

Revised Donor Performance Assessment Framework (DPAF) Indicators and Targets

Background:

Adopted in 2008, the Donor Performance Assessment Framework (DPAF) forms a part of a mutual review process designed to strengthen mutual accountability at the country level, drawn from international and national agreements on the quality of development assistance to Rwanda. The DPAF reviews the performance of bilateral and multilateral donors against a set of established indicators on the quality and volume of development assistance to Rwanda, while the Common Performance Assessment Framework (CPAF) drawn from the M&E framework of Rwanda's Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS) reviews performance against a set of agreed indicators and targets on EDPRS outcomes and policy actions. The DPAF is presented both in aggregate form (comprising all development assistance to Rwanda), and disaggregated by donor to allow for comparison, individual reflection on performance, accountability and peer pressure, which are recognised as key ingredients to the successful implementation of the Paris Declaration and Rwanda's Aid Policy at the country level.

The fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness held in Busan, South Korea, adopted the Busan Partnership document (PBd), which is the result of an inclusive process of consultation and negotiation in preparation for the HLF 4 Busan. The BPd sets principles, goals and commitments that aim to improve the effectiveness – and in turn the results – of development cooperation. It is informed by the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and Accra Agenda for Action (2008). Those partners endorsed the aid effectiveness agreements through the Paris Declaration and AAA have also reaffirmed their respective commitments alongside the new commitments agreed by a much broader set of stakeholders in Busan.

The Busan Partnership document places an emphasis on country-level implementation and monitoring of efforts in ways that meet the needs of developing countries and are appropriate to country context.

Busan Partnership document agreements on monitoring

- At the level of individual developing countries, agree on frameworks based on national needs and priorities for monitoring progress and promoting mutual accountability in our efforts to improve the effectiveness of our cooperation and, in turn, development results. Developing countries will lead in the elaboration of such frameworks which, together with any indicators and targets agreed, will respond to their specific needs and will be grounded in their aid and development policies. The results of these exercises will be made public. [Paragraph 35 (a)]
- Agree by June 2012, on a selective and relevant set of indicators and targets through which we will monitor progress on a rolling basis, supporting international and regional accountability for the implementation of our commitments. We will build on the initiative led by developing countries and learn from existing international efforts to monitor aid effectiveness. We will review these arrangements in the context of the post-MDG framework. We will periodically publish the results of these exercises. [paragraph 35 (b)]

Rwanda has been part of the Post-Busan Interim Group (PBIG), which has worked on proposing the Post-Busan global monitoring framework. The Post-Busan Global Monitoring Framework is proposed to include 10 key global indicators, with 7 out of 10 are monitored at country level to be aggregated to inform the global progress.

To this end, there is a need to incorporate the global monitoring indicators in the country-level monitoring framework. It is in this context that the existing DPAF framework is proposed to be revised and adjusted to

reflect the global monitoring indicators as well as the targets as well as to strengthen the country-level monitoring. The previous DPAF exercise has also noted on the weakness of some of the DPAF indicators in ensuring credibility of assessment due to inconsistency in application of definitions and criteria, noting that qualitative assessment may be best suited to assess the progress in some issues. The revision also aims to consider these weakness and different approach in order to strengthen the usefulness and credibility of the assessment.

Proposed Revised DPAF Indicators and Targets

1. The below are proposed revised DPAF indicators and targets. The targets for G1-G6 are already set as agreed in the forward looking Joint Budget Support Review (JBSR).

Indicators		FY 10/11 Actual	PD 2010 Actual	2010 PD Target	2015 BPd target	FY11/12 Target	FY12/13 Target
A.1	Volume of ODA on budget (RWF)	350,446,379					
A.2	% ODA for GoR sector recorded in the national budget (PD Indicator 3)	64%	71%	85%	85.5%	100%	100%
A.3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies	65%		n/a	n/a	85%	90%
B.1	% ODA disbursed in context of a PBA (PD Indic 9)	66%	67%	67%	71%	79%	85%
B.2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD Indic 5a)	34%	42%	59%	71%	54%	59%
B.3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD Indic 5a)	47%	47%	59%	74%	58%	63%
B.4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD Indic 5a)	59%	62%	59%	81%	70%	73%
B.5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement procedures (PD Indic 5a)	62%	64%	66%	82%	71%	75%
b.6 (new)	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems	72%	73%	n/a	n/a	85%	90%
B.6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	31	25	14	9	0	0
B.6 rev	Number of PIUs				Baseline	0	0
B.7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	94%	94%	Maintain or increase	50%	50%	50%
B.8	% of ODA untied (PD indic 8)	Not available	-	Continued increase	Proposed to discontinue		
C.1	% of donors delivered all ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years	60%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%
C.1. rev	% of aid covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level	NA	NA	NA	TBD	Baseline	TBD
C.2	% of donors providing non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year.	67%		100%	NA	100%	100%
C.3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled by cooperation providers	88%	97%	NA	99%	98%	98%
D.1	Total number of missions	113			For Tracking Only		
D.1.1 (new)	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during silent period			0	TBD	0	0
D.2	% of total missions that are joint (PD Indic 10a)	49%	44%	40%	72%	55%	61%
D.3	Total number of analytic works	39		Maintain or decrease	For Tracking Only		
D.4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD Indic 10b)	67%	82%	66%	91%	86%	87%
E.1	% of Donors using country results framework	TBD					
E.2.	Inclusive mutual assessment review undertaken	TBD					
E.3.	Systems that track and make public resource allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment in place	TBD					

Division of Labour related DPAF Indicators and Targets (Monitored at Sector level and Individual DP level)							
E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL.	5.5			3	3	3
E2	Total Funding per Sector (Sector and Individual DP level)	NA	NA	NA	For Monitoring Only		
E3	Average number of projects per sector (Sector and Individual DP level)	NA	NA	NA	Baseline	2	2
E4	Average size of initiatives provided to the sector (Sector and Individual DP level)	NA	NA	NA	Baseline	>\$1 Mill	>\$1 Mill
E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)	NA	NA	NA	Baseline	>70%	>80%
Budget Support Related Indicators and Targets (Already Agreed Through BSHG)							
G1	% of BS donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question.	29%	NA	NA	NA	100%	100%
G2	% of BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year.	86%	NA	NA	NA	100%	100%
G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year	43%	NA	NA	NA	50%	55%
G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled (quarterly).	91%	NA	NA	NA	100%	100%
G5	% of BS donors adhering fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)	100%	NA	NA	NA	100%	100%
G6	% of BS donors adhering fully to partnership framework (MoU).	100%	NA	NA	NA	100%	100%
G7 (new)	'% of BS disbursed within the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled monthly' to '% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned.	NA	NA	NA	NA	Baseline	TBD

Annex: Post-Busan Global Monitoring Framework

	Indicator	Target (2015)	Data Source	
			Existing international source	Collected at country level
1	Co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries priorities			
	Extent of use of country results frameworks by providers of co-operation (specific criteria to be finalised)	All providers of development cooperation use country results frameworks. (linking to quality assessment noted to be considered).		?
2	Civil society operates within an environment which maximises their contribution to development			
	Enabling Environment Index	Continued progress over time (all countries proposed by civil society organisations)	?	
3	Improving the environment for private sector development			
	(measure to be identified, subject to relevant existing data source). Further consideration given to environment that natures domestic private sector engagement	Continued progress over time (all countries proposed by civil society organisations)	?	(TBD)
4	Information on development co-operation is publicly available			
	(measure of state of implementation of the common standard by donors to be elaborated)	Implement the common standard – All donors are on track to implement a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on development co-operation.	?	
5.	Development co-operation is predictable			
	(a) Annual: proportion of aid disbursed within the fiscal year within which it was scheduled; and (b) Medium-term: proportion of aid covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level.	Halve the gap – halve the proportion of aid not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled (baseline year 2010). Halve the gap – halve the proportion of aid not covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level (Baseline to be determined)		?
6.	Aid is on budgets which are subject to parliamentary scrutiny.			
	% of aid scheduled for disbursement by donors and communicated to government that is recorded in the annual budget approved by the legislature.	Halve the gap – halve the proportion of aid flows to the government sector not reported on government's budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget). (Baseline year 2010).		?
7.	Mutual accountability among co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive mechanisms			
	% of countries that undertake inclusive mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments.	All developing countries have inclusive mutual assessment reviews in place.		?
8.	Efforts are made to ensure that public expenditures benefit gender equality and women's empowerment			
	% of countries with systems that track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment.	All countries have systems that track and make public resource allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment.		?
9.	Developing countries' systems and institutions are strengthened and used.			
	(a) Quality of developing country PFM systems; and (b) Use of country PFM and procurement systems	Half of developing countries move up at least one measure (i.e. 0.5 points) on the PFM.CPIA scale of performance (baseline year 2010) – partner countries propose to use PEFA, noting the issue of CPIA. Reduce the gap (use the same logic as in Paris – close the gap by two third where CPIA score is >=5, or by one-third where between 3.5 and 4.5) Baseline year 2010.	?	?
10.	Aid is untied.			
	% of aid that is fully untied.	Continued progress over time (baseline year 2010)	?	