

# Technical Working Group Performance Review

Prepared for the  
Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board  
Council for the Development of Cambodia

Brett M. Ballard, PhD

12 March 2015

## Table of Contents

Section/Annex	Page
Acknowledgements	2
Acronyms	3
Executive Summary	4
Technical Working Group Performance Review	6
Section 1: Introduction	6
Section 2: A Dynamic development Context	8
Section 3: Overall Performance	10
Section 3.1: Good Performance and Best Practices	10
Section 3.2: Constraints and Limitations	14
Section 3.3: Functional Analysis of Performance	16
Section 4: The Role of the CDC	23
Section 5: Conclusions and recommendations	25
Annex 1: Terms of Reference	30
Annex 2: Documents Reviewed	33
Annex 3: Persons Interviewed	34
Annex 4: Scoring Questions	37
Annex 5: Scoring Summary	39

## **Acknowledgements**

The author wishes to acknowledge with respect and appreciation the time and effort that TWG Chairs, Secretariats, DP Lead Facilitators, and Non-Governmental Organizations made to discuss matters pertaining to the TWG performance review. The author is also grateful for the candor and frankness of comments by all stakeholders who reviewed the first draft report and participated in a recent performance review consultation. HE Chhieng Yanara, Minister attached to the Prime Minister, Secretary General of CRDB/CDC, provided clear leadership and encouragement throughout the entire review process. Philip Courtnadge, Senior Advisor to CRDB, UNDP Cambodia, provided sound advice at key junctures of the review process. The author would especially like to thank CRDB/CDC staff members Ms. Ly Sokleap, Mr. Kim Lumangbopata, Ms. Chi Polydeth, and Ms. Kong Yada for their hard work and insights in support of the review. The author alone is responsible for the content of the report and as such responsible for any factual errors or shortcomings in analysis.

### List of Acronyms

A and W	Agriculture and Water (TWG)
CAR	Council for Administrative Reform
CARD	Council for Agriculture and Rural Development
CCC	Cooperation Committee for Cambodia
CDC	Council for the Development of Cambodia
CDCF	Cambodia Development Cooperation Forum
CDF	Cambodia Development Forum
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
CWG	Coordination Working Group
D & D	Deconcentration and Decentralization (TWG)
DCPS	Development Cooperation and Partnership Strategy 2014 – 2018
DPs	Development Partners
ELCs	Economic Land Concessions
FSN and SP	Food Security, Nutrition, and Social Protection (TWG)
GDCC	Government-Development Partner Coordination Committee
IDP	Industrial Development Policy
IRI	Infrastructure and Regional Integration (TWG)
JMIs	Joint Monitoring Indicators
LJR	Legal Judicial Review (TWG)
LMIC	Lower Middle Income Country
MA	Mine Action (TWG)
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries
M & E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEF	Ministry of Economy and Finance
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
MoWRaM	Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology
MRD	Ministry of Rural Development
MTR	Mid Term Review
ODA	Official Development Assistance
NEP	National Education Program
NSDP	National Strategic Development Plan 2014-2018
P and H	Partnership and Harmonization (TWG)
PAR	Public Administration Reform (TWG)
PBAs	Program Based Approaches
PFM	Public Financial Management (TWG)
PPR	Planning and Poverty Reduction (TWG)
PSD	Private Sector Development (TWG)
RGC	Royal Government of Cambodia
RWSSH	Rural Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (TWG)
SWAP	Sector Wide Approach
ToR	Terms of Reference
TVET	Technical Vocational and Education Training
TWG	Technical Working Group



## Executive Summary

The objective of this Technical Working Group review is to help strengthen TWG performance in support of the Royal Government of Cambodia's Rectangular Strategy III and the National Strategic Development Plan 2014 – 2018 (NSDP). The TWG architecture is an important cornerstone of the RGC's Development Cooperation and Partnership Strategy 2014 – 2018 that aims to promote and strengthen aid effectiveness. The review considers performance in terms of six key TWG functions: aid coordination and resource mobilization; information sharing; monitoring; policy dialogue; capacity building; and cross-cutting issues. The review situates the analysis within a context of a rapidly evolving development environment, emerging new partnership opportunities, and shifting aid modalities.

**Performance** The TWG architecture is generally sound but performance (i.e., implementation) is mixed. As a result, TWG contributions to achieving sector objectives and national development goals, including aid effectiveness and public sector reforms, is uneven. RGC Chairs and Secretariats tend to view the overall performance of TWGs higher than do the DP Lead Facilitators.

TWGs that perform well over time tend to exhibit a mix of common factors. These factors include: Strong government ownership; Committed leadership by the Chair; Active commitment and support from DP Lead Facilitators; Sound managerial capacity; High levels of trust and good communication; Strong secretariats; Clear Terms of Reference, sector development plans and strategies; Annual TWG work plans; Regularly scheduled and well managed plenary meetings; Active sub-groups; Self-initiated TWG retreats and reviews; and Considerable time and effort on the part of all stakeholders.

TWGs also face a number of challenges and constraints that can impede good performance. First, although accountability is a key function of government ownership, there is lack of an over-arching accountability framework to monitor and evaluate performance. Second, in some TWGs certain development issues have become increasingly contentious, while in other TWGs shifting circumstances are changing stakeholder perceptions of development priorities. Third, aid and investment modalities are changing and new development actors are emerging. Fourth, the quality of participation by TWG members, both RGC and DPs, is inconsistent. Fifth, plenary meetings often have agendas that are so crowded they preclude dialogue concerning both technical and policy issues.

It is not feasible to expect that all TWGs will reach a similar level of performance across all six functional areas. The capacity of the TWGs to effectively address these core functions varies according to the context and circumstances associated with enabling factors and constraints. Most TWGs perform well in terms of information sharing, while some perform reasonably well with regard to aid coordination and resource mobilizations. Many TWGs struggle with monitoring, capacity building, and cross-cutting issues. Some TWGs have performed well regarding policy dialogue, but others have struggled.

**The Role of the CDC** Although the CDC's performance receives mixed reviews from key stakeholders, most acknowledge that its role in certain areas has been very constructive. These areas include: the ODA database; TWG annual retreats; Focal point support; and Support for high level consultations with bi-

lateral donors. There are three areas in which the CDC can play a more active role in promoting better TWG performance. First, the CDC can provide better support and guidance to those TWGs that have experienced recent turn-over among RGC Chairs and/or DP Lead Facilitators. Second, the CDC should be prepared to play a more active “brokering” role with those TWGs that are not performing well. Third, the CDC should play a more active role providing oversight with respect to accountability. This is especially important given the long gaps in time when GDCC and GDCCF meeting are convened. CDC appears to be the appropriate intermediary institution linking TWGs to the GDCC/GDCF framework.

**Conclusions** There are several areas in which improvements can be made to strengthen TWG performance. These include accountability, capacity building, cross-cutting issues, and development dialogue. It is important to bear in mind that improving TWG performance is in the short term not so much a matter of creating new institutional arrangements, but rather one of re-invigorating and implementing the structure that is currently in place.

In the longer term, however, institutional arrangements may need to be modified to accommodate a rapidly changing development context and shifting aid modalities. It may also be necessary to adjust, or re-focus, the core functional features of aid effectiveness. For example, a revised institutional framework that is more focused on the RGC’s reform agenda, as outlined in the NSDP 2014-2018, could include explicit emphasis on addressing cross-cutting issues and the development of innovative dialogue arrangements. This suggests that over time, the guidelines on the role and functioning of the TWG may need to be revised. In both the short and longer term, the TWG for Partnership and Harmonization (P&H), which includes the Council for the Development of Cambodia (CDC) as Chair, should play a more active role to promote better TWG performance and accountability.

**Recommendations** The review identifies six recommendations for strengthening TWG performance in the short and medium term. ***First, TWG performance cannot be sustainably improved without fully implementing the Development Cooperation and Partnership Strategy, 2014-2018.*** The next GDCC should be convened during the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter of 2015. The CDC should also play a more active role to encourage each TWG, including the TWG P&H, to articulate the roles and responsibilities of civil society organizations, and ensure that civil society member organizations are routinely invited to sub-group and plenary meetings as well as TWG annual retreats.

***Second, the TWG P&H, along with the CDC as Chair, should play a more active role in providing leadership for the overall TWG infrastructure.*** For example, the TWG P&H should also encourage each TWG to review their respective ToRs, including consideration of how aid modalities can be better coordinated in a changing development context.

***Third, the CDC should play a more active role in ensuring that TWGs are accountable to a higher authority for performance and progress toward JMIs.*** As noted with respect to the implementation of the DCPS, the higher authority in this regard is the GDCC annual meeting.

***Fourth, the TWG landscape in terms of the number and sector coverage should be rationalized.*** One approach may be to consolidate certain TWGs. Another option would simply be to allow non-

performing, or poorly performing, TWGs to lie dormant, while being available to respond to special needs as they arise.

***Fifth, the CDC along with the TWG P&H should encourage TWGs to assess how well they perform each function and identify areas and plans to strengthen core functions.*** This can be achieved by:

- **Aid Coordination and Resource Mobilization** can be improved by the joint development of clearly articulated ToRs, Sector Development Strategies, and TWG annual work plans;
- **Information Sharing** can be improved by careful preparation of plenary agendas and the establishment of a broader sub-groups system as well as a shared commitment to transparency in budgeting and planning, including sharing draft laws and policies ;
- **Monitoring and Evaluation** can be improved by establishing appropriately resourced Management Information Systems and stronger accountability arrangements concerning JMI performance;
- **Capacity Development** can be improved by conducting a capacity needs assessment, identifying an appropriate division of labour, and mobilizing resources;
- **Policy Dialogue** can be improved by articulating a shared policy discussion agenda that clearly delineates issues and boundaries as well as a shared commitment to better coordinate research and improve monitoring systems that support evidence-based policy making;
- **Cross-cutting issues** can be pursued in a broader range of venues, including informal networks, bi-lateral discussions, periodic “super-cluster” meetings, and periodic policy roundtables. Stakeholders must first clearly identify priority cutting issues.

***Sixth, the Guidelines on the Role and Functioning of the Technical Working Groups (October 2010) should be reviewed in light of the myriad changes affecting the development context and aid modalities since 2010.*** Such a review should be forward looking and provide explicit reference to situating TWGs within the broader and more complex development context reflected in the NSDP and DCPS. It may be useful to conduct a “coordination mapping” exercise to better situate and rationalize the role and functions of the TWGs going forward within the overall complex coordination landscape (e.g., working groups, committees, councils, associations).

The Guidelines could be reviewed in the context of the Mid-Term Review of the current DCPS. The MTR should include an assessment of how aid coordination and harmonization is, or is not, contributing to progress in reaching sector objectives and national development goals. In preparation for this assessment, TWGs can be tasked to consider and document how TWG functions and aid modalities can evolve in mutually relevant directions over the remainder of the current NSDP.

## Technical Working Group Performance Review

### Section 1: Introduction

1) The objective of the Technical Working Group (TWG) review is to help strengthen TWG performance in support of the Royal Government of Cambodia's Rectangular Strategy III and the National Strategic Development Plan 2014 – 2018 (NSDP).<sup>1</sup>The review builds on findings from an earlier analysis of development effectiveness that informed the formulation of the Development Cooperation and Partnerships Strategy (DCPS) in 2013. That analysis identified a range of issues concerning aid effectiveness, including partnership and dialogue, capacity development and public sector reform. This review intends to (1) identify the factors and circumstances that contribute to good performance and (2) make recommendations for strengthening TWG performance. The review considers performance in terms of six key TWG functions: aid coordination and resource mobilization; information sharing; monitoring; policy dialogue; capacity building, and cross-cutting issues. The review situates the analysis within a context of a rapidly evolving development environment, emerging new partnership opportunities, and shifting aid modalities.

2) The review finds that the TWG architecture as outlined in the Guidelines on the Role and Functions of the Technical Working Groups (2010) guidelines is generally sound but performance (i.e., implementation) is mixed. As a result, the TWG contribution to achieving sector objectives and national development goals, including public sector reforms, is uneven. There are several areas in which improvements can be made to strengthen performance. These include accountability, capacity building, cross-cutting issues, and development dialogue. It is important to bear in mind that improving TWG performance is in the short term not so much a matter of creating new institutional arrangements, but rather one of re-invigorating and implementing the structure that is currently in place as outlined in the 2010 TWG guidelines and the current DCPS.

3) In the longer term, however, institutional arrangements may need to be modified to accommodate a rapidly changing development context and shifting aid modalities. It may also be necessary to adjust, or re-focus, the core functional features of aid effectiveness. For example, a revised institutional framework that is more focused on the RGC's reform agenda, as outlined in the NSDP 2014-2018, could include explicit emphasis on addressing cross-cutting issues and the development of innovative dialogue arrangements. This suggests that over time, the guidelines on the role and functioning of the TWG may need to be revised. In both the short and longer term, the TWG for Partnership and Harmonization (P&H), which includes the Council for the Development of Cambodia (CDC) as Chair, should play a more active role to promote better TWG performance and accountability.

4) The review methodology is five-fold. First, relevant documents concerning partnership and aid effectiveness have been reviewed (Please see Annex 2). Second, interviews with Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) Chairs (or their representatives) and Development Partner (DP) Lead Facilitators for all

---

<sup>1</sup> Please Annex 1: Terms of Reference.

19 TWGs were conducted (Please see Annex 3). Third, a brief set of questions was circulated for scoring by RGC Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators (Please see Annexes 4 and 5). Fourth, a draft report on the preliminary findings was circulated among RGC Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators for their review and comment. Fifth, the lead reviewer presented key findings and recommendations to a TWG P&H plenary meeting for review and comment to inform the final report of the performance review.

5) The report is structured as follows. Section 2 identifies changes in the development context over the past 10 years since the TWG framework was initiated. Section 3 discusses TWG performance. Section 3.1 identifies key “best practice” factors that contribute to good performance. Section 3.2 identifies challenges and constraints that can impede good performance. Section 3.3 analyzes performance factors according to specific TWG functions. Section 4 discusses the role that CDC plays to support the TWGs. Section 5 concludes the review with recommendations for strengthening TWG performance.

## **Section 2: A Dynamic Development Context**

6) The current TWG framework was first implemented in 2004, starting with an initial 18 TWGs. In 2007, the TWG for Rural Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (RWSSH) was established. During this 10 year period of time, Cambodia has experienced a wide range of economic, political and social change. This suggests that the context in which TWGs are operating today is far different from the context in which they were initially conceived and implemented. Some of the key facets of change include:

- Cambodia has achieved considerable economic growth that has contributed to significant gains in poverty reduction. At its current pace of development, Cambodia is expected to reach Lower Middle Income Country (LMIC) status during the next few years.
- Demographic changes are transforming the social landscape. For example, Cambodia’s population is increasingly young. Migration has featured broad movements of young women and men to urban areas seeking employment. This in turn has contributed to rapid urbanization in Phnom Penh and other cities. As a result of these and other changes, development processes have in many ways become more complex than those of a decade ago.
- Political developments are generating broad demand for reform in key sectors of the economy and governance as well as social service delivery. Such reforms are complex and require specific skill sets and expertise on the part of all stakeholders. Reforms in certain areas such as PFM, PAR, D & D, and LJR can be especially sensitive and pose significant challenges for development partnerships.
- Human resource capacity of the RGC has strengthened considerably over the past 10 years, especially at the national level among government officials and at the local level among civil society. Going forward, DPs may target institutional capacity development to support the management of more complex cross-sector challenges.
- The development aid context has changed considerably. Several long-standing bi-lateral development partners have departed (e.g., DANIDA, DfID, CIDA), while so-called non-traditional partners have emerged as increasingly important actors (e.g., China, South Korea). At the same time, the loan proportion of development assistance has been increasing. For example, the

CDC's ODA database showed that in 2013 the loan disbursement projection exceeded that of grant and technical cooperation for the first time since 1992.<sup>2</sup>

- ODA is still an important source of finance but other domestic and external development actors are also playing important roles and must be engaged in the process as well. The prospects for increasing South-South cooperation suggest new partners such as ASEAN member states, the BRIC Bank, and the Asian Infrastructure Development Bank may play increasingly important roles in Cambodia's development.
- Traditional sources of funding public services critical for sustaining gains in poverty reduction may be affected, especially for marginalized groups such as disabled and people living with HIV/AIDS. A decline in ODA grants may also affect the environment and natural resource sector.
- Private sector investments, both domestic and international, are playing an increasingly significant role in shaping Cambodia's economic and social development. The space for policy dialogue therefore needs to be widened to accommodate diversity of influences.
- Regional and global development trends provide important economic opportunities for Cambodia. The impending ASEAN integration slated for 2015 is especially relevant in this regard.

7) These changes raise questions concerning the ongoing relevance of the over-arching architecture for partnership and aid effectiveness in general, and the TWG framework in particular. The overall impression that emerged from interviews with Chairs, DP Lead Facilitators and Civil Society Organization (CSO) members is that the TWG framework for the most part continues to be relevant, and will likely continue to be relevant during the current NSDP mandate (2104 -2018). This is especially the case in those sectors that remain highly dependent on external aid, including social services (e.g., education, health), agriculture, and institutional reform.

8) At the same time, there is widespread recognition among both RGC and DPs that development assistance from bi-lateral and multi-lateral partners may become somewhat diminished relative to development assistance from China and other new regional partners, global funds, private sector investments, and government revenue.<sup>3</sup>As a result, the current ODA partnership and aid effectiveness architecture may become increasingly less relevant overtime without adapting to new realities.

9) The RGC's capacity to mobilize, allocate and monitor effective implementation of new funding sources will need to be strengthened. The changes in the nature of ODA and the RGC's need for support with financial management should motivate DPs to approach partnership and aid effectiveness differently. Development partners will need to focus more on helping build up the capacity of the RGC to support the transition to greater reliance on resources other than ODA. In principle, the TWG architecture under strong government ownership can be an important mechanism for helping the RGC manage such transitions, provided that TWG roles and functions can adapt to a new development context and aid modalities, and that performance can be improved.

---

<sup>2</sup> CDC (2014); Development Cooperation Trends in Cambodia, 2014: Using Evidence to Promote Partnerships and Development Effectiveness; RGC: Phnom Penh.

<sup>3</sup> Development Cooperation Trends in Cambodia; CRDB/CDC (July 2014) provides a useful overview and discussion concerning such trends.

### Section 3: Overall Performance

10) The objective to keep in mind at all times when considering TWG performance, including the performance of the entire partnership architecture, is that these mechanisms must contribute to aid effectiveness. In order to do so, TWGs perform six basic core functions: aid coordination and resource mobilization; information sharing; monitoring; policy dialogue, capacity building, and cross-cutting issues. The degree to which TWGs perform well across the six core functions provides a basis for assessing overall performance of specific TWGs as well as the overall partnership architecture. This section first identifies key performance factors, or indicators, of best practice as well as constraints and challenges. It then discusses the six core functions in the context of these performance factors.

11) The RGC Chairs and Secretariats tend to view the overall performance of TWGs higher than do the DP Lead Facilitators. This observation is reflected in the difference responses to the scoring questionnaire concerning overall performance (7.70 vs 5.68, with 10 being most positive). However, the performance across the TWG landscape is in fact quite mixed: some TWGs work well, while others do not. In between is a large population of TWGs whose performance may be generally acceptable, but where there is ample room for improvement. Among those working well now, several did not work well before; while some that are not working well at present were once considered high performing TWGs. It appears then that performance across the TWG landscape is highly dynamic and subject to a variety of factors and circumstances. This suggests that performance can be improved in the short term by focusing attention on strengthening best practices and addressing constraints and challenges. In the longer term, however, better performance may require adjustments in partnership arrangements.

#### 3.1: Good Performance and Best Practices

Factors that contribute to good performance also serve as best practice indicators. These include:

12) **Government Ownership** There is widespread agreement among TWG officials and DPs that government ownership of the TWGs is an important factor contributing to good performance. Although funding is an important factor, ownership does not necessarily simply mean that the RGC covers the costs associated with TWG management and function. Ownership is also a function of how RGC stakeholders view the practical utility of the TWG to contribute to the achievement of development goals and objectives. In this sense, government ownership is a function of both institutional and professional incentives. Ownership also refers to “owning accountability” for TWG performance.

13) **Committed leadership by the TWG Chairs** There is widespread agreement that strong leadership and interest by the TWG Chair is essential for good performance. TWGs that perform well tend to have Chairs who are committed to the work of the TWG. This does not necessarily mean Chairs are able to have a direct hand in the day-to-day business of the TWG. Some Chairs, particularly those at the level of Minister, who are interested in the work of the TWG may delegate responsibilities to others, often at the level of Secretary of State. Chairs must be well connected to the work of their host ministry to ensure that TWG activities have traction and remain relevant. The commitment of the TWG Chair to actively participate in TWG affairs can also be an important factor that supports RGC ownership.

14) **Active commitment and support from the DP Lead Facilitator** There is also widespread acknowledgement that strong commitment and support on the part of the DP Lead Facilitator is an important factor that promotes good performance. This does not always mean, however, that a committed Lead Facilitator can ensure good TWG performance. In the absence of committed Chairs and government ownership, even the best efforts of any Lead Facilitator will not be sufficient to assure good performance. One of the key functions that Lead Facilitators perform concerns the mobilization of development partners and building a shared commitment to the work of the TWG. Indeed, many Chairs and Secretariats observed that the degree to which DPs and CSOs can “speak with one voice” is an important factor promoting good TWG performance.

15) **Capacity, Technical and Managerial Style** A high level of technical and managerial capacity on the part of both Government and DPs is an important component of good performance and ownership. This suggests that TWG partnerships are stronger when there is an appropriate mix, or balance, of complementary technical skill (expertise) and managerial capacity within the TWG on the part of both RGC and DPs. The emphasis on managerial capacity highlights the role that experience and style play in the day-to-day work of the TWG, including the management of plenary meetings. The fact that managerial styles may vary does not preclude good performance; rather, it is the mix of skill, experience, and style that Chairs and Lead Facilitators bring to the table that enables good performance.

16) **Trust and Communication** The quality of the relationship between the Chair and the DP Lead Facilitator, as well as the TWG membership, is vital for sustaining good performance over time. While frequent communication is an important factor in this regard, the quality of that communication largely depends on the level of trust and respect that characterizes the relationship. This in turn often depends on the level of skill and experience that both Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators bring to the relationship in which they are working across cultural and institutional perceptions and expectations. Regular and less formal dialogue between Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators between TWG meetings may contribute to effective relationships and, therefore, improved TWG performance.

17) **Strong secretariats, appropriately resourced and motivated** This is a constant feature of all TWGs that perform well and is often a function of committed leadership from the Chair with appropriate support from DP Lead Facilitators. Secretariats that perform well are often guided by a clear job description that is developed in the context of the TWG Terms of Reference (ToR). At one point in time, some TWG secretariats were supported by a trust fund financed by development partners and administered by CDC. It was discontinued after 2 years as an evaluation showed that such support was administratively challenging while making little or no impact on performance. Since then, TWGs have developed different approaches to provide secretariat support for the TWG. In some cases (e.g., Forestry, Fisheries), secretariats are supported by externally financed consultants, while other secretariats (e.g., Education, Gender) consist of highly motivated and empowered ministry staff who have been assigned to serve as the TWG secretariat as part of their regular duties. For the most part, issues pertaining to incentive arrangements for the secretariat did not feature prominently in the interviews. However, in some TWGs (e.g., Agriculture/ Water), incentives have been a matter of ongoing concern affecting secretariat performance.

18) **Clear Terms of Reference (ToRs)** The joint development of ToRs for the TWGs by the RGC and DPs provides an opportunity for dialogue around the core functions and objectives of the particular TWG. TWGs that have a ToR that clearly articulates the roles and functions of key leadership, including the secretariat, as well as the goals and objectives of the TWG often perform well, especially when there is shared buy-in from both government and DPs. This is especially the case when the ToR is actively used as a reference point to guide the work of the TWG. In this sense, the ToRs serve as the “rules of the game” for process and content. The ToRs are also important in a context of frequent turn-over by RGC and DPs, as they help serve as TWG’s institutional memory. The ToRs should be considered as living documents. In some instances, the ToRs have recently been reviewed and amended to addresses sector changes or promote better performance. In other instances, however, ToRs have not been developed, have elapsed, or are not referred to at all.

19) **Clear Sector Development Plans and Strategies** TWGs that tend to perform well also have clear sector development plans and strategies that enjoy broad-based buy-in and support from both line agencies and development partners. These TWGs often have the advantage of more specific mandates and areas of focus (e.g., Education, Health, Forestry, Fisheries). Buy-in can be achieved by either actively involving all sector stakeholders in the development of the plans and strategies and/or regular consultations with stakeholders concerning implementation and monitoring. In this sense, clear sector development plans and strategies help guide how RGC and DP investments fit together within sector financing. This is a cornerstone of Program Based Approaches (PBAs) to development finance.

20) **Annual TWG Work Plans** Annual work plans that are oriented to the implementation of sector development plans and strategies can be effective tools for mapping out planned activities for a one-year period. This enables TWG members to be aware of and participate in TWGs by scheduling well ahead of time meetings and sharing information related to progress on the implementation of sector development plans and strategies. Annual work plans can also help mitigate the effects of frequent turn-over of TWG members. Annual TWG work plans will be less effective in those sectors that do not have clear development plans and strategies.

21) **Regularly Scheduled Plenary Meetings** There does not appear to be any specific rule about the number of meeting per year: some TWGs meet every quarter while others meet on a bi-annual basis. The TWG Health actually meets on a monthly basis. However, it is not necessarily frequency but rather predictability that is the key. The regularly scheduled plenary meetings provide a focal point around which Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators are able to discuss priority topics and issues for the agenda and around which sub-groups can focus attention. Regularly scheduled meetings, in effect, can serve as important points of mobilization of TWG energy. Although frequently and regularly scheduled meetings may not always be indicative of good performance, infrequent and irregularly scheduled plenary meetings almost always indicate poor performance.

22) **Well-managed Meetings** The quality of the plenary meeting is also important. Many DP Lead Facilitators define good meetings as those in which there is sufficient (or at least some) time for discussion and interaction among key stakeholders, as well as clear decisions that can then be followed up upon. Chairs tended to define good meetings as those that are well attended by line agency and DP

members and also provided clear decisions. Well-managed meetings that meet both definitions are facilitated by planning and preparation in which the agenda is carefully articulated and coordinated by the TWG secretariat and all stakeholders. Although regularly scheduled and well managed meetings can be mutually supportive, it is important not to assume that they are necessarily synonymous.

23) **Sub-groups** Both Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators recognize the important role that sub-groups can play. TWGs that perform well tend to refer important matters to sub-groups where technical, and in some cases policy, issues can be addressed over time. This is especially important in the case of larger, more complex TWGs that cover a number of technical issues and involve a number of line agencies and DPs. In the larger TWGs, important work is often done at the sub-group level, as it would be impossible to discuss everything of importance at the plenary level. Sub-groups also play an important role by informing the development of the plenary agenda by putting forth recommendations for discussion and/or decision. In this sense, sub-groups can also serve as a type of filter that identifies priority issues and topics for inclusion in the plenary meeting agenda. One important sub-group, albeit one that meets on an informal basis, concerns development partner meetings that take place within many of the TWGs. These meetings provide an opportunity for DPs to share views and information and, in several instances, make recommendations about items to be addressed at plenary meetings beforehand.

24) **TWG Retreats** Some TWGs (e.g., Education, Forestry, Fisheries) have organized their own retreats for members. The retreats provide an opportunity for informal discussions and have helped improve communication between government officials and development partners. For example, the members of the Forestry TWG have visited the field to observe forest management activities and their impact. Other TWGs, such as PPR, are now considering organizing similar retreats. As with plenary meetings, retreats benefit from good preparation and clarity of objectives and expectations. Retreats that are not well-prepared may not be all that useful for improving performance. This is especially important in terms of generating specific action points that can be followed up and monitored.

25) **TWG Reviews** Some TWGs have undertaken reviews of their own performance in order to consider how well they are progressing and make recommendations for improvements. The TWGs for Health and RWSSH have both undertaken such reviews. In the case of the TWG Health review, an external independent consultant was engaged to undertake the review, while the TWG RWSSH completed a review internally. As with TWG Retreats, such reviews can be useful in terms of facilitating communication among stakeholders while also providing institutional memory for stakeholders. It is also important that such reviews generate specific action points that can be followed up and monitored.

26) **Time and Effort** It is important to recognize the extraordinary amount of time and effort that both RGC officials and DPs expend in managing the work of most TWGs. This is especially the case with respect to TWG Chairs or their designated representatives, DP Lead Facilitators, Secretariats, and certain CSOs. This suggests a broad-based commitment to making the TWG structures perform well. It is also important to recognize the time and effort that TWG members, including line agencies, DPs, and in some instances civil society, expend participating in plenary and sub-group meetings. This raises questions concerning the value added of the TWGs in terms of the investment of time and effort and

development outcomes. With so much time and effort expended on TWG work, it is understandable that all stakeholders wish to see improved aid effectiveness over time.

(27) **Summary** TWGs that perform well will over time exhibit many, though not necessarily all, of the above factors. Indeed, among those TWGs that perform well, or acceptably, there is often a different mix of factors that are shaped by sector context and the individuals involved. The important question that emerges is how to actually convey best practice lessons to poorly performing TWGs. One approach to date has been to present such lessons in general plenary at the annual TWG network retreats. This approach assumes that key stakeholders in poorly performing TWGs are motivated and able to act on suggestions about improving performance. This approach may also assume that exposure to such lessons is somehow enough to guide improvement. Such assumptions are especially problematic in cases when key stakeholders do not participate in retreats or plenary meetings. In many instances, a more direct hand for support and guidance is required to transfer best practices to TWGs whose performance is lagging. The bottom line, however, is that in order for poorly or moderately performing TWGs to actively improve performance, TWG leadership must be motivated by incentives that recognize TWGs can help promote the achievement of sector objectives and/or national development goals.

### **Section 3.2: Constraints and Limitations**

28) All TWGs, including those that work well and those that do not, face a number of challenges that can impede performance. Some constraints are procedural, while others are more institutional in nature. Still others may concern the style and personalities of the individual stakeholders involved. The management of constraints and challenges is an important factor affecting TWG performance over time.

29) **Accountability** As observed above, accountability is a key function of government ownership. However, a higher level of accountability to monitor and evaluate TWG performance is lacking. This is a particularly important concern for many DP Lead Facilitators, as well as some Chairs, who would like to see the CDC play a more active role in this regard. Most stakeholders agreed that accountability must be managed within the overall framework that includes annual GDCC and bi-annual CDCF (or the proposed CDF), as outlined in the DCPS 2014 - 2018. There is widespread support and encouragement, especially among DPs, for the GDCC meetings to be re-activated. Of particular concern is the accountability for overall performance, including progress toward the Joint Monitoring Indicators (JMIs). The incentives to motivate progress toward achieving the JMIs are not clear. The link between the GDCC and the TWGs is important as it is the mechanism whereby TWG work can be assessed for their contribution to development results as outlined in the NSDP 2014-2018. Institutionally, the CDC plays a key intermediary role linking the TWG network to the GDCC and CDCF framework.

30) **Increasingly Contentious Issues and Shifting Priorities** Some issues have become increasingly contentious and have in turn affected TWG performance. For example, in the case of the Land TWG, issues associated with Economic Land Concessions (ELCs) and resettlement have of course always been important matters, but the major focus of the TWG when it was first established concerned technical aspects of land management and land titling. Since then, issues concerning ELCs and resettlement have emerged as increasingly important albeit contentious issues. TWG members must agree on the TWG

mandate in order to better align expectations and establish a shared understanding of the TWG's role and purpose. Periodic review of the TWG ToRs may help TWGs respond more flexibly to emerging sector and cross-cutting issues. Annual work plans can also help to provide greater detail on topics to be covered each year.

31) In other TWGs, sector priorities may be shifting over time. For example, the education sector is now receiving more attention as a result of evolving government policies focusing on human resource development. In this case, the TWG is playing an important role in responding to increased attention. Conversely, in the HIV/AIDS sector, initial areas of concern were primarily focused on issues associated with prevention, while more recently attention has shifted to treatment. This has resulted in DPs migrating to the Health TWG where treatment plays a more prominent role as opposed to prevention.

32) **Aid Modalities** Aid modalities have been changing in several TWGs. For example, the number of DPs providing support in Land Management has decreased. In some TWGs, government counterpart funding is playing a larger role in sector finances. In other areas, aid modalities appear to be shifting from grant arrangements to loan agreements, which in turn will mean greater involvement by the Ministry of Economy and Finance (MEF) in the coordination of development assistance. In other TWGs, new development actors, such as China, are emerging (e.g. infrastructure; irrigation). The RGC's preferred PBA model attempts to accommodate these changes by integrating domestic and external funding arrangements. If PBAs could be deployed more effectively, they could have the potential to support new partnership arrangements. However, the viability of the PBAs will depend to a large extent on the scope, scale, and pace of institutional reforms now underway under RGC leadership.

33) **Participation by TWG members often varies** Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators agree that quality participation by TWG members is often lacking. On the RGC side, matters of protocol may inhibit more active participation. Line agency representation often varies, and those who do attend often lack sufficient standing to voice opinions and as a result are reluctant to speak. On the DP side, participation can also vary from one meeting to the next, which also inhibits meaningful participation. Reasons for variations in DP participation include scheduling conflicts, late invitations for plenary meetings, a lack of interest or feeling such meetings (or retreats) may not be useful and therefore are not a priority. Participation by CSOs representatives is also highly variable across TWGs for many of the same reasons.

34) Another aspect of variable participation concerns changes in personnel at the levels of Chair and DP Lead Facilitator. Such changes result in new people having to learn how to work together and learn new concepts and approaches to aid effectiveness, coordination, and partnership that feature a new set of terminology. For example, in several instances both Chairs, or their representatives, and DP Lead Facilitators were unfamiliar with "PBAs" (Program Based Approaches). In other instances, TWG leadership appeared to have only a vague understanding of "JMIs" (Joint Monitoring Indicators) and how they contribute to assessing aid effectiveness.

35) Although it is generally assumed that the position of TWG Chair is more stable over time, there has been, nevertheless, significant change, especially since the mid-2013 national election. Changes in TWG leadership (both RGC and DPs) can of course have both positive and negative consequences. In any

event, such changes are inevitable and as a result it is important for all stakeholders to be aware that this dynamic plays an important role in influencing TWG performance.

36) **Changes in Government Organization** Changes in government organization represent both challenges and opportunities. For example, the TWG/LJR that was once located within the Council for Judicial and Legal Reform has subsequently been relocated to the Ministry of Justice. When the Council for Judicial and Legal Reform was dissolved, the TWG itself was also dissolved. The Ministry of Justice has now reconstituted the TWG/LJR, which was a slow process. In the case of the TWG/PAR, the TWG was transferred to the new Ministry of Civil Services when the Council for Administrative Reform (CAR) was dissolved. Such changes in institutional arrangements may have the effect of breathing new life into what had once been more or less moribund TWGs.

37) **Technical Capacity** Issues pertaining to capacity and a lack of appropriate expertise are also an important factor that affects the quality of participation by both RGC and DP members. Participants who are not sufficiently familiar with the technical issues associated with a particular sector may not be able to make meaningful contributions to discussions taking place. This in turn may affect the performance of the TWG, including policy dialogue, capacity building, and monitoring aid effectiveness. For example, progress on various complex sector reforms requires matching complementary expertise and experience from both RGC and DPs. Generally speaking, the RGC's overall technical and policy capacity is continually strengthening and DPs must ensure that their expertise appropriately complements that of the RGC.

38) **Ambitious Meeting Agendas** Plenary meetings often have agendas that are so crowded that they preclude dialogue and discussion. This is a concern largely voiced by DPs who wish to see more open and transparent discussion about technical and policy matters taken up in TWG plenary meetings. This constraint can be addressed, at least to a certain extent, by advanced preparation in which the Chair and DP Lead Facilitator collaborate on setting a plenary agenda that provides sufficient time for discussion. The management of TWG plenary meetings, including time management, is also an important function of addressing crowded agendas.

39) **Summary** A wide range of institutional, procedural, and contextual constraints can affect TWG performance. Institutional constraints include vertical hierarchies of decision making that impede better horizontal coordination. This is particularly relevant with respect to cross-cutting issues. Other institutional constraints include a lack of clear accountability mechanisms with which to monitor TWG performance over time. Recent changes in government organization can constructively affect or undermine performance in certain TWGs. Procedural constraints include overly ambitious plenary meeting agendas and variable participation by TWG members. Other constraints that impinge upon TWG performance are more related to circumstances. Such factors would include changes in aid modalities as well as the emergence of increasingly contentious issues. Constraints pertaining to technical and managerial capacity affect the ability of TWGs to effectively address these constraints.

### **Section 3.3: Functional Analysis of Performance**

40) An analysis of key TWG functions helps illustrate how factors contributing to good performance as well as constraints and challenges may combine to either promote or impede good performance. The

interviews identified six core functions: aid coordination and resource mobilization; information sharing; monitoring and evaluation (M&E); policy dialogue; capacity building; and cross cutting issues. These core functions correspond to the general role and function themes outlined in the Guidelines on the Role and Function of the Technical Working Groups, October 2010.<sup>4</sup>

41) **Aid Coordination and Resource Mobilization** This function appears most relevant in service delivery sectors (e.g., Education, Health) that continue to rely on traditional modalities of bi-lateral and multi-lateral assistance. In such sectors, both Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators identified this as a particularly important function. Aid coordination and resource mobilization is enhanced when clear sector plans and strategies are in place. In addition to Education and Health, the Forestry and Fishery TWGs have played an important role in developing sector plans and strategies around which aid can be better coordinated and resources more effectively mobilized. A clear ToR for the TWG is also helpful in this regard.

42) Other TWGs, however, that also involve considerable bi-lateral and multi-lateral development assistance do not appear to play a strong role regarding coordination and mobilization. The TWG for Agriculture and Water, for example, has not been able to play an active role in this regard due to a lack of clear priorities and a fragmented investment landscape. This may be changing, though not because of the TWG itself but rather by perceived interests on the part of DPs to do so. In the area of irrigation and water resource management, there is little coordination involving traditional DPs and newly emerging partners. The TWG IRI also involves significant amount of donor assistance, including increasing support from new partners, but the coordination of aid appears to be beyond the scope of the TWG's structural arrangements. In this and other areas, aid coordination tends to take place through high level consultations between the concerned parties about specific investment projects.

43) In other TWGs, the dwindling number of DPs and resources is reducing the role that TWGs play in resource mobilization. For example, the TWGs for HIV/AIDS and Mine Action appear to be playing a less important role in this regard. The same may be said for the TWG/Land in which there are few remaining DPs that contribute resources to the sector. Over time, increases in RGC financing relative to donor funding will also affect issues pertaining to aid coordination and mobilization.

44) As LMIC status approaches and development assistance becomes increasingly loan-based, the time may be approaching to consider a consolidation of grant-funding to specific sectors. This would rationalize financing and produce potential efficiencies in the partnership dialogue. CDF and GDCC would provide opportunities for high-level policy dialogue related to national development at a macro level and for reviews of NSDP and Rectangular Strategy progress.

45) In addition to financial resources, the mobilization of knowledge also requires greater emphasis, especially with respect to cross-sector coordination. While there are many examples of TWG members sharing information such as impact evaluation reports and research findings, it is generally on an ad hoc basis. The TWGs as a whole can play a more active role in knowledge management. TWG work plans could specifically refer to knowledge coordination and mobilization as a key objective.

---

<sup>4</sup> These broader themes include: NSDP Linkages; Sector/Thematic Strategies; Financing; Capacity Development; Partnerships and Aid Effectiveness; and Reporting and Review.

**(46) Information Sharing** There is widespread variation across TWGs concerning the type, quality and quantity of information available to stakeholders. The interviews identified four areas, or types of information: stakeholder activities; monitoring data; planning and budgeting; and cross-cutting issues.

(47) First, Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators both agree that TWGs can and should play an important role with respect to sharing information about “who is doing what, and where”. This is particularly relevant in the larger more complex sectors in which there are a wide range of actors and issues and the TWG. As discussed above, the better performing TWGs tend to have active sub-groups that can refer policy issues and technical matters to the plenary meeting. When these are included on the agenda, it represents an important opportunity to inform key stakeholders about issues and matters that otherwise may not be widely discussed.

48) DPs routinely observed that even in those TWGs where other functions are not pursued with much vigor, the plenary meetings, especially those that are well planned and managed, can provide a good opportunity to learn about what the government and other development stakeholders are doing, or planning to do, within the sector. For example, the plenary meetings can provide an opportunity for government to brief other line agencies, DPs, and civil society members about policy developments in the sector, while providing DPs an opportunity to inform others about program development and project implementation. In many cases, therefore, information sharing appears to still make continued involvement with the TWG useful.

49) Those TWGs that tend to have few, if any meetings, or ad hoc meetings, do not provide a reliable platform for information sharing. This is especially true for those instances in which TWG plenary meetings are announced at the last minute and do not provide adequate time for preparation. In such situations, potentially valuable opportunities for information sharing (as well as other functions) are lost.

50) Second, the supply of data for monitoring is often a function of information systems that are in place and adequately resourced. For example, the TWG Education has access to a wealth of information concerning key sector indicators as a result of a well-developed and maintained management information system (MIS) that informs policy and investment decisions. In those sectors where management information systems are less well developed, or non-existent, the supply of relevant and accurate information for monitoring and decision making is more constrained.

51) Third, it is difficult for TWGs to perform well in the absence of basic information regarding budgeting and sector planning from both RGC and DPs. It is also difficult for TWGs to perform well when the plans and content of draft laws and policies are not available to all members of the TWG. The ready availability of such information would serve as transparent tools for mobilizing and coordinating resources. This would be especially relevant for achieving the RGC’s preferred modalities for PBAs and pooled resources. Progress in the various reform areas now underway, including transparency in budgeting and planning, will be a key factor in shaping how PBA and pooled resources can be managed going forward. Those TWGs that perform well, especially in sectors with some kind of pooled resource arrangements (e.g., Education, Health), tend to have more transparent processes concerning budgeting and planning. This type of information may also be helpful in terms of mobilizing appropriately skilled

technical expertise and providing relevant knowledge in support of the RGCs public sector reform objectives. Ideally, the transparent generation and circulation of knowledge should be a fundamental aspect of information sharing.

52) Finally, it is important to observe that information sharing across TWGs concerning cross-cutting issues poses especially difficult challenges. RGC stakeholders observed this is especially important and relevant for those TWGs that have a mandate for coordinating cross-cutting issues. For example, the secretariat of the TWG for Food Security, Nutrition and Social Protection (FSNSP) expressed a keen interest in receiving information about the activities of other TWGs on a regular basis. One approach to address this information need would be to post minutes of TWG plenary meetings on the CDC website.

**53) Monitoring** there is broad agreement among Chairs and Lead Facilitators that the current NSDP 2014 – 2018 provides a useful framework for monitoring progress toward established targets. In fact, several DP Lead Facilitators observed that the current NSDP provides an opportunity for improving performance monitoring and that good progress has been made in establishing a “results based” monitoring framework.

54) However, the performance record across TWGs is mixed with respect to monitoring and evaluation.<sup>5</sup> Only a small number of TWGs appear to have the capacity, commitment, and resources with which to effectively assess progress against key performance indicators (e.g., Education, Fisheries, Forestry, Health). Also, certain sectors lend themselves more easily to measurement while others, particularly those that are more cross-cutting in nature, may have more difficulties with identifying and then measuring against overarching indicators. There are several factors that enable effective monitoring:

- A development plan/strategy that clearly identifies objectives, targets, and relevant joint monitoring indicators (JMIs);
- A well-designed and implemented baseline data collection instrument;
- A well-functioning data collection and information system that enables accurate data collection;
- A secretariat with skill and experience in monitoring and evaluation;
- Committed leadership and good communication among all stakeholders;
- Transparent budgeting and planning information and processes.

55) An overarching accountability mechanism for monitoring performance evaluation is also important. Some DP Lead Facilitators expressed concerns that the JMI's are not always taken seriously by relevant stakeholders. In some instances, especially with respect to poorly performing TWGs, effective communication about the development of JMIs has been lacking. For example, in one instance, a JMI report was submitted to CDC without agreement between the Chair and DP Lead Facilitators.

56) In terms of aid effectiveness, this may be the most important function that TWGs can and should play. In principle, the development of the JMIs should provide all stakeholders with a focal point for

---

<sup>5</sup> The performance scores also indicate a difference in perceptions concerning measurable results between Government (7.44) and Development Partners (5.63).

wide ranging discussions about sector performance. For example, issues pertaining to aid coordination and resource mobilization are highly relevant to how progress can be achieved.

57) TWG effectiveness, especially related to the JMIs, will continue to be limited while the complementary and higher-level arrangements – GDCC and CDCF – are not functioning. There must be a holistic view of the entire partnership architecture that recognizes the inter-dependence of the individual components and does not place impractical expectations on the TWGs as the primary vehicle for accountability.

58) It should be a “legacy objective” of the current TWG framework to help strengthen the capacity of the RGC to monitor and assess progress toward development objectives. Development partners should devote more effort to support the RGC’s capacity in this regard.

**59) Capacity Building** RGC and DP leaderships refer to capacity building as a priority core TWG function. TWG leaders tend to refer to capacity building in terms of contributing to the RGCs institutional reform agenda, especially with respect to areas such as PAR, PFM, D & D, and LJR. They also referred to capacity building in terms of technical skill sets germane to specific sectors. In several instances, capacity building referred to strengthening the management of the TWG, with more focus on the Secretariats.

60) The 2010 Guidelines explicitly refer to capacity building: *Capacity development activities should be located in the context of ongoing service reforms*. This would include (a) developing a coherent capacity development strategy; (b) identifying an agreeing on a rational and RGC-led program providing TA, and (c) establishing monitoring indicators that inform progress in these areas. In this sense, it appears that very little progress has been made in this particular core function TWGs. The Guidelines assume that TWG’s are well-suited to facilitate capacity development, but do not go far enough in terms of specifying what capacity development actually covers. The details are left to the specific TWGs to work out.

61) Capacity building is easier said than done. It covers a range of complex issues that require specific skill sets in terms of management, planning and implementation. It is also an area of activity that requires a long term planning and implementation horizon, usually longer than traditional project/program cycles.

62) It appears especially timely to renew, or re-invigorate, a shared commitment to focus on capacity building as a core function of TWGs. One area that has already been mentioned concerns the need to develop the TWG monitoring capacity. A second area concerns the TWGs capacity to support transitions in aid modalities, including more loan based modalities and those involving global foundations. A third area of importance is to re-invigorate efforts to strengthen capacity in support of the RGC’s public service reforms. Indeed, these three areas of concern are deeply inter-woven.

**63) Policy Dialogue** In principle, TWGs should provide an ideal framework for policy dialogue between RGC and DPs. In practice, however, policy dialogue within the TWG framework has proved to be, in many instances, problematic. One notable achievement with respect to policy dialogue concerns the recent development of the Rectangular Strategy III and the NSDP 2014-2018 in which certain TWGs served as a platform for mobilizing input from DPs and civil society for consideration by RGC planners

and policy makers. Although not all recommendations were included in the NSDP, DPs expressed appreciation for the opportunity to contribute to the process. Chairs and secretariats also observed that the process was very useful. This exercise can serve as a model for future engagement in which RGC articulates where it needs and welcomes input with respect to policy development and where there are clear avenues available for DPs to provide such inputs.

64) Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators both observe that a considerable degree of policy dialogue takes place between RGC and DPs, albeit outside the TWG framework. Such dialogue may take place in formal settings within the context of high level consultations between bi-lateral agencies and the government, and/or in the context of ongoing discussions about the implementation of programs and projects. Policy dialogue between RGC officials and DPs also takes place in informal off-the-record discussions. It is also important to recognize that a great deal of policy discussion takes place *among* RGC stakeholders outside the context of the TWGs. This is especially the case in the key areas of reform where government appears to be making some progress.

65) As the institutional and human resource capacity of government continues to strengthen, policy dialogue will need to be more carefully structured. RGC officials and their development partner counterparts will need to pro-actively engage with one another to identify specific areas and modalities for on-going policy engagement.

66) In the meantime, TWG plenary meetings are not necessarily the most suitable or appropriate venue for policy dialogue, especially with respect to highly sensitive and/or complex policy issues. For one thing, the manner in which most TWG plenary meetings are structured and managed do not lend themselves to meaningful policy dialogue. In most cases, this would require a complete re-orientation of how meetings are organized and conducted. For example, as discussed above, tightly packaged plenary agendas routinely obviate discussion of any sort in several TWGs. Chairs and Lead Facilitators would also need to ensure that public discussions are conducted in an atmosphere of mutual respect and patience.

67) Another concern pertains to the ToRs that guide the business of each TWG. In some cases, the boundaries concerning policy dialogue are not clearly articulated. This would include clarification about what subjects or issues are appropriate for discussion and how such discussions can/should be structured. Plenary meetings may, however, serve as useful venues for announcing or clarifying endorsing certain policy agreements that have taken place on the sidelines.

**68) Cross-cutting issues** There is widespread agreement that coordination across sectors, different line agencies and national committees and councils, is complex and fragmented. Both RGC and DPs recognize there is a real need for improvement in the way cross-cutting issues are addressed. However, there is not a clear consensus about how this can be most effectively managed within the current aid architecture. Nor is there a clear consensus among stakeholders about what the most important or relevant key cross-cutting issues are.

69) The discussion about cross-cutting issues needs to be more sharply defined and may be most effective when focused on the RGC's reform and development agenda. There are already TWGs that provide a platform for addressing cross-cutting issues within particular sectors. These include TWG/FSN

& SP; PFM, PAR, D & D; Forestry, and Gender. Whether or not these platforms are effectively utilized is another matter.

70) In other instances cross-cutting issues can be effectively, addressed outside the formal TWG framework. A good example of this concerns the progress that has been achieved to date regarding climate change and environment. While TWGs such as forestry are concerned about climate change, there is also an informal network of stakeholders that meets to discuss issues pertaining to climate change. Another example is the Coordination Working Group for Technical and Vocational Education Training (CWT/TVET), an informal network of stakeholders interested in technical and vocational training. Another format is the Trade SWAP discussions that bring together DP and relevant ministries to discuss issues associated with trade and commerce. Informal networks may also be an effective approach for addressing more sensitive cross-cutting issues such as transparency and corruption.

72) One suggestion for better addressing cross-cutting issues concerns the creation of “super clusters”. Perhaps the most obvious example concerns the RGC reform agenda as outlined in the NSDP, which would involve the TWGs for PFM, PAR, D & D and perhaps PPR. Another potential “super cluster” could include those TWGs concerning human development, including Education, Gender, Health, FSN/SP, and RWSSH. The TWGs for AW, Fisheries, Forestry and Land could jointly address areas concerning rural livelihoods and natural resource management. Closer coordination across these priority reform areas could help improve the effectiveness of implementation. Closer coordination could also include joint retreats and the formulation of key common indicators in their respective JMIs.

73) Another approach would be to convene periodic policy seminars, or roundtables, focused around the four pillars of the RGC’s development framework as outlined in the current NSDP 2014 – 2018. Yet another approach would be to focus such discussions on important policy initiatives such as the RGC’s Industrial Development Policy (IDP) that will be launched soon. Such discussions concerning policy reform and implementation are by definition deeply cross-cutting and should provide opportunities for constructive engagement between relevant RGC line agencies and DPs. This is an approach in which government should lead with DP support. The CDC could also play an important role in convening periodic policy seminars in which relevant national stakeholders, including NGOs, can share a podium to discuss how ODA can most effectively be used to support RGC policy initiatives.

**74) Summary:** It is not feasible to expect that all TWGs will reach a similar level of performance across all six functional areas. The capacity of the TWGs to effectively address these six core functions as discussed above varies according to context and circumstances associated with enabling factors and constraints. For example, in some instances, some TWGs may perform better with regard to coordination and aid mobilization, while others struggle with cross-cutting issues. It appears many TWGs perform well in terms of information sharing while others struggle with policy dialogue, capacity building, and cross-cutting issues. Several TWGs, however, perform well with respect to aid coordination and monitoring.

75) More effort is required to improve TWG capacity to strengthen the complementarity of core functions. In each instance, the CDC should be prepared to play a supporting/facilitating role in collaboration with specific TWGs. This can be achieved by:

- **Aid Coordination and Resource Mobilization** can be improved by the joint development of clearly articulated ToRs, Sector Development Strategies, and TWG annual work plans;
- **Information Sharing** can be improved by careful preparation of plenary agendas and the establishment of a broader sub-groups system as well as a shared commitment to transparency in budgeting and planning, including sharing draft laws and policies ;
- **Monitoring and Evaluation** can be improved by establishing appropriately resourced Management Information Systems and stronger accountability arrangements concerning JMI performance;
- **Capacity Development** can be improved by conducting a capacity needs assessment, identifying an appropriate division of labour, and mobilizing resources;
- **Policy Dialogue** can be improved by articulating a shared policy discussion agenda that clearly delineates issues and boundaries as well as a shared commitment to better coordinate research and improve monitoring systems that support evidence-based policy making;
- **Cross-cutting issues** can be pursued in a broader range of venues, including informal networks, bi-lateral discussions, periodic “super-cluster” meetings, and periodic policy roundtables. Stakeholders must first clearly identify priority cutting issues.

#### **Section 4: The Role of the CDC**

76) The role of CDC and its performance in support of the TWGs receives mixed reviews among stakeholders. Generally speaking, the RGC tends to rate CDC’s support much higher than do the DPs (7.3 vs 4.75, with 10 being highly effective). Despite the difference in these scores, stakeholder interviews suggested broad agreement that the CDC can and should play an important role in supporting the work of the TWGs, and that such a role would be very welcomed. Most stakeholders acknowledged that CDC’s role in certain areas has been very constructive. The key areas of support include:

- The ODA data base that the CDC manages is perceived as very useful;
- The annual TWG network retreats are considered to be a positive initiative in principle, especially among RGC officials who scored the retreats a high 8.47 in terms of effectiveness. The retreats were observed to be a good opportunity for networking;
- The role that CDC focal points play in terms of providing practical advice and support with respect to information about PBAs and JMI development is generally appreciated;
- The CDC’s facilitation of high level consultations with bi-lateral donors is helpful. This is an area where the CDC can complement the TWG’s aid coordination and mobilization function.

77) There are, however, frustrations in some of these areas. For example, several DP Lead Facilitators observed that the results of the networking retreats are often unclear as they tend not to generate specific agreements and agendas for follow up. As with TWG plenary meetings, sporadic attendance at the Networking Retreats across government, DPs, and civil society is cited as a real weakness. As a

result, it is difficult to discuss matters of substance and reach agreement for follow up actions. In a sense, the networking retreats have evolved into primarily one-off information sharing events. These observations help account for the relatively low score of 6.44 provided by DPs. At the same time, some Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators were not aware that CDC focal points were assigned to particular TWGs. In some cases they were surprised to learn focal points had actually attended TWG plenary meetings.

78) There are three key areas where the CDC can play a more active role in promoting better TWG performance. First, the CDC can provide better support and guidance to those TWGs in which there has been recent turnover among RGC Chairs and/or DP Co-chairs. For example, the TWG/LJR has recently been re-constituted by the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). Certain concepts and issues pertaining to aid modalities and aid effectiveness may be new to the MoJ. This suggests both a need and an opportunity for more technical guidance and support from CDC in areas such as developing ToRs and JMIs.

79) Second, the CDC should be prepared to play a more pro-active “brokering role” with those TWGs that are not performing well. More frequent TWG reporting should be undertaken and follow-up measures should be discussed at the TWG P&H. This will add at least a minimum of oversight and also provide for opportunities to seek and secure support. As observed above, this may require more direct hand in facilitating dialogue within the TWG about how performance can be achieved. This assumes however, that both RGC and DP stakeholders are motivated to improve performance by jointly inviting CDC to play such a role. It also assumes CDC has the technical capacity and mandate to play such a role.

80) Third, there is also some frustration, especially among DPs, about the lack of accountability concerning TWG performance and progress toward, or lack thereof, meeting development targets as articulated in the JMIs. The basic question is: To whom, or to what institution(s), are the TWGs accountable? Some Lead Facilitators believe that the CDC can and should play a more active role providing oversight with respect to accountability. However, as CDC’s mandated function/role is primarily one of co-ordination, its role with respect to accountability is not clear. RGC Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators alike suggested that the GDCC should be convened according to the DCPS to provide an over-arching framework supporting accountability. However, as the CDCC is only supposed to meet annually, there also needs to be an ongoing accountability reference point. CDC appears to be the appropriate intermediary institution linking TWGs to the GDCC/CDF framework.

81) In order to better support these three key areas, there is a need to continue strengthening the capacity of the CDC focal points so they can play a more active supportive role in the affairs of the TWG. CDC already provides training opportunities for its staff. This could be complemented with more support from DPs, especially if it is specifically targeted at helping promote public service reforms.

82) In light of the expected trends in shifting development finance modalities, including private sector and increased public expenditures, it is also timely to clarify the CDC’s role with respect to global institutions, South-South actors, and other potential development investors. It is also important to clarify the CDC’s role with respect to an anticipated shift from grants to loans, which are managed by the Ministry of Economy Finance (MEF). It will therefore be important from the perspective of aid

effectiveness to clarify the respective roles and functions of the CDC and MEF with respect to managing such transitions.

## **Section 5: Conclusions and Recommendations**

83) The TWG architecture is generally sound but performance is mixed. There are several areas in which improvements can be made. The recommendations outlined below focus on strengthening the complementarity of procedural and institutional arrangements. For example, in order to strengthen TWG performance and accountability, institutional arrangements for governance need to be reactivated, modified, or simply implemented. It is important to bear in mind that improving TWG performance is in the short term not so much a matter of creating new institutional arrangements, but rather one of re-invigorating and/or implementing the structure that is currently in place as outlined in the 2010 TWG guidelines and the current DCPS.

84) In the longer term, however, institutional arrangements may need to be modified to accommodate a rapidly changing development context. It may also be necessary to adjust, or re-focus, the core functional features of aid effectiveness. For example, a revised institutional framework that is more specifically focused on the RGC's reform agenda and approach to cross-cutting issues, as outlined in the NSDP 2014-2018, could include more explicit emphasis on addressing cross cutting and the development of innovative dialogue arrangements. This suggests the guidelines on TWG roles and functions may need to be revised. In both the short and longer term, the TWG P&H, which includes the CDC as Chair, should be prepared to play a more active role to promote better TWG performance and accountability.

**85) *Implement the Partnership Strategy*** TWG performance cannot be sustainably improved without fully implementing the DCPS (2014 – 2018). In this sense, the next GDCC should be convened in the first quarter of 2015.<sup>6</sup> The Terms of Reference for the GDCC and the agenda for the actual plenary meeting should be developed in consultation between RGC and DPs. The TWG P&H should be prepared to play a more active role to help inform and set the agenda to ensure opportunities for dialogue and that action point decisions will be reached for follow up. Issues pertaining to performance, accountability, and agreed upon actions should be assessed for inclusion in the GDCC agenda for discussion and endorsement. The tools identified in the DCPS 2014-2018, especially PBAs and results frameworks, also provide constructive opportunities to forge closer partnerships for achieving sector objectives and national development goals outlined in the NSDP 2014-2018.

86) The CDC should also play a more active role to encourage each TWG to articulate the roles and responsibilities of civil society organizations, and ensure that civil society member organizations are routinely invited to sub-group and plenary meetings as well as TWG annual retreats. These points could be included in revised TWG ToRs as well as revised TWG guidelines. Civil society can support accountability and help strengthen performance based on their comparative advantages associated with experienced “hands-on” service delivery and local knowledge. The participation of relevant local and/or international NGOs could also help fill expertise gaps in certain sectors and provide a useful perspective concerning the implementation of sector plans and strategies. One possible role for CSOs could be to

---

<sup>6</sup> As the first quarter of 2015 is nearly passed the next GDCC should then be convened in the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of 2015.

serve as a chair, or co-chair chair, of certain TWG sub-groups. CSOs, perhaps certain membership organizations, could also be invited to participate in the TWG/P&H. In the meantime, the CDC should convene annual consultations with CSOs as outlined in the DCPS.

**87) Strengthen the Role of the TWG P&H** The TWG P&H, along with the CDC as Chair, should play a more active role in providing leadership for the overall TWG infrastructure as well as guidance and support for TWGs that are currently not performing well, and/or in areas in which the Chair and the DP Lead Facilitator request guidance on specific areas of concern. For example, given the on-going turn-over of Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators, as well as line agency and DP members, the CDC in conjunction with the TWG P&H should be prepared to provide orientation (or re-orientation) for new TWG Chairs, Secretariats, DP Lead Facilitators and CSO representatives on a periodic basis. These workshops would help new leadership better understand the TWG architecture and concepts such as PBAs and JMIs, as well as familiarizing them with performance “best practices”.

88) The TWG P&H should also encourage each TWG to review their respective ToRs, including consideration of how aid modalities can be better coordinated in a changing development context. The Mid-Term Review of the DCPS represents an opportunity for RGC and DPs to more formally consider aid coordination and harmonization in a rapidly changing context.

89) The TWG P&H should meet more frequently and regularly. The TWG P&H may also need to establish sub-groups to address issues of specific concern, such as changing aid modalities, inclusion and participation of so-called non-traditional development partners, and the implications for partnership and harmonization.

**90) Strengthen Accountability** The CDC should play a more active role in ensuring that TWGs are accountable to a higher authority for performance and progress toward JMIs. The higher authority in this regard is the GDCC annual meeting. The CDC, in consultation with the TWG P&H, should lead the development of the agenda that reviews TWG performance and progress. In preparation of the GDCC agenda, the CDC should encourage the TWGs to hold their own retreats in order to assess their own performance vis-à-vis the six core functions, or at least those that are most relevant to specific TWGs. The outcome of these retreats could be agreed upon immediate remedial actions where feasible (e.g., agreement on a revised ToR; creation or update of sub-groups; agreement on the participation of CSO is the TWG; agreement on the frequency and preparation of TWG meetings). Such actions would need to be complemented by a concrete action plan that would include monitoring of relevant JMIs. Participation of high level representation by CDC and relevant RGC officials would help strengthen RGC ownership by signaling an ongoing commitment to the work of the TWGs.

91) As observed above, a more systematic involvement of civil society organizations across the TWGs could support greater accountability and introduce feedback from grass-roots experiences in policy discussions. This should be explored in the context of a review TWG roles and functions with a view to developing a more consistent approach to their (i.e., CSOs) involvement.

**92) Rationalizing the TWG Landscape** There is widespread agreement there may be too many TWGs at this point in time. One reason concerns the changing development dynamics in certain sectors that may

obviate the ongoing utility of certain TWG arrangements. A second reason is that fewer TWGs could enable CDC to focus more attention on playing a more active supporting role for TWGs, including promoting more active participation by civil society organizations and providing more support for new TWG leadership. It could also help create more space for different approaches to cross-cutting issues and a sharper focus on accountability.

93) There is also widespread understanding this may be a difficult challenge given the institutional interests that have accrued around the TWGs over time. One approach may be to consolidate certain TWGs. For example, the TWGHIV/AIDs could be rolled into the TWG Health, perhaps as a special subgroup, while the TWG for Private Sector Development (PSD) could be rolled into the CDF as outlined in the DCPS. A performance assessment employing the six core functional areas could help inform such a process. This exercise could be undertaken as a component of the DCPS MTR. Another option would simply be to allow non-performing, or poorly performing, TWGs to lie dormant, while being available to respond to special needs as they arise. One such need could be monitoring the JMIs under the continued guidance of CDC. Key stakeholders in dormant TWGs could – and should - of course continue to engage and collaborate in the work of the sector, albeit in the absence of formal institutional arrangements.

**94) Strengthen TWG Core Functions** It is important to bear in mind that the six core functions are to a large extent complementary and mutually supportive. For example, monitoring and policy dialogue both require relevant information, while capacity development can support coordination and aid mobilization as well as monitoring and evaluation. The CDC should encourage TWGs to assess how well they perform each function and identify areas and plans to strengthen core functions.

- **Monitoring** CDC should continue to focus attention on strengthening a Results Based Framework that emphasizes monitoring progress toward achieving NSDP 2014-2018 objectives and targets. This suggests that information systems in certain sectors need to be strengthened in terms of how they are linked to the NSDP's M&E system. DPs should consider how they can support the development of information and monitoring systems, including institutional and human resource capacity building, most effectively. The CDC should be prepared to continue its ongoing support to TWGs concerning the development of realistic and appropriate JMIs.
- **Aid Coordination and Resource Mobilization** More work is required to link RGC and DP investments to performance objectives in each sector. This will require increased transparency on the part of both RGC and DP about budget preparation and execution. This is particularly important in light of the approaching graduation to LMIC status and changing aid modalities. The implementation of PBAs will require greater progress in key areas of institutional and service delivery reform.
- **Information Sharing** the CDC should encourage greater transparency of information sharing, including information about RGC and DP budgeting and planning. This would help support the aid mobilization and monitoring functions, both of which are required for developing PBAs and pooled resourcing. Ongoing effort is also required to ensure that information about the work of each TWG is available to all members of the TWG as well as other TWGs in both Khmer and English. One way to help achieve this is to post the minutes of TWG plenary meeting on the CDC

website. RGC, DPs, and CSOs should continue to provide accurate and up-to-date information about ODA development expenditures for the ODA data base maintained by CDC. The CDC data base could also be modified to enable planners to spatially map development investments. This would require more details about the location of investments (e.g., district, commune)

- **Policy Dialogue** The TWGs may not be the most appropriate venue for policy dialogue, especially with respect to highly sensitive and/or complex issues and technical matters. Nevertheless, discussion of certain policy issues may be feasible provided there is clear understanding of appropriate boundaries. This can be achieved by reviewing ToRs and ongoing discussion between Chairs and DP Lead Facilitators. RGC, DP, and CSO stakeholders could discuss a Code of Conduct that would guide any policy discussions in formal TWG settings. At the same time, key stakeholders should continue to use other mechanisms for policy engagement. Stakeholders should have a shared commitment to evidence-based policy making.
- **Capacity Building** Capacity building in terms of institutions and human resources is essential for improving TWG core functions. In this sense, strengthening TWG capacity should be the overarching function of aid effectiveness. The objective for capacity building efforts should be to strengthen the RGC's ability to plan and manage anticipated transitions in development finance and aid modalities. One approach for this is to clearly define the role and function of the TWGs in a changing development context and then assess the skill sets required to plan and manage core functions. This can then be followed by a capacity needs assessment and development plan in each TWG and mobilizing appropriate resources;
- **Cross-cutting Issues** There are myriad issues of a cross-cutting nature and it would neither be feasible nor desirable to try and address all of them. It will be important to focus on those cross-cutting issues that are most relevant to achieving the development goals and objectives set forth in the current NSDP. One option is to create sub-groups within current TWGs to address specific cross-cutting issues. A second option is to establish thematic "super clusters" that would include TWGs with complementary overarching objectives. For example, the TWGs for PAR, PFM, D & D, LJR, and perhaps PPR, could address key areas of institutional reform as outlined by the NSDP. The TWGs for Education, FSN/SP, Gender, Health, and RWSS could address priority areas concerning relevant human development. The TWGs for A&W, Fisheries, Forestry and Land could jointly address areas concerning rural livelihoods and natural resource management. Super clusters could also identify key common indicators for their respective JMIs and hold annual retreats. A third option could be for the CDC, with DP support, to facilitate seminars or roundtables that would provide a venue for relevant RGC stakeholders to discuss issues pertaining to the NSDP's four pillars as well as important policy initiatives (e.g., IDP). A fourth option would be to identify areas where less formal interactions among stakeholders may be possible (e.g., CWG/TVET; Trade SWAP; climate change).<sup>7</sup>

**95) Consider the Future** the Guidelines on the Role and Functioning of the Technical Working Groups (October 2010) should be reviewed in light of the myriad changes affecting the development context and aid modalities since 2010. Such a review should be forward looking and provide explicit

---

<sup>7</sup> An informal group of DPs concerned with issue pertaining to anti-corruption has also recently begun meeting.

reference to situating TWGs within a broader and more complex development context as reflected in the NSDP and DCPS. In support of a review, it may be useful to conduct a “coordination mapping” exercise to better situate and rationalize the role and functions of the TWGs going forward within the overall coordination landscape. The coordination landscape in Cambodia is complex and fragmented with myriad working groups, committees, and councils. A mapping exercise could help identify gaps, areas of overlap, and potential complementarities across coordination structures.

96) The review of the TWG Guidelines should consider:

- How TWG roles and functions contribute to achieving the RGC’s development and reform objectives as outlined in the NSDP 2014 - 2018.
- How TWGs can perform such functions better, and how performance can be more effectively monitored.
- How institutional arrangements can be modified to promote better performance over time.
- Accountability of performance within the overall development effectiveness architecture.
- More active roles and participation by relevant civil society organizations.
- How cross-cutting issues can be prioritized and acted on.
- How CDC can more effectively support TWGs in particular, and the aid coordination architecture in general. This would include clarifying the mandate of the CDC in the context of changing aid modalities.
- How TWGs can help manage the transition to a development environment in which aid modalities are shifting.

97) The Guidelines could be reviewed in the context of the Mid-Term Review of the current DCPS. The MTR should include an assessment of how aid coordination and harmonization is, or is not, contributing to progress in reaching sector objectives and national development goals. The TWG P&H can provide a useful forum for initial discussions about how the aid coordination architecture can/should evolve to accommodate dynamic changes in aid context and better support the RGC’s reform agenda and development policies. In preparation for this assessment, TWGs can be tasked to consider and document how TWG functions and aid modalities can evolve in mutually relevant directions over the remainder of the current NSDP.

END TEXT



## ANNEX 1: TWG Performance Review Terms of Reference

### Study to Review and Strengthen TWG Performance Terms of Reference (July 2014)

#### 1. Background

In June 2014, the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) finalised its Development Cooperation and Partnerships Strategy (2014-2018). The Strategy identifies a number of principles and tools that will guide the strengthening of partnerships intended to promote development effectiveness. Partnership, which is emphasised amongst these principles, is to be advanced through a series of dialogue arrangements that includes Technical Working Groups (TWGs) that are managed under the Government-Development Partner Coordination Committee (GDCC).

The 2004 establishment of the TWGs and the GDCC mechanism, which initiated a shift from bilateral to multi-stakeholder coordination processes, represented a significant change in the institutional set up for advancing alignment and harmonisation with RGC's programmes at national and sector/thematic level and for strengthening planning, managing and monitoring the implementation of external cooperation.

The TWG mechanism has been reviewed on three previous occasions: in 2006, as part of a broader TWG-GDCC assessment; in 2008, as part of the mid-term review of the RGC Harmonisation-Alignment-Results Action Plan; and in 2011 as part of the Paris Declaration global evaluation.<sup>8</sup> A further review, in the context of the implementation of the Development Cooperation and Partnerships Strategy, is planned for the third quarter of 2014. This review builds on and complements the findings of the more general analysis that was produced as a result of interviewing a wide range of stakeholders on the subject of development effectiveness during the formulation of the Development Cooperation and Partnerships Strategy in 2013. The overall objective of the review is to further strengthen the performance of the TWGs in order to support the implementation of the Rectangular Strategy . Phase III and the NSDP (2014-2018).

#### 2. Objectives and Purpose

As stated above, the overall objective of the TWG review is to strengthen TWG performance in order to support the implementation of the Rectangular Strategy . Phase III and the NSDP (2014-2018). The specific purpose of the study is therefore to: (i) review TWG progress, challenges and opportunities for improved performance; (ii) document and evaluate experience; (iii) identify relevant measures and recommendations for improved performance (both general for the whole TWG structure as well as specific to particular TWGs); and (iv) consider future needs in the context of an evolving partnership that needs to respond to the development priorities in the Rectangular Strategy . Phase III and NSDP 2014-2018.

The focus areas for the study can be summarised as follows:

(i) Notable achievements and challenges

Identify relevant trends and practices in partnership management since 2010 that influence TWG progress.

(ii) Identify positive change and good practice

Document good practice that is emerging and evaluate conditions for their successful adaptation.

The Review will place emphasis on development effectiveness by showing how TWG activities have:

(i) supported the achievement of development results; and

<sup>8</sup>All documents referenced in this document are available on <http://www.cdc-crdb.gov.kh/cdc/aid-management-cambodia.html>

(iii) Provide practical recommendations  
Make specific and operational proposals relevant to the needs of specific TWGs.

(iv) Consider medium-term outlook  
Identify forward-looking issues and considerations that are likely to affect partnership mechanisms

(ii) contributed to the development of national capacity and the strengthening of national systems.

(iii) strengthened multi-stakeholder partnerships

The benchmark, or standard, for assessing the TWGs is the ~~the~~ Guideline on the Role and Functioning of the TWGs (October 2010), which addresses TWG composition/membership, size, management of cross-cutting issues and coordination/linkages, roles and functions, and conduct of meetings.

### 3. Methodology

- a) A review team, comprising one independent consultant (25 days including report-drafting responsibility) will be recruited by CRDB/CDC to lead the TWG study. The independent consultant will be supported by 2 members of the CRDB/CDC Policy Department during interviews.
- b) The TWG review work will consist of:
  - document review (especially to establish a baseline from past reviews and to clarify the context for the 2014 work);
  - interviews with TWG Chairs, development partner co-facilitators, secretariats and members (i.e. approximately 38 1-hour interviews);
  - preparation of a draft independent report;
  - presentation of findings to the Partnership and Harmonisation TWG;
  - Finalization of an independent report based on comments/inputs.
- c) The TWG review team will assess and examine TWG activity as a dynamic and continuous process with appropriate emphasis on trends rather than end-states. An emphasis will be placed on promoting development effectiveness in the TWGs in line with the approach set out in the Development Cooperation and Partnerships Strategy: (i) achieving results; (ii) strengthening capacities and systems; (iii) building effective multi-stakeholder partnerships.
- d) Analysis may be qualitatively evaluated in terms of:
  - Summative evaluation . an assessment of progress and impact.
  - Formative evaluation . an assessment of process and its relevance to results.
  - Counter-factual analysis . expected outcome in the absence of TWG efforts.
  - Unexpected consequences . other results of TWG work that lay outside guidelines.
- e) Findings should include an analysis into explanatory causes and should be placed in the context of broader reforms in Cambodia and at development partner HQ/capitals (e.g. in light of commitments in Paris/Accra/Busan/Mexico).

### 4. Outputs and timing

The main outputs, to be completed over 20 working days (25 days for the international consultant to allow for report drafting and incorporation of final comments) are anticipated as follows:

- a) Inception meeting (August): discussion with a sub-group of the Partnership and Harmonisation TWG during the first week of the assignment. This will be followed by interviews and document analysis.
- b) Draft report (by end-September): submission of a draft report that is based on the four focus areas of analysis identified in section 2 of the TOR. Specific issues to feature in the report include:
  - (i) Identification of both general observations and those relevant to specific TWGs, especially where they face challenges in their performance.
  - (ii) Recommendations of a general nature as well as specific to particular TWGs, especially where they face challenges in their performance.
  - (iii) With regard to medium-term outlook and ensuring future relevance of the system, provide observations and recommendations related to possible options for the future evolution of the TWG and partnership dialogue mechanism.
  - (iv) Specific recommendations on revising the ~~Guideline~~ Guideline on the Role and Functioning of the TWGs (October 2010),
- c) Presentation to stakeholders (end-October): the review team will present initial findings to a meeting of the Partnership and Harmonisation TWG. This meeting will provide the basis for finalising the assignment and validating the findings.
- d) Final report (end-October): comments received from Government and development partners, either written or provided at the review meeting, should be taken into account in the final draft of the report.

## **5. Management Arrangements**

The TWG review team will be managed by CRDB/CDC on behalf of RGC and in consultation with the Partnership and Harmonisation TWG. Lead DPs of the P&H TWG will provide technical inputs. Two members of the CRDB/CDC Policy Department will provide support during the interview stage but will not participate in the independent report-writing phase of the exercise. Technical, logistical and administrative backstopping support will be provided by CRDB and the Partnerships for Development Results project team at CRDB/CDC.

## **ANNEX 2: Documents Reviewed**

Abraham, Belinda (2014); RWSSH TWG Review (ppt).

CDC (2010); Guidelines on the Role and Functioning of the Technical Working Groups.

CDC (2014); Development Cooperation and Partnership Strategy 2014-2014.

CDC (2014); Development Cooperation Trends in Cambodia.

CDC (2012); Partnership and Dialogue Arrangements for Promoting Development Effectiveness in Cambodia.

CRDB (2006); The Government Donor Coordination Committee (CDCC) and Technical Working Groups (TWGs) in Cambodia.

Wilkinson, David (2012); Review of the Functioning of the Technical Working Group Health (TWGH).

### Additional Documents

2008; MTR Synthesis Self-Assessment

2009; Partnership SWOT Analysis

2010; Cambodia Paris Declaration Evaluation Summary

2013; Strategy Preparation Interviews Synthesis

2014; TWG + JMI Report

### ANNEX 3: Persons Interviewed

Royal Government of Cambodia: TWG Chairs and/or Secretariats			
TWG	Names	Titles	Ministry
Agriculture and Water	H.E. Mam Annot	Secretary of State, MAFF (Form) Co-Chair of TWG/AW	MAFF & MoWRaM
	H.E. HE Thor Chetha	Secretary of State, MoWRaM	
	Mr. MakMony	Deputy Director Head the TWG Secretariat	
D & D	H.E. SakSetha	Secretary of State, Mol Chair of the TWG/D&D	Ministry of Interior
Education	Mr. Lim Sothea	Director of Planning Dept.	Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports
Fisheries	H.E. Nao Thuok	Delegate of Government and Director of Fisheries Administration Chairs of the TWG-Fisheries	MAFF, Directorate of Fisheries
	Mr. Chan Danith	Head of the TWG Secretariat	Fisheries Administration
Food Security, Nutrition and Social Protection	H.E. Lao Sokharom	Secretary General – CARD Head TWG Secretariat	CARD/CoM
	H.E. Sok Silo	Dep. Sec. General, CARD Head, FS&N Coordination Unit	
	H.E. SannVathana	Dep. Sec. General Head, SP Coordination Unit	
Forestry	Mr. Sok Srun	Chief Officer Head of Secretariat	Forestry Administration
Gender	Ms. Nhean Sochetra	Director Gender Equality Head TWG Secretariat	Ministry of Women's Affairs
Health	Prof. Eng Huot	Secretary of State, MoH Head of TWG Secretariat	Ministry of Health
HIV	H.E. Tia Phalla	Vice Chairman, NAA	Nat. AIDS Authority
	Dr. Sim Kamsan	Dir. Resource Mobilization	Nat. AIDS Authority
IRI	H.E. Pheng Sovicheano	Under Sec. State, MoPWT Head of TWG Secretariat	MoPWT
LJR	H.E. Ith Rady	Under Sec. State, MoJ Head of TWG Secretariat	Ministry of Justice
Land	H.E. Sar Sovann	Secretary of State	MLUPC
	Mr. Tuo Sothou	Head of TWG Secretariat	MLUPC
Mine Action	H.E. Chum Bun Rong	Secretary General, CMAA	CMAA
	H.E. Chan Rotha	Dep. Sec. General, CMAA Head of TWG Secretariat	CMAA
P & H	H.E. Chhieng Yanara	Minister attached to the Prime Minister; Secretary General CRDB/CDC	CDC/CRDB
	Ms. Ly Sokleap	Assistant to the Minister	
	Mr. Kim Lumangbopata	Dep. Bureau Chief; Develop. Asst Coord. Dept.	

		CRDB/CDC	
PAR	H.E. Yuok Bunna	Secretary of State, MoCS Chair of TWG – PAR	Ministry of Civil Service
	H.E. Kong Sophy	Director General, MoCS Head of TWG Secretariat	Ministry of Civil Service
PFM	Dr. Hel Chamroeun	Acting Secretary General	MEF
	Mr. BouVong Sokha	Deputy Secretary General	MEF
PPR	H.E. TuonThavrak	Secretary of State, MoP Co-Chair of TWG-PPR	
	H.E. San Sy Than	Secretary of State, MoP Co-chair of TWG-PPR	
PSD	H.E. SokChendaSopheha	Minister Attached to the PM Secretary General, CDC Chair of the TWG-PSD	CDC
RWSSH	H.E. Try Meng	Secretary of State, MoRD	MRD
	Mr. Chreay Pom	Head of the TWG Secretariat	
	Dr. Mao Saray	Dep. Head, TWG Secretariat	
Development Partners			
TWG	Names	Title	Agency
Agriculture and Water	Mr. Paul Keogh	Head, Development Cooperation, Co-Lead Facilitator (Former)	Australian Embassy
	Mr. Nicholas Wolf	Second Secretary	
	Ms. Nina Brandstrup	Representative, Lead Facilitator	FAO
D & D	Ms. Kristina Kuhnel	Head, Development Cooperation	SIDA
	Mr. Eric h Wallin	First Sec. Program Officer	
Education	Ms. Anne Lemaistre	Representative, UNESCO Lead Facilitator	UNESCO
Fisheries	Mr. Georges Dehoux	Attache (Aid Effectiveness, Budget Support, and PFM Lead Facilitator	EU
Forestry	Ms. Elodie Maria-Sube	Attache, EU Lead Facilitator	EU
	Mr. Koen Everaert	Attache, EU Lead Facilitator (former)	
Food Security, Nutrition, and Social Protection	Mr. Gianpietro Bordignon	Country Director Co-Lead Facilitator	WFP
	Ms. Edith Heines	Deputy Country Director	
	Ms. Rana Flower	Country Representative Co-Lead Facilitator	UNICEF
Gender	Mr. Napoleon Navarro	Deputy Country Director Lead Facilitator	UNDP
	Ms. Mia Hyun	Gender Advisor	
	Ms. Kumi Careme Mr. NheanTola	Project Formulation Advisor Program Offcier	JICA

	Mr. Eiichiro Hatashi Ms. Pich Thyda	Project Formulation Advisor Program Officer	
Health	Dr. Rasul Baghirov	Team Leader Health Sector Department	WHO
HIV	Ms. Marie-Odile Emond	UNAIDS Country Coordinator Lead Facilitator, TWG HIV	UNAIDS
IRI	Ms. Kumi Careme Mr. Nhean Tola	Project Formulation Advisor Program Advisor	JICA
	Mr. Masahiko Egami Mr. Say Bora	Representative Program Officer	
Land	Dr. Ludgera Klemp	Counselor, Cooperation Lead Facilitator, TWG Land	German Embassy
LJR	Ms. Wan-Hea Lee	Representative, OHCHR Lead Facilitator, TWG LJR	OHCHR
	Ms. Catherine Phuong	Head, Rule of Law Unit	
Mine Action	Mr. Napoleon Navarro	Deputy Country Director Lead Facilitator	UNDP
	Mr. David Horrocks	Mine Action	
PAR	Ms. Birgit Yvonne Strube	2 <sup>nd</sup> Secretary	German Embassy
PFM	Mr. Christian Provoost	Attache, (Aid Effectiveness, Budget Support and PFM)	EU
PPR	Mr. Alassane Sow	Country Manager	World Bank
	Ms. Claire Van der Vaeren	UN Resident Coordinator	UN
P & H	Mr. Klas Rasmusson	Counselor, Swedish Embassy	SIDA
	Ms. Khristina Kuhnel	Head, Development Cooperation	
	Ms. Setsuko Yamazaki	Representative, UNDP	UNDP
	Ms. Anja Thomas	Aid Effectiveness	
PSD	Mr. Julian Clarke	Trade Economist	World Bank
	Mr. Eric Sidgwick	Country Director	ADB
RWSSH	Ms. Rana Flower	Country Representative	UNICEF
	Ms. Belinda Abraham	Chief, WASH	
Development Partners	Ms. Rebecca Black	Mission Director	USAID
Non-Governmental Organizations, Membership Organizations			
TWG/Sector	Name	Title	Agency
Education	Mr. Chim Chanveasna	Executive Director	NEP
Health	Dr. Sin Somuny	Executive Director	MEDICAM
	Mr. Soeung Saroeun	Executive Director	CCC
	Mr. Tek Vannara	Executive Director	NGO Forum

## **ANNEX 4: Scoring Questions**

The independent review team is interested to hear your reflections about the performance of your TWG and any suggestions you may have about improving performance. We would like to ask that you take a few minutes to consider the following questions and rate accordingly in advance of our meeting. We will ask follow up questions about your scoring during the interview.

### **1.0 Working Arrangements**

**The roles and responsibilities of the TWG Chair, Facilitator, and Secretariat are clear**

**(10 = strongly agree; 1 = does not agree; 5 = somewhat agree)**

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

**The TWG is sufficiently resourced to work effectively and achieve its objectives.**

**(10 = strongly agree; 1 = does not agree; 5 = somewhat agree)**

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

**The TWG network retreats are useful for achieving TWG objectives.**

**(10 = strongly agree; 1 = does not agree; 5 = somewhat agree)**

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

### **2.0 Performance/Effectiveness**

**How would you rate the overall performance of the TWG?**

**(10 = excellent; 1 = poorly; 5 = adequate)**

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

**Please rate the following statements accordingly:**

**The TWG is a useful means to promote open dialogue and achieve effective working relationships?**

**(10 = strongly agree; 1 = does not agree; 5 = somewhat agree)**

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

**The TWG achieves measurable results in terms of promoting development impact/results?**

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

**The TWG plays a useful role in promoting the RGCs policy reform agenda.**

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

### **3.0 Support**

**The TWG receives useful support from CRDB/CDC to promote more effective performance.**

**(10 = strongly agree; 1 = does not agree; 5 = somewhat agree)**

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

**How useful are these interventions, and how often are they used? Please rate according to 10 = Very useful; 1 = not at all useful; 5 = sometimes useful.**

Intervention	Effectiveness	Comment
TWG Focal Points		
Network Retreats		
PBA Clinics		
Advisory Support		
Financial		
Information		
Other		

## **ANNEX 5: Scoring Summary**

### **1. The roles and responsibilities of the TWG Chair, Facilitator, and Secretariat are clear**

(10 = strongly agree; 1 = does not agree; 5 = somewhat agree)

Chairs/Secretariats = 8.70 (17 respondents)

Lead Facilitators = 6.67 (18 respondents)

### **2. The TWG is sufficiently resourced to work effectively and achieve its objectives.**

(10 = strongly agree; 1 = does not agree; 5 = somewhat agree)

Chairs/Secretariats = 7.03 (17)

Lead Facilitators = 6.20 (18)

### **3. The TWG network retreats are useful for achieving TWG objectives.**

(10 = strongly agree; 1 = does not agree; 5 = somewhat agree)

Chairs/Secretariats = 8.47 (17)

Lead Facilitators = 6.44 (16)

### **4. How would you rate the overall performance of the TWG?**

(10 = excellent; 1 = poorly; 5 = adequate)

Chairs/Secretariats = 7.70 (17)

Lead Facilitators = 5.68 (17)

### **5. The TWG is a useful means to promote open dialogue and achieve effective working relationships?**

(10 = strongly agree; 1 = does not agree; 5 = somewhat agree)

Chair/Secretariat = 8.12 (17)

Lead Facilitator = 6.42 (18)

### **6. The TWG achieves measurable results in terms of promoting development impact/results?**

Chair/Secretariat = 7.44 (16)

Lead Facilitators = 5.63 (18)

**7. The TWG plays a useful role in promoting the RGCs policy reform agenda.**

Chair/Secretariat = 7.65 (17)

Lead Facilitators = 5.53 (18)

**8. The TWG receives useful support from CRDB/CDC to promote more effective performance.**

**(10 = strongly agree; 1 = does not agree; 5 = somewhat agree)**

Chair/Secretariat = 7.3 (16)

Lead Facilitators = 4.75 (14)