****

**PRESENTATION ON DRAFT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK**

**FOR DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS (DP-PAF) IN GHANA**

**RATIONALE**

The development of the DP-PAF is in response to the Government of Ghana’s decision to assess the performance of the Development Partners (DPs) in development cooperation.

Ghana has for some years now been assessed under a Performance Assessment Framework (now called Progress Assessment Framework) within the context of the Multi-Donor Budget Support (MDBS) arrangement between Ghana and participating DPs. We believe that in line with the principles and commitments on mutual accountability, as spelt out in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (PD) and the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA), the performance of DPs in the context of development cooperation needs to be assessed as well.

When Government first indicated its intention to assess DPs’ performance, DPs raised concerns about who would conduct the assessment. It was agreed that the same mechanism used to assess Government’s performance in meeting the MDBS triggers and targets would be used to assess DP sides, to ensure consistency.

The process of developing Ghana’s DP-PAF commenced in 2009. It allows for both Government and the DPs to make comments and inputs to the draft. A team of two (2) consultants, one each from both the Government and DPs, has been contracted to develop the DP-PAF and ensure that it is a realistic and practical instrument with minimum transaction costs.

The draft DP-PAF takes into account multilateral commitments such as those in the PD and the AAA; as well as experiences from other countries that have a DP assessment framework.

It is anticipated that the DP-PAF would be endorsed at the forthcoming Consultative Group (CG) meeting in September 2010; and the first assessment for 2010 would be carried out in 2011 to be closely coordinated with the PD/AAA Survey in the first quarter of 2011.

**DP-PAF: CONTENTS**

The DP-PAF comprises a set of indicators anchored on the principles as well as commitments in the PD and AAA. It primarily requests baseline data for the 2008 and 2009 years with regard to development cooperation, as well as the targets for 2010, 2011 and 2012 years. It also gives DPs the opportunity to provide qualitative views regarding any of the figures they provide.

The assessment is structured in questionnaire form under broad headings as follows:

* description of the DPs portfolio, ***e.g.*** ***how much ODA was provided at country level? How much ODA did you provide as General Budget Support (GBS)?***
* how the portfolio responds to the principle of harmonisation, ***e.g.*** ***how many donor missions did you undertake and how many were undertaken jointly with other DPs? How many country analytic works did you undertake jointly with other DPs?***
* alignment of the portfolio to Government systems, ***e.g. how ODA disbursed to Government used national budget, financial reporting and auditing procedures? Did you share the reasons why you did not use national systems?***
* predictability of funds in the portfolio, ***e.g. how much total ODA for the Government was scheduled for disbursement in the calendar year in question? How much of your ODA to GoG was delivered through multi-year binding agreements of at least 3 years?***
* transparency of the portfolio, ***e.g. did you provide timely information on all ODA disbursements to Government along the lines of Government budget classification? Did you make public all conditionalities linked to your disbursements?***
* contribution of the portfolio to capacity development, ***e.g. how much technical cooperation did you disburse through co-ordinated programmes in support of capacity development?***

There are also indicators linking DPs’ portfolio to MDBS-related actions. However, discussions on this are currently on-going given that some DPs, including non-DAC donors, are not part of the MDBS process.

The DP-PAF also provides background information to guide DPs. These include:

* cross-referencing the indicator to PD, AAA or other assessments such as PEFA
* providing the rationale for the indicator and its relation to the country’s agenda
* additional clarity in the definition of the indicator
* suggested means of verification

Whilst Government does not fully agree with some feedback on the draft DP-PAF received from DPs, we share them as follows:

* “The requested dataset is very broad and the total number of questions comes up to 50, creating additional transaction costs”.
* “The follow-up process on DP performance is not clearly defined and it is also not clear what would be the consequences of ‘good or bad’ performance.”
* “The DP-PAF draws heavily on the PD-Survey and to a large degree duplicates efforts and creates additional transaction costs. The DP-PAF should complement the PD survey and cover aspects that the latter does not cover.”
* “There is a strong preference for GBS; other financing modalities such as project support and capacity development should be better reflected in the DP-PAF.”

It should be noted that the assessment is still a ‘work-in-progress’. Government has scheduled a consultative workshop on **Thursday, 15th April 2010** with all stakeholders (Government, DPs, Non State Actors, etc) to provide a platform to address all concerns, including those outlined above. This should help facilitate discussions on the different result areas as well as the indicators.