

Study on the Demand and Supply of Evaluation/Evaluative Research in Selected Sub-Saharan African Countries

Revised Inception Report: 22 April 2013

**CENTRE FOR LEARNING ON EVALUATION AND RESULTS FOR ANGLOPHONE AFRICA
(CLEAR-AA) AT THE UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND¹**

¹ For more information on this study contact Stephen.Porter@wits.ac.za

Introduction	3
Background to the Study.....	3
Users and Dissemination of this Study	4
Guiding Questions and Purpose of the Study.....	4
Overall Framework of the Study	5
Theory of Change	9
Approach to the Research Process	11
Study Methodology	13
Outline Method	13
Stakeholder Groupings for the Interviews	15
Structuring the Country Case Studies.....	17
Annex I: References	19
Annex II: Guiding Research Framework.....	21
Annex III: Cases Selected during the Kick-off Workshop	25
Annex IV: Timeframe and Outputs.....	26

Introduction

The Regional Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results for Anglophone Africa (CLEAR-AA)^{2 3} is conducting a study on demand and supply of evaluation/evaluative research⁴ in a selection of Sub-Saharan African countries for the UK Department for International Development (DFID). The purpose of the study to lead to a better understanding of demand and supply factors in evaluation and evaluative research in these countries, to aid national stakeholders and those supporting them to better structure their assistance.

It should be noted that this study is neither an evaluation of evaluation capacity development (ECD) nor a meta-evaluation. Instead this is a study that maps the demand and supply for evaluation, the political context in which it unfolds, and illustrative cases.

The study runs from February to September 2013. The countries involved are Ethiopia, Ghana, Malawi, Rwanda, and Zambia.

To facilitate a level of commonality on the focus for the study, this document provides a broad guiding framework on the study approach, methodology and scope. In order to do this paper discusses: The background of the study; the research questions and purpose of the study; key issues to be considered in understanding national evaluation systems; the theory of change; and the studies tools.

Background to the Study

In Africa there is now evidence of emerging country-led demands for evaluation (Porter 2012), consistent with the general emphasis of the Paris Declaration on the use of country owned systems. However, understanding of how to identify and connect supply to these demands remains limited. Often analyses have not considered a full range of opportunities, and have instead focused exclusively on strengthening the executive functions for evaluation or areas where monitoring information can more easily be generated. Consequently, capacity development efforts on the demand and supply sides, amongst politicians and bureaucratic units, can be better informed by systems diagnostics.

Recent experience from both DFID and CLEAR-AA has highlighted the limitations of some of capacity development efforts in successfully connecting supply with demand and confirms the above analysis. As the DFID ToR noted evaluation is not, in general terms, well embedded within national systems of partner countries. Within CLEAR-AA we have recognised that although there is apparent demand for evaluation, the main response to incipient demands for evidence remains monitoring systems. This means that though there are 'M&E Units' in the heart of governments in Africa that ostensibly set the incentives for M&E and do evaluation, in reality most are units that collate monitoring information and conduct some analyses based on that information (CLEAR and DPME 2012). Meanwhile evaluations that are undertaken are

² CLEAR-AA is based at the Graduate School of Public and Development Management at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg. CLEAR-AA aims to enhance development anchored in learning, evaluation and results.

³ The team supporting this study are: Stephen Porter, Salim Latib, Osvaldo Feinstein and Anne McLennan from CLEAR-AA/Wits; and from the countries Mr. Oswald Mulenga (Zambia), Dr. Getnet Zewdu (Ethiopia), Mr Charles Gasana (Rwanda), Dr. Hannock Kumwenda (Malawi), Prof. Samuel Adams (Ghana)

⁴ From here on in the report we refer to evaluation as covering both evaluation and evaluative research.

sometimes delinked from the development context by being focused on exogenous requirements (AFREA 2002; Ofir et al. 2012).

As a result of these issues this study aims to map demand in the five countries noted above and in doing so identify latent and actual demand, the conditions under which demand is generated and potential sources of supply. In doing this it will build upon current M&E systems diagnostic experience, with an explicit sensitivity to the political economy context.⁵

Users and Dissemination of this Study

There are two sets of users of this study. The main users of this study are Evaluation Associations in the target countries, AfrEA, local governments, local development partners and CLEAR-AA. These are the primary users because they can most directly benefit from the study. We intend to keep them closely in the loop either asking for support, being part of data collection or arranging in-country feedback. The secondary users are the African Union Commission and development partners and donors that are potential and/or actual supporters of ECD in Africa (such as AfDB and other multilateral and bilateral donors, including DFID). CLEAR-AA will use this study to also further inform their ECD efforts in countries, as well as, developing further knowledge processes with the countries concerned.⁶

The secondary users have been identified based upon their interests in the results of the study. Although they have not had substantive input into the design and implementation of the study (except DFID) they are considered key points for dissemination in terms of knowledge and practice. The evaluation associations, for example, will have particular interests in the study on the basis that the findings may identify specific areas where evaluation could grow and help the associations think about areas of engagement with government. National governments have been informed of the studies and will have the study disseminated to them. Finally, it is intended to involve the ECD task team of the OECD-DAC evaluation network through a presentation and follow-up dissemination efforts, such as the final edited cases and synthesis report.

Guiding Questions and Purpose of the Study

In the light of the foregoing, and taking into account the primary objectives of the study, as indicated in the Terms of Reference, i.e., to understand in relation to evaluation/evaluative research:

- (i) The conditions under which demand is generated for evidence; and
- (ii) the areas in which supply can be strengthened to meet and foster this demand;

⁵ The initial literature review (that may be enlarged by participants as the study progresses) identified three sources focused on the political economy of evaluation: Jerker Carlsson, Gunnar Köhlin, and Anders Ekbohm, *The Political Economy of Evaluation: International Aid Agencies and the Effectiveness of Aid* (Macmillan Press Ltd., 1994). and Lant Pritchett, 'It Pays to Be Ignorant: A Simple Political Economy of Rigorous Program Evaluation', *The Journal of Policy Reform*, 5/4 (2002), 251-69., and to a lesser extent Pollitt, Bouckaert and van Dooren C. Pollitt, G. Bouckaert, and W. Van Dooren, *Measuring Government Activity* (Paris: OECD, 2009). More recent literature on political economy and the policy process, such as . Cristina Corduneanu-Huci, Alexander Hamilton, and Issel Masses Ferrer, *Understanding Policy Change: How to Apply Political Economy Concepts in Practice* (World Bank Publications, 2012)..will also be considered.

⁶ A possible follow-up to this study is to hold a similar knowledge sharing event with African governments to that held last March. This will be scoped out as the study unfolds.

The guiding questions for this study on demand for and supply of evaluation in a set of Sub-Saharan African countries are the following:

On the demand side,

- a) What has been the actual demand for evaluation from principal agents?
- b) Where is there latent and potential demand for evaluation?
- c) How is evaluation demanded in the current organisational arrangements?

On the supply side,

- d) What is the range and capacity of entities supplying evaluation services?
- e) How relevant are the managers and producers of evaluation to the actual demand for evaluation?

On matching evaluation supply and demand,

- f) Where can evaluation supply (actual, latent and potential) be strengthened so that it meets and fosters demand?

The overall contribution of this study is expected to enhance development practice in supporting country-led evaluation systems that interact with policy processes. The implementation of this study builds upon previous case studies facilitated by CLEAR-AA on monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems across six African countries, undertaken in partnership with the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) in the South African Presidency.⁷

Overall Framework of the Study

This section presents an overall framework for the study of demand and supply of evaluation/evaluation research, which includes the: (i) political context; (ii) conceptual framework to analyse the national evaluation system; (iii) role of policy processes in this study; (iv) definition of evaluation in this study; and finally (v) the definition of evaluation demand and supply.

(i) Political Context

Pervading the assessment of the national evaluation system within the study is an analysis of the political context. In order to analyse the political context the study defines the political economy within which decisions are made as the “social relations, particularly the power relations, that mutually constitute the production, distribution, and consumption of...[policy]” (Mosco 1996: 24). The study will call attention to the forces and processes at work in the broader nexus between policy and decision-making. The emphasis is hence on how and why government and political agents, the principal focus on the demand-side in this study, establish or modulate evaluation or evaluative perspectives within policy processes, how the production and response unfolds, and how the supply and distribution of evaluation is mediated in society. Central to this is also an understanding of how policy agents engage government, and themselves demand evaluation; and how the evaluation supply side needs to be

⁷ At <http://tinyurl.com/ac7ng7w>.

configured in order to interact with political agents, invoking and responding to various demands.⁸

(ii) Overall Conceptual Framework for National Evaluation Capacities

The National Evaluation Capacity (NEC) matrix, below, provides a conceptual map of the ‘principals’ and ‘agents’ involved in the study and is an indication of the scope of the study. This conceptual scheme recognises that there is a multitude of actual and potential actors who can supply and demand evaluation. Capacity in this scheme refers to individual, organisational and systems capacity. So, for example, in managing evaluations you require not only individuals who can manage evaluations, but also incentive structures to support evaluation to happen.

Table 1. National Evaluation Capacity matrix

Evaluation Practice Requiring Capacity	Government Agents - Delivery and Management (Central Government (Treasury etc.) Line departments (Health etc.).	Evaluation Community - Actual and Potential (Universities, think tanks, consultants)	Principal agents (Cabinet, Parliament, political parties, Civil Society, the media)
<i>Managing Evaluations (interface between supply and demand)</i>	I	II	III
<i>Conducting evaluations (Supply side)</i>	IV	V	VI
<i>Using Evaluations (Demand side)</i>	VII	VIII	IX

The Roman numerals are used to facilitate reference to the matrix’s cells. Thus, I is Government’s capacity to manage evaluations; IV is government’s capacity to conduct evaluations, and so on. This matrix allows consideration of different actual and possible scenarios. Thus, during the 1970s and 1980s, the emphasis of evaluation capacity development (ECD) was on conducting evaluations by government, sometimes with support from international organisations (so IV was the dominant cell of the matrix). In the 1990s, some developing countries (Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico) started to develop government based evaluation systems. Governments contracted out most of the evaluations and played a management role (shifting from cell IV to I).⁹ There has not been much involvement

⁸ Adapted from Feinstein (2011)

⁹ See Cunill Grau & Ospina (2008). As part of the process of creating and legitimising M&E systems, some countries like Colombia have a series of laws and decrees mandating evaluation, which could contribute to an enabling environment for NEC. However, as stated in Mackay (2007) “a law or decree on its own does not ensure that the considerable efforts required to build an M&E system will be undertaken”, whereas Cunill Grau & Ospina (2008) refer to the Brazilian and Chilean cases as two examples where systems were consolidated without a legal foundation. Taken together, these cases indicate that a legal framework is neither necessary nor sufficient for the

of parliaments or civil society in evaluations (traditionally weak second and third columns, except V). Early in the 21st century think tanks and universities have become more and more involved in conducting evaluations. However, ECD efforts have had only limited engagement with cells III, VI and IX, which are almost empty in most developing countries. Whereas cell V has become significant.¹⁰

Cells I, V, VII and IX (**in bold**), the diagonal of the matrix, are the backbone of critical national evaluation capacities that need to be mapped in this study.

There is a hierarchy within the backbone of the matrix. The interaction between different principal agents, as users of evaluation (cell IX), to a large extent conditions the responses of the two other sets of actors as managers, users and producers of evaluation (cells I, V, and VII). This is because the government agents and evaluation community need to be considered relevant and legitimate to the principal agents for them to at best use the evidence or at least even just allow evidence to be generated. In a society where there is greater pluralism in policy processes the management and production of evaluation can appeal to a variety of pathways of use in order to provide political cover. In contrast, where decision-making channels are limited the processes by which evaluation is managed and conducted can become tenuous depending on where political interest lies. For example, where policy process are more open, evidence highlighted by the media may influence political discussions, even when it may be at odds with the conventional wisdom; conversely in less open processes evidence that differs or threatens the party line within the media maybe perceived as a threat and lead to the neglect of evaluations.

This means that in studying the backbone of the matrix through the research questions, we need to establish an understanding of the policy space available and how this conditions the management and production of evaluation. In the research the links between the different role-players in the matrix is understood by identifying the relevance of *government agents* and the *evaluation community* are to the *principal agent*.

In addition to understanding the broad political economic and social context and configurations of relationships that shape how and what information feeds into policies and decisions in each of the boxes, it is imperative to understand what happens between the boxes - What links the users of evaluation to managers, and those conducting evaluations. This means that we need to study the evaluation practices that are embedded both in 'formalised' research initiatives and within 'informal' deliberative spaces. Whilst the study is primarily focused on enhancing formal evaluation practices, it also seeks to understand the less formalised spaces within which evaluations unfold in order to better shape interventions that close the evaluation quality gap and the breach that often exists between the supply and demand of evaluation.

The study thus encompasses three broad terrains of explorations. The first is the conditions and manner in which demand is generated for evidence – who are the users (especially champions) of evaluation and what gives rise to them; the second is the areas in which supply unfolds to respond to and shape the demand for evaluation; the third is how evaluation managers operate the interface between supply and demand.

(iii) Policy process

development of an M&E system, though it may be help to create an enabling environment for it, and for the enhancement of NEC.

¹⁰ With respect to cell VI, note that in some OECD countries supreme audit institutions, reporting to Parliaments, undertake performance audits, which are a type of evaluation.

Analysing the way a policy process take places helps us to understand the conditions under which policy agents arrive at using evaluation. Doing this analysis helps us to understand how national evaluation capacity is applied within the political context to support in-country demands for evidence.

Specifically, in this study we will be analysing policy processes and shifts. Evaluation can be applied to a routine process, like a budget or annual plan. For example, the reprioritisation of expenditure may take place based on the way that the policy is implemented. Typically, when evidence is applied in a process this represents an incremental step. Evidence may also be applied to change a policy, typically when a policy shift happens there is a more fundamental change taking place. Incremental and fundamental policy changes represent different opportunities for evidence to affect the situation (Carden 2009) and evaluation evidence can play a role in both.

(iv) Evaluation

In this study evaluation is defined in accordance with the OECD Development Assistance Committee (2002), as:

“The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors. Evaluation also refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of an activity, policy or program.”

In implementing this definition the evaluation community should aspire to the AfREA Programme Evaluation Standards (AFREA 2002): Utility, feasibility, property, and accuracy.

In this study we are particularly interested in the use and relevance of the evaluation. It is worth noting here that evaluation use can happen in a number of ways, be it: Instrumentally, by changing an intervention; enlightening people related to new ways to approach issues; mobilising internal support for change; or influencing others to change their ideas or approaches (Weiss 1998: 24). In analysing a policy process, in this study we need to see if an evaluation was put to use in any of these ways. Relevance is the extent to which the evaluation activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, whether principal agents or government (OECD 2002).

(v) Evaluation Demand and Supply

Demand and supply in this study are defined in terms of the NEC framework above. Principal and government agents are generally the demand-side of evaluation; the evaluation community is generally the supply-side. Delivery and management agents have a role in connecting the demand and supply sides. Although those managing evaluation have a bias towards demand, good evaluation managers need to be aware of the challenges of conducting evaluation

Demand for Evaluation: When decision makers want to use evidence to assist them in making decisions an actual, latent or potential demand arises (“latent” if the decision maker is not aware that evaluation can be a source of evidence, “potential” if there is an awareness but resources to fund the evaluation are lacking¹¹). Amongst

¹¹ For example, latent demand and potential demand may exist in a legislature where a faction of the ruling party wants to better understand why education is performing poorly. By introducing them to different evaluative methods that can help answer their questions they may demand evaluations.

different interest groups the configuration of demand may be different. For example, for the executive the focus may be more on improving performance, while the legislature might be focused on accountability.¹²

When demand for evaluation arises from the governance context in which it is operating, as opposed to arising from structures external to the system, such as donors, there is ownership of the evaluation, a critical factor to ensure its use. This argument is elaborated in a variety of forms in evaluation and capacity development literature (Bemelmans-Videc et al. 2003; Boyle and Lemarie 1999; Chelimsky 2006; Lopes and Theisoohn 2003; Mackay 2007; Picciotto 1995; Plaatjes and Porter 2011; Pollitt et al. 2009; Toulemonde 1999; Vedung 2003; Wiesner 2011).

In order to analyse demand there is a need to build an understanding of the overall governance system and the formal and informal influences that shape decision-making, as reflected in policy, planning and budgetary choices. Decision-making is further determined by the nature of the political system, the formalised decision structures, the influence of donors, key decision-makers, and other formal and informal influences that shape demand.

Supply of evaluation: Those who conduct evaluation are the supply-side. A supply-side capacity development approach typically focuses on putting in place people who are trained, to collect, capture and verify data. However, this approach is insufficient to ensure evidence use. Credible data does not mean that it is relevant to the existing political context. The supply of evaluation is predicated on the existence of frameworks, institutions and resources for evaluation. Those supplying evaluation need to understand the legal, policy, institutions and strategic framework that facilitate supply, the system for commissioning, designing and disseminating credible evaluation and the wider capacities for generating commissioner and non-commissioned evaluations. The NEC matrix clarifies that evaluation supply in this study we are focusing on is the evaluation community.

Theory of Change

Outcome for embedded National Evaluation Capacity Development: A well functioning evaluation system that supplies high quality evaluations¹³, responding to demand in accordance with the political context and interacting with policy processes

The assumptions implicit in this outcome statement relevant for mapping evaluation demand and supply are as follows:

- A policy process presents an opportunity to actualise potential and latent evaluation demand
- Political context issues affect the demand for, and supply of, evaluation/evidence
- There is sufficient actual evaluation supply in-country that can be mobilised for policy processes in accordance with the political context.

The elements of a theory of change supporting movement towards the development of evaluation supply and demand can briefly be summarised as follows (in reference to the NEC matrix):

¹² For an elaboration of different types of evaluations used in Congress see Eleanor Chelimsky, 'The Purpose of Evaluation in a Democratic Society', in Ian Shaw, Jennifer C. Green, and Melvin M. Mark (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Evaluation* (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2006).

¹³ Taking into account Norm 8 of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) "Norms for Evaluation in the UN System".

DEMAND FOR EVALUATION

DE.1 Interest in evidence to inform policy processes (Principal agents, Government agents)

DE.2 Realisation that evaluation is a source of evidence (P, G)

DE.3 Availability of funds to contract evaluations (P, G)

SUPPLY OF EVALUATION

SE 1 Capacity to conduct evaluations

1.a Actual Capacity (Evaluation Community)

1. b Potential Capacity (EC)

SE 2 Capacity to manage evaluations

2.a Actual capacity (Government agents)

2.b Potential capacity (G)

(DE & SE) → Use of evaluation for policy making

The key assumptions that underlie the elements of the theory of change is that:

- In demand constrained environments there are sources of potential and latent demand, which need to be invoked.
- Supply can invoke potential and latent demand if it is relevant to principal agents' political context and policy questions

The elements of the theory of change can be restated as a process:

- If potential users of evaluation come to recognise that they can affect policy processes to their benefit through using evaluation, then they will demand evaluation (DE1, 2 and 3)
- If managers and conductors of evaluation have the capacity, political understanding and funds, then they respond to the demand from users (SE1 and SE2);
- If commissioning and use of evaluation becomes widespread, then virtuous cycles of evaluation capacity development take place, leading to more institutionalised evidence-based practice (DE& SE).

Key hypothesis: When there is an active demand for evaluation, and evaluation supply, evaluations will be conducted and used.

In this study we aim to map how the key elements and process of the theory of change unfold. The research questions stated earlier in this report guide us in this regard.

Reflecting upon literature focused on understanding how scientific and evaluative research affects policy consistently highlights two main issues: First, that there needs to be regard that evaluation is a social process, and second that researchers (evaluators) need to be alive to understanding the how to make the social process work. For example, Nutley, Walter and Davies (2007) reinforced that whether a researcher is seeking a consensual, contentious or paradigm shifting work, they need to develop networks of practitioners who are supportive. What changes is the manner in which they attempt to develop the network. Nutley *et al* (2007) also reinforce that getting research into practice is a complex, unpredictable, iterative process. Jasanoff's (2013) work co-production of knowledge is also very much focused on understanding the complex social dynamic of knowledge production. Empirically, the importance of attempting to connect evaluation supply and demand is demonstrated in adaptive management for environmental conservation (Clark *et al.* 2006; Lee 1999).

Fully reviewing the literature on the subject of research into policy prior to this study is difficult due to its range. What we need to recognise is that pathways of knowledge into practice are context dependent. This study will focus upon mapping the strategies, challenges and successes of the supply of evaluation in connecting to managers and users of evaluation in the case countries given their complex circumstance. The short case studies that map how evaluation did or did not affect policy will be revealing in this regard.

Approach to the Research Process

Of critical importance in this study is that the analysis flows from mapping and analysing the current arrangements of demand and supply, to illustrating actual cases where evaluation is being used in a policy process. In doing this the study is both widely exploratory and substantively detailed in orientation. It is exploratory as it seeks to understand the incentives and opportunities that shape the nature of the supply of and demand for evaluation within the national context. It is also detailed in that it seeks to build a substantive explanation of evaluations that have had positive policy value and those that have failed.

The study thus has a macro- and sector/area-level focus and broadly includes two main units of analysis and/or exploration:

- (i) **Mapping the National System:** The evaluation system as it currently stands at the national level. This means mapping the demand for evaluation in government and amongst principals, while also mapping the supply of evaluation in terms of government managers and those who conduct evaluations. In doing this we need to analyse the relevance of supply to demand. Working in this way helps to identify the links between the overall political economy of the country and the systemic elements on the demand and supply side of evaluation.
- (ii) **Cases of Policy Engagement:** A selection of useful cases of 'policy engagement' will be made related to the criteria outlined below. These will be sector focused (e.g. child nutrition and child immunisation programmes within the health sector), policy areas or in generic areas (i.e. budgeting reform, capacity building, results based reforms, planning interventions)

Working at these two levels will enable us to develop a substantive example based perspective on the overall national evaluation system. By reviewing useful policy processes as it relates programme evaluations at a sector or generic level it is

anticipated that the study will reveal what success and challenges looks like on the demand and supply sides of the study. In doing this we will be able to identify *the conditions under which demand is generated for evidence and supply optimised*.

The demand side mapping will mainly be focused on principal and government agents. To narrow the scope on the mapping of the supply side of the national evaluation system, the study will primarily map the national evaluation community (as per the elements of the theory of change). It will also look at the evaluative research being conducted by the social science communities in the country, recognising that the evaluation profession and its methodologies tends to be led by certain disciplines, namely economics, sociology and related social sciences. The actual, potential and latent demand and supply will be analysed as the basis for possible capacity strengthening towards providing better quality and relevant evaluations and evaluative products of public policies and investments. The scheme for mapping the National System is presented in Annexure 2.

Given the nature of the study and the challenges of identifying cases of policy processes to incorporate, the final choice will be based on deliberations with key stakeholders (between the researchers, evaluation associations and DFID).

The following specific criteria would be used for determine which policy cases would be explored:

- 1) There should be a minimum of four policy cases to ensure that a substantive understanding is developed of policy supply and demand
- 2) The cases should balance the presentation of evaluations that have been useful and those where politics closed down the space for use. It is important, if possible, that at least one case shows how supply can invoke latent demand.
- 3) The case should relate to issues identified in the political analysis about the relevance of supply to demand.
- 4) The policy cases presented should ideally incorporate both sector based initiatives and generic processes (i.e. budget process, PRSPs, financial management reform, public sector management reform including RBM). For example, there could be cases related to each the national planning and budgeting processes, a third case exploring an educational policy (i.e. universal primary education), and the fourth, about agricultural policy.
- 5) The policy cases should ideally be endogenous in terms of funding
- 6) The cases explored should identify areas where future investments in evaluation supply (both conducting and management could be made)

The analysis of the case should describe briefly the actual evaluations. The primarily focus of the analysis should be on the relationships between the different units within the backbone of the NEC Matrix. Cases that were initially selected during the kick-off workshop are presented in Annexure 3.

It is further anticipated that the case would be depicted as focused boxed example in the narrative of the country case study. Details on the different sections of the anticipated study report are reflected in sections that follow. By subsequently or in parallel conducting data collection and analysis at the level of the country system we may then be able to assess the extent to which 'good examples' are replicated at the country systems level. It should be recognised that the formalised evaluation systems in the countries are emergent. This means that we will need to understand how more or less formalised evaluation has historically unfolded, and the important role-players in the process. Through this process we will then be able to identify the

areas in which *supply can be strengthened to foster demand*, thereby enhancing development practice.

Study Methodology

The DFID ToR indicates that the study should be carried out through a combination of desk review, including an analysis of existing evaluation/evaluation research products, and direct semi-structured interviews with a selection of informants across critical stakeholder groupings. The rest of this section presents the broad methodology of the study, and provides details on the stakeholder groups that would be engaged with, as well as of the different stages in the research process.

Outline Method

The NEC matrix established for the study is directed at providing the framework for the collection and collation of relevant information in key areas of evaluation. In keeping with this, the study methodology will encompass the following overlapping stages: 1) Establishing study commitment and support from key stakeholders. 2) Collating and analysing primary and secondary data and information of the evaluation system (including available academic and popular literature). 3) Conducting a series of interviews with actors that fall within the space established through the broad conceptual map. 4) Producing a draft paper. Each of these stages is discussed in more detail below.

1) **Stage one: Establishing support from key stakeholders:** Given the nature of the study, an important initial step in the study process is to secure a level of buy-in and commitment from relevant national stakeholders. Whilst the study will be conducted independently, it is preferable that there is some level of active buy-in from key stakeholders in government and the evaluation community, because the study may have direct relevance for government departments or sections dealing with evaluations across the system. The research approach (Annexure II) outlines the strategies that will be undertaken to secure their active buy-in and to enhance the prospects of getting access to relevant data and information. In this way, to the extent feasible, the approach and ethos of the study would be one of securing interest so that the results of the research feed into policy processes and influence future efforts within the capacity-development fold. Prior to the study, there will be formal correspondence with key actors in government and outside. Key actors and stakeholders will also be engaged with to secure interest and active cooperation.

2) **Stage two: Collating and analysing secondary data and information:** The collation of and analysis of secondary data will encompass relevant information relating to the political context and the demand and supply side of evaluation. It should include information on the policy processes and actors within the context; the legal frameworks and related documents pertinent to evaluation; data on the institutions active in evaluation, including data on size and scope of initiatives within government and the supply that emanates from outside of government. This initial analysis will draw on evidence available on the Internet and in country documents that can be sourced by the researchers. Included in this stage will be familiarisation with the country research teams on the study approach, especially in regards to the NEC matrix. Within this process a choice will be made on the policy cases that would be explored for more in-depth analysis. The literature review will include primary and secondary sources, collecting documents from sources in-country. The national researchers will prepare a list of documents, including “grey literature” (reports prepared by government and international agencies), which the full team will take

into account and eventually expand, complementing this in country search with an internet search, addressing questions such as those indicated below.¹⁴

On the demand side,

- a) What has been the actual demand for evaluation from principal agents?
 - i. Review of national development policy/strategy
 - ii. Review of budget priorities
 - iii. Examples of nationally commissioned and completed evaluations
 - iv. Evidence in media internet sources of use of evidence
 - v. Identification of institutional commissions that utilise evidence in decision-making
- b) Where is there latent and potential demand for evaluation?
 - i. Identification of legal mechanisms that support the demand for evaluation (e.g. constitution or committee structures in parliament)
 - ii. Identification of political structures that can legitimately contest policy
- c) How is evaluation demanded in the current organisational arrangements?
 - i. Identification of any government frameworks for evaluation (especially in reference to sectors where there are existing social science research journals)
 - ii. Identification of political processes into which evidence has been used

On the supply side,

- d) What is the range and capacity of entities supplying evaluation services?
 - i. Review main types of academic journals
 - ii. Identification of any University or management courses in evaluation, the level and where they are offered
 - iii. Review of evaluation association website/documents
 - iv. Review of research institute websites/in-country analysis
 - v. Identification of consultancy companies
- e) How relevant are the managers and producers of evaluation to the actual demand for evaluation?
 - i. Identification of government sponsored research initiatives
 - ii. Identification of the traits that make preferred researchers/evaluators legitimate

On matching evaluation supply and demand,

- f) Where can evaluation supply (actual, latent and potential) be strengthened so that it meets and fosters demand?
 - i. Identification of mismatches between national development demand and current supply

¹⁴ In conducting the literature review reference will be made to guidance on literature reviews, such as, Patricia Cronin, Frances Ryan, and Michael Coughlan, 'Undertaking a Literature Review: A Step-by-Step Approach', *British Journal of Nursing*, 17/1 (2008), 38 - 43.

- ii. Review of principal agents not current involved in evaluation efforts

3) **Stage three: Interviews with key informants:** In alignment with the literature review in stage two, a series of interviews will be arranged with key in-country stakeholders. In each interview instance the purpose of the study would be explained as part of the effort of securing buy-in on the value of the study. It is proposed that interviews be tailored to probe on gap in information related to the initial literature review. In particular issues of potential and latent demand and the ability of supply to invoke demand through its relevance demand are likely to need to be explored through the interview process due to limitations in documentation. In addition, filling out gaps in the cases will need to be achieved through the interview process (on occasions a focus group of 6 people or less could be undertaken e.g. with donor organisations.) As noted by Stanfield (2000), if one begins with deep probing questions people will not be fully engaged. Data collection will need to take place in a lightly-structured fashion that allows people to narrate their story – with some probing taking place based upon the guiding supply and demand questions. The country literature review would serve to guide the initial approach at the national level. The data from interviews would need to be analysed after interviews with emerging conclusions refined as the study progresses.

4) **Stage four: Production of a draft and final country report:** Following the completion of first draft of the first case by the country researcher, following review by and input from the CLEAR-AA counterpart, the study report will be reviewed internally and externally. After finalisation of the draft of the first two cases the three other cases will be implemented with only internal reviews taking place. Only when the report is at a sufficient standard will it be submitted to DFID for review. Due to the short timelines on this project, a project manager will follow-up with country researchers for weekly reports on progress. The lead researchers will be the point persons for checking that the methodology and synthesis process meet international standards. Meetings between members of the CLEAR-AA team will provide an opportunity for checking on adherence to quality issues. CLEAR-AA will check that the information being presented is original and correctly referenced. In addition to these mechanisms CLEAR-AA may use specialists available through the CLEAR global programme as well as its partnership with the BetterEvaluation initiative in the review processes.

The CLEAR-AA team will then be responsible for developing a synthesis report that captures and considers the trends and contrasts emanating from the five country studies, and elicits insights – including adjustment of refinement of the prior conceptual map – towards conclusions.

Stakeholder Groupings for the Interviews

The following groupings of stakeholders provide a broad indication of those actors that are closely linked to evaluation demand and supply. The exact stakeholders to be interviewed will be premised upon the initial literature review and the selected cases.

1) **Principal Agents**

- a) **Political executive/Legislature:** This includes individuals and formations that are strategic in the policy construction and resource allocation process within the country. These include, where possible, Members of Cabinet level structures, Committees, and Ministers, or senior policy advisors. It may also incorporate structures within the political space that are closely tied to the political executives, such as in-party structures that shape policy choices prior to this being formally addressed within the Political Executive.

- b) **Non-executive political leaders:** Individuals and formations (and their advisors) that have an influence over or responsibility for policy, but that do not have executive authority or responsibility. These include influential government and opposition party members, and legislators.
 - c) **Civil society organisations:** These would include organisations that are specifically geared towards influencing government policies and choices, and perhaps conducting evaluation for government. They may include CSOs, business organisations, the media and trade unions.
 - d) **Media:** Depending on the evidence that emerges from the literature review the media, may be identified as potential of latent demand for evaluation. In this case they would need to be interviewed to understand how connections could be better supported.
- 2) **Government Agents**
- a) **Senior policy and implementation public servants:** Individuals who are directly involved in shaping plans and implementation strategies and line department officials who are directly involved in the overall government-wide planning and evaluation process, and its use (e.g. Treasury). This should ideally be those at the centre of administrative policy and plan construction and those who are or could be involved in commissioning evaluation.
 - b) **Donors and multilaterals:** These are organisations indirectly involved in government's budget process and more directly in programme support. Many are active in the PRSP and related planning processes and may commission evaluations with government. Some of them may have provided technical assistance for evaluation capacity building.
- 3) **Evaluation Community**
- a) **Government-established think tanks and support institutions:** These are institutions created by government for 'independent' advice on policy and may include special university centres, the Public Service Commissions and related statutory type institutions or institutions that have emerged to support the ruling party etc.
 - b) **Evaluators:** These people are the likely supply side of evaluation outside of government agencies, which have undertaken evaluation either for the government or on government programmes. Experienced informants will be prioritised.
 - c) **Academic Research:** These are organisations and people engaged in research or evaluative research that is feeding the policy discourse, either through routine mechanisms or occasional research.

Engagements with these stakeholders' groupings would serve to provide a substantive understanding of both demand and supply and their constitutive capacity elements. However, given the complexities of evaluation practice in different contexts, the role and efficacy of each of the stakeholders will vary and some are likely to emerge as being more significant than others.

The Table in Annexure 2 provides a broad indication of the questions that need to be answered to map the evaluation supply and demand arrangements amongst different stakeholders. A restricted number of follow-up interviews by the national consultant may arise, to ensure that critical information is sourced. In addition to the stakeholders to be interviewed for understanding the overall evaluation system, a minimum of three interviews is anticipated for each of the policy shift examples.

Structuring the Country Case Studies

The overall framework for the structuring of each of the case studies is broadly captured here to facilitate a consistent writing approach across all case studies. Establishing a consistent structure for all of the case studies is essential as it would serve to ensure that an appropriate understanding is achieved of all of the cases and that the information needs of the reader are catered to and that comparability is maximised. It is expected that each case–study would be no longer than 15 000 to 20 000 words long (approx. 25 to 30 pages).

This structure is consistent with the framework established to guide the process of developing and understanding the supply and demand for evaluation. The framework is intended to provide guidance rather than constrain innovation. It is expected that each of the country papers are standalone studies structured as ‘policy influencing’ papers publishable as journal articles, rather than as ‘consultancy’ oriented report with recommendations. Issues of methodology and approach to the study, where necessary, should be included as footnotes and references and need not be stated, unless deemed necessary, in the body of the paper. Self-crafted (not copy and paste) diagrams may be used to explain systems where necessary. The paper would include the following sections:

Broad title	Contents
Executive summary	The Executive Summary should encourage review of the report, by providing its core messages, including an overview of the paper and its key findings.
Introduction	<p>The introduction should give a broad overview of the main issues and findings of the study.</p> <p>The introduction should include an overview of the institutions interviewed, a high-level map of supply and demand (government agencies, research bodies, universities and advisory bodies). The influence of donors and other agencies would also shape an understanding of the changing trajectory of evaluation and policy making in the country.</p> <p>Finally, this section would include an overview of the overall structure of the report.</p>
Country context and development trajectory	<p>This section would entail a broad description of the country and its overall developmental history and trajectory. This should incorporate a broad introductory historical overview of the evolution of policy making within the country and the influences that have featured in the current policy process, including where relevant, structures that have emerged to support the policy process.</p> <p>Of particular importance are the overall changes in the political context and how these have reshaped the amenability for outside influences and voices on the policy process.</p>
The current state of evaluation in the country and a mapping of the evaluation supply and demand system in the	This section would comprise a detailed description of the state of evaluation in the country. It should include evaluation practices as they emerge within the governance system as well as those in the wider developmental terrain. The description should provide the broader trajectories of

country	<p>evaluation within and outside of government and the points of intersection between government initiatives and policy processes and society.</p> <p>The supply and demand section of the report will be shaped in accordance with the answers to the research questions and sub-questions contained in Annexure II.</p>
Cases of the relationship between policy processes and evaluation	<p>This section would serve to incorporate an analytical characterisation of policy cases to illustrate issues with the evaluation system. This section will be guided by responses to the generic questions contained in Annexure II.</p>
Challenges and opportunities for evaluation practice	<p>The section would focus on the opportunities that exist for strengthening the link between demand and supply, including opportunities for nurturing demand and enhancing supply, so that the gaps (if any) may be closed. The focus here would be on the pathways for evaluators to connect supply to demand. The section would comprise an assessment of the systemic supply and demand challenges. This should include an understanding of the shape of the policy process, the points of entry for evaluation and the possibilities for reshaping policy practices to facilitate evidence based decision-making.</p> <p>This section should provide a perspective on interventions that would assist to shape or reshape evaluation policy and practice within the national context. Whilst using recommendation type orientation, it should read as exploratory ideas and strategies for the future. Highlight, where relevant, the political, social and economic conditions and constraints with the national context.</p>
Bibliography	<p>Please closely follow the examples in the References at Appendix 4, especially capitalisation and punctuation. Notice:</p> <p>Titles of books and journals: Initial capitals for substantive words.</p> <p>Titles of journal articles or chapters within collections: Capital at the outset, and after a colon; then generally lower case except, e.g., for names.</p> <p>Chapters in edited volumes: See example, e.g. Plaatjies (2011).</p> <p>Unpublished reports and manuscripts: See example, Heather and Peter (2008).</p> <p>Documents from websites: See example, UN (2010).</p> <p>Citations in the text and footnotes: See the examples on p. 4 of this document.</p>

Annex I: References

- AFREA (2010), 'The African Evaluation Guidelines', accessed 02/03.
- Bemelmans-Videc, ML, Rist, RC, and Vedung, E (2003), *Carrots, sticks, and sermons: Policy instruments and their evaluation* (New Brunswick: Transaction).
- Boyle, Richard and Lemarie, Donald (1999), *Building Effective Evaluation Capacity: Lessons From Practice* (London: Transaction Publishers).
- Carden, Fred (2009), *Knowledge to policy: making the most of development research* (Sage Publications Pvt. Limited).
- Carlsson, Jerker, Köhlin, Gunnar, and Ekblom, Anders (1994), *The political economy of evaluation: International aid agencies and the effectiveness of aid* (Macmillan Press Ltd.).
- Chelimsky, Eleanor (2006), 'The purpose of evaluation in a democratic society', in Ian Shaw, Jennifer C. Green, and Melvin M. Mark (eds.), *The Sage handbook of evaluation* (Thousand Oaks: Sage).
- CLEAR, Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results and DPME, The Presidency Republic of South Africa Department: Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (2012), 'African Monitoring and Evaluation Systems: Exploratory Case Studies', (Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand).
- Committee, Development Assistance (2002), 'Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management', (Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development).
- Corduneanu-Huci, Cristina, Hamilton, Alexander, and Ferrer, Issel Masses (2012), *Understanding Policy Change: How to Apply Political Economy Concepts in Practice* (World Bank Publications).
- Cronin, Patricia, Ryan, Frances, and Coughlan, Michael (2008), 'Undertaking a literature review: a step-by-step approach', *British Journal of Nursing*, 17 (1), 38 - 43.
- Feinstein, Osvaldo (2011) "On the Development of National Evaluation Capacities" Presentation at the Cambridge Judge Business School workshop on "Evidence-Based Policy-Making And The Real World – A Difficult Match?"
- Jasanoff, Sheila (2013), 'The Idiom of Co-Production', *States of Knowledge: the Co-production of Science and the Social order* (London: Routledge).
- Lopes, C and Theisohn, T (2003), *Ownership, Leadership and Transformation: Can We Do Better for Capacity Development?* (Earthscan/James & James).
- Mackay, Keith (2007), *How to Build M&E Systems to Better Support Government* (Washington: World Bank).
- Mosco, Vincent (1996), *The political economy of communication: Rethinking and renewal* (13: Sage Publications Limited).
- Nutley, Sandra M, Walter, Isabel, and Davies, Huw TO (2007), *Using evidence: How research can inform public services* (Bristol: The Policy Press).
- OECD, DAC (2002), *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management* (Paris: OECD).
- Ofir, Zenda, et al. (2012), 'Proposal: African Thought Leaders Forum on Evaluation and Development', (Johannesburg: CLEAR, AfrEA, University of the Witwatersrand).
- Picciotto, Robert (1995), 'Introduction: Evaluation and development', *New Directions for Evaluation*, 1995 (67), 13-23.
- Plaatjies, Daniel and Porter, Stephen (2011), 'Delivering on the Promise of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation ', in Daniel Plaatjies (ed.), *The Future Inheritance: Building State Capacity in Democratic South Africa* (Johannesburg: Jacana).
- Pollitt, C., Bouckaert, G., and van Dooren, W. (2009), *Measuring Government Activity* (Paris: OECD).

- Porter, Stephen (2012), 'The Growing Demand for Monitoring and Evaluation in Africa', in Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results CLEAR (ed.), *African Monitoring and Evaluation Systems: Exploratory Case Studies* (Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand).
- Pritchett, Lant (2002), 'It pays to be ignorant: a simple political economy of rigorous program evaluation', *The Journal of Policy Reform*, 5 (4), 251-69.
- Toulemonde, J (1999), 'Incentives, Constraints and Culture-building as Instruments for the Development of Evaluation Demand', in R Boyle and D Lemaire (eds.), *Building Effective Evaluation Capacity: Lessons from Practice* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers).
- Vedung, E (2003), 'Policy instruments: typologies and theories', in ML Bemelmans-Videc, RC Rist, and E Vedung (eds.), *Carrots, sticks, and sermons: Policy instruments and their evaluation* (New Brunswick: Transaction), 21-58.
- Weiss, Carol H. (1998), 'Have We Learned Anything New About the Use of Evaluation?', *American Journal of Evaluation*, 19 (1), 21-33.
- Wiesner, Eduardo (2011), 'The Evaluation of Macroeconomic Institutional Arrangements in Latin America', in Ray C Rist, Marie-Helene Boily, and Frederic Martin (eds.), *Influencing change: evaluation and capacity building driving good practice in development and evaluation* (Washington: World Bank).

Annex II: Guiding Research Framework

The following table outlines key questions and processes for each of the four stages of the study.

<p>Stage one: Establishing support from key stakeholders</p> <p>CLEAR-AA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Letters of introduction sent to the local evaluation association• Letters of introduction sent by the local DFID to key stakeholders• Brief AFDB/AU on the progress of the work, get feedback during the pre-country study phase• Put into motion initial dissemination work, including the synthesis and dissemination workshop in Ghana.• Put into motion publication strategy• Establish with government a process to host a publication workshop. <p>Local Researchers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conduct initial briefs with person's within government, while setting-up interviews and gathering initial documentation• Brief local evaluation association on the basis of the letter, attain level of local support <p>DFID</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Brief local development partners structures on evaluation on the basis of inception report in study countries• Brief international stakeholders (reference group and OECD) to the study on revised timeline
<p>Stage two: Collating and analysing secondary data and information¹⁵</p> <p>1. Mapping the National System:</p> <p>Overall policy environment Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">i. What's the country's historical background?ii. What is the political balance between executive, legislature, judiciary, political party and civil society?iii. What are the dominant political decision-making bodies?iv. How much is the government budget of the last three years?v. What proportion of the national budget over the past three years is development aid?vi. What are the countries trends in composite categories of the Mo Ibrahim index?vii. How decentralised in the policy environment? <p>a. What has been the actual demand for evaluation from principal agents?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">i. Who are the current champions for evaluation in the country? (See Table 1)ii. What are the important elements in the political context that condition the demand of evaluation (e.g. leadership, form of government, history of

¹⁵ Documents reviewed in this section should refer to the broad outline established in the body of the report

- evidence usage)?
- iii. How does the system deal with evaluation information that is critical of the state?
 - iv. Who promotes the use of evaluations?
- b. Where is there latent and potential demand for evaluation?
- i. Where are the spaces for competing policy perspectives?
 - ii. To what extent is the system open to new knowledge and evidence?
- c. How is evaluation demanded in the current organisational arrangements?
- i. What is the ACTUAL story concerning the evolution of evaluation demand?
 - ii. What current public sector reforms are taking place? (E.g. linked to performance budgeting, results-based management, evidence based policy)
 - iii. Who acts as a central government commissioning unit for high-quality evaluations?
 - iv. How is evaluation being financed, and staffed?
 - v. What are the structured or informal relationship between academics and Government that demonstrate a level of collaboration to influence policy?
 - vi. What (if any) are the legal provisions for evaluation to be conducted?
 - vii. What are the incentives that drive the system (carrots, sticks and sermons)? Are these formalised or informal?
 - viii. What frameworks do government agents need to work with when conducting evaluation?
 - ix. What are the main aspects of public sector management that evaluations supports (Budget decision making, National/sector planning, Program management, Accountability relationships)
 - x. What are the formalised links between evaluation and budgeting?
- d. What is the range and capacity of entities supplying evaluation services?
- i. What forms of evaluation are undertaken by in country agents (impact, implementation, monitoring systems development)?
 - ii. Are there established Policy Fora that bring together analysts and officials on a regular basis?
 - iii. What capacity development efforts for evaluation have been undertaken?
 - iv. Are there institutions/ organisations/ individuals with experience to contract, manage and/or conduct evaluations?
 - v. Who are the main suppliers of evaluative research in the social sciences sector?
- e. How relevant are the managers and producers of evaluation to the actual demand for evaluation?
- i. Who are the main roleplayers in the 'evaluation market'?
 - ii. What is the relationship of the main think tanks in the country to the political context?
 - iii. How active are the evaluation associations regarded by within the political context?
- f. Where can evaluation supply (actual, latent and potential) be strengthened so that it meets and fosters demand?
- i. In what areas of social science research is there particularly strong demand for evaluation?

2. Areas of Policy Engagement

- a. What are the priority policy projects currently in the country?
 - i. What evaluations are currently being implemented that link to the priority policy projects in the country?
- b. Who are the major role players in defining the trajectory of policy?

- c. Who actually controls the annual budget process?
- d. What are the tactics that the evaluation community has undertaken to interact with demand?
- e. How is evaluation demanded in the current arrangements?
 - i. What are the examples of high-stakes evaluations that have been carried out
 - ii. Who demanded the evaluations (which policy and delivery agents?)?
 - iii. In what policy areas have there been regular evaluations and who were the intended users and who has managed these?
- f. How was the evaluation used (e.g. instrumentally in budget decisions, enlightenment, mobilising support internally, influencing others externally)?

Stage three: Interviews with Key Informants

It should be noted that individual interview schedules and questions will be developed out of the initial country review and policy case studies selected. Below is an illustrative list of questions that will need to be further specified in relation to the initial research. Some of these questions will be more directed to the national system and others to specific policy processes

- a. Principal Agents:**
 - i. Why would people commission evaluation during policy processes?
 - ii. When is evaluation used for policy?
 - iii. Who in the legislature and executive is interested in undertaking evaluations?
- b. Government Agents**
 - i. What are the main influences on policy processes?
 - ii. How do the central government departments use evaluation?
 - iii. How are you involved in the management of evaluation?
- c. Evaluation Community**
 - i. How are evaluators/researchers involved in policy processes?
 - ii. How do those who develop policy use evaluation?
 - iii. What important evaluations have or have not been useful for policy?

Principles of the Key Informant Interviews

- A (self-) critical perspective: Both good and not-so-good practices should be explored.
- Tell the story of the practice: The perspectives of the various stakeholders are important. Possible differences in opinions should be explained.
- Be short, but concise: The primary audience of the cases has very limited time. Accordingly, very direct high-quality analysis of immediate usefulness needs to be prepared.
- Consider the context: The cases should embed their analysis in the overall policy process, especially the role of incentives and interests of those involved in the policy.
- Informality matters: Often lacking systematization, success in institutionalizing good practice relies on informal aspects, such as individual leadership, consensus-building among key players, or creative response to the existing policy and institutional constraints. These aspects need to be explored.
- Independence of research: Despite close interaction the authors shall commit to maximum independence and rigour. Indeed understanding what has not worked as well as what worked is of high analytical value and should be fully addressed.
- Comprehensiveness: The research questions are closely inter-linked, and should be analyzed from a comprehensive perspective.

- Explaining lessons learned: Understanding what has worked is a key objective. It is important to fully analyze and explain the reasons as well as the implications of why something has happened.

Stage four: Production of a draft and final country report

Given the data collected in Stage II and III. Information will be synthesised and delivered as per the overall framework for the country reports as per the inception report. This will be related to the elements of the theory of change in order to identify possible pathways to improve evaluation use in the targeted countries.

Annex III: Cases Selected during the Kick-off Workshop

The following table represents the initial cases of interest that illustrate successes and challenges around the implementation of evaluation within the country contexts. The selection of these cases will be verified during the initial country analysis.

<i>Ethiopia</i>	<i>Malawi</i>	<i>Rwanda</i>	<i>Zambia</i>	<i>Ghana</i>
Production safety net programme	Formulation of national development strategies	Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme	Decentralisation	National Health Insurance scheme – recent evaluation
Public sector reform	Development of sector wide approaches	EDPRS2 Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy 2	Supply of free ARVs	LEAP programme –CT – recent evaluation
Health extension programme	Decentralisation of local government		Girl-child policy of re-integration into school system following pregnancy	School feeding programme
Land certification	Farming subsidy programme		Farming	MASLOC = small business loans

Annex IV: Timeframe and Outputs

The following are the anticipated outputs to be produced, and the planned timeline per country and deadlines for the project. Some flexibility may be required around dates, especially around the length of the in-country work that needs to respond to the availability of key stakeholders.

Phase	Sub-Activity	Dates for Completion	Status
Output 1: An inception report detailing the approach, scope and methodology for the assignment accepted by DFID, by Mid-March.	Contracting Country Consultants	1 March	Completed
	Submitted Inception report to DFID and Reference Group for comment	11 March	Completed
Output 2: A draft report of the first country study, submitted to DFID, by end of April 2013	Kick-off Workshop with Country Consultants	19 – 20 March	Completed
	Report on Workshop submitted to DFID	29 March	Draft Ready
	Hire country visit replacements for Mark	4 April	Completed
	Hire international replacement for Mark	2 April	Completed
	Revised Inception Report	15 April	Final Draft Submitted
	Initial Studies Ethiopia (SL) and Rwanda (SP):		
	Work in-country	11 – 19 May	
Draft report submitted to DFID for comment	31 May		
Receive comments from DFID and discuss implications	7 June		
Comments Integrated into reports and process	14 June		
Finalise Pilot Study Report	30 June		
Output 3: Draft report of country case-studies, submitted to DFID, by end of May 2013	Country Visit Malawi (SL):		
	Work in-country	15 – 23 June	
	Submit draft report to DFID	15 July	
	Receive comments from DFID and integrate	22 July	
	Country Visit Zambia (SP):		
	Work in-country	15 – 23 June	
	Submit draft report to DFID	15 July	
	Receive comments from DFID and integrate	22 July	
	Country Visit Ghana (OF):		
Work in-country	20 – 28 July		
Submit draft report to DFID	12 August		
Receive comments from DFID and integrate	19 August		
	Submit Final Country reports with integrated comments	30 August	
Output 4: Final report, accepted by DFID, by the end of July 2013	Synthesis Discussion and Ghana Dissemination workshop (to support use of the study in Ghana)	21 – 23 August	
	Submit draft of Synthesis Report for comments by DFID		

Phase	Sub-Activity	Dates for Completion	Status
	and reference group Receive comments from DFID, and reference group via DFID Finalise country reports based on reference group feedback	6 September 13 September 20 September	
	Design of Report Finalised Final Report published in .pdf format	27 September 30 September	
Output 5: Preparation and delivery of presentation / seminar in Africa (location and date TBD), UK and Paris by end of August 2013	Presentation of Power points from country studies: OECD - Helsinki UK Ghana	11 – 12 June TBD 22 – 23 August	