, Quarterly Effectiveness update, ANAO report, DESC ToR, Country strategies, staff interviews, including with ODE Performance Analysis Group and Fragility and Conflict group, ODE commissioned reports.</p>
<p>12. How can Australia ‘do things the best way’ in relation to:</p> <p>a) Delivering aid in fragile states</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent are the enabling conditions (commitment and leadership, capacity, incentives) in place to improve aid effectiveness in fragile states?</li> <li>• Refer to Q 5c</li> </ul> <p>b) Scaling up</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What mechanisms or arrangements have been in place to maintain effectiveness during scaling up, how well are they working, and what lessons should be applied moving forward?</li> </ul> <p>c) Measuring performance on aid effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How far does our performance management system get us?</li> <li>• Are there changes evident?</li> <li>• Can we identify outcomes and data more easily than last time?</li> <li>• How well are existing efforts working, and what lessons should be applied moving forward?</li> </ul> <p><i>Leadership in relation to the Paris Declaration principles is addressed in question 5, and a similar focus should be used here in relation to parts a, b, &amp; c. The answer should explore leadership and how it is encountering or overcoming challenges to internalise the principles and demonstrate them in practice on these three issues. This is consistent with the study-wide focus on the input level through the assessment of enabling conditions (specifically leadership and commitment) with reference where appropriate to outputs or intermediate outcomes.</i></p>	<p>a) How well could the questions in this review be answered from existing reporting processes and reports? Have the existing reporting systems provided sufficient effectiveness information to meet information requests/demand from domestic and international stakeholders?</p> <p>b) Existence of policies and frameworks for scaling up that address effectiveness issues. Diagnostic reviews on progress and outcomes of scaling up.</p> <p>c) Refer to evidence from questions 1-5, with focus on fragile states evidence and case studies. Staff perceptions, program reports, work of Fragility and conflict group.</p>	<p>Reports: DAC Peer review, monitoring Survey, Annual Report, ARDE, Quarterly Effectiveness Updates, ANAO report, DESC ToR, Country Strategies, Cairns Compact reporting, staff interviews, including with ODE Performance Analysis Group, interviews with Fragility and Conflict group, ODE commissioned reports.</p>