Independent External Evaluation of the Joint Financing Arrangement II (JFA-II) Support of Pooled Fund Partners to the 2010-2012 ECA Business Plan

TEKLEHAIMANOT HAILESELASSIE PATRICK DIBERE PEACE MOLUTSI RUDOLFBAYONG FOMBAD

# Norad Collected Reviews

# 6/2012

The report is presented in a series, compiled by Norad to disseminate and share analyses of development cooperation. The views and interpretations are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation.



Independent External Evaluation of the Joint Financing Arrangement II (JFA-II) Support of Pooled Fund Partners to the 2010-2012 ECA Business Plan

Final Report

December 2012

### **Evaluation Team**

#### 1. HAILESELASSIE Teklehaimanot (Lead Consultant)

Doctor of Philosophy in Education, M.A. in Geography (Regional Planning), B.A. in Education, Geography Major and Psychology minor

#### 2. MOLUTSI Patrick Dibere Peace

Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology Master of Philosophy in Sociology B. A History and Sociology Postgraduate Diploma in Population Studies Diploma in Public International Law Diploma in Education

#### 3. FOMBAD Rudolf Bayong

Doctor of Philosophy in Agriculture, Master of Science in Agricultural Biochemistry and Nutrition, Bachelor of Science in Biochemistry

#### Acknowledgements

Many people have contributed differently to this Evaluation and its Report. First we would like to express our gratitude to the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) and the members of the Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA) for giving us this opportunity to undertake this evaluation. Many people around Africa could have been chosen to do it but were not. It was a privilege and honour that we deeply appreciate. This exercise was both insightful and educational to us. Our deepest appreciation goes to the different people from different governments and organizations who gave so generously of their precious time to respond to our long questions. We were amazed by the willingness of all those we met to go an extra hour to speak to us sometimes till the late hours of the day. This spirit of giving and readiness to assist ran across a wide spectrum of our respondents from those in Addis Ababa – AUC, ECA, JFA partners to Ministers of the Governments of the Republics of Ethiopia and Rwanda to officials of government and regional organizations in the countries visited and to the civil society organizations that we met in the field. We thank them all.

The work of evaluation would have been very difficult without the highly professional and efficient steering and support services of Mr. Anthony Nwanze and his hardworking team in the Partnerships and Technical Cooperation Office (PATCO) of ECA. Planning and execution of the evaluation fieldwork was superb and the day to day administrative support was incredible. Many of the staff of the Office even sacrificed their family time on the weekends to assist the team with printing and related support services. We thank you all and hope that the quality of this Report march the amount of time you put into it.

We thank the staff of the UNECA library in Addis Ababa who had to put up with these three strangers who were always coming in and out at odd hours and demanding this and that of their time.

Finally, this Report was written with the positive spirit of contributing to the goal of Africa's development. The achievement of this goal requires honesty and frankness – the values which hope this Report manifests.

We thank you all.

The Evaluation Team

# **Contents**

Acknowledgements	II
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	VI
Executive Summary	1
Chapter 1: Background	5
Chapter 2: Evaluation Analytical Framework and Methods	7
2.1 Objectives of the Evaluation	7
2.3 Analytical Framework and Evaluation Criteria	7
2.4 Evaluation Design: Sampling of Countries and Sub-programmes	10
2.5 Sources and Types of Data	12
2.6. Data Analysis and Triangulation	13
2.7 Limitations of Evaluation	14
Chapter 3: Evaluation Findings and Analysis	16
3.1 Macroeconomic Analysis, Finance and Economic Development and NEPAD	18
3.2 Regional Integration, Infrastructure and Trade	24
3.3 Sub-programme on Promoting Good Governance and Public Administration	33
3.4 Sub-programme on Gender Equality and Social Development	40
3.5 Evaluation of the JFA Partnership	47
Chapter 4: General Conclusions, Lessons Learnt and Recommendations	53
4.1 Conclusions	53
4.2 Lessons Learnt	56
4.3 Recommendations	57
ANNEX I: Terms of Reference	59
Annex II: Analytical Framework	64
c) Analytical Framework for Governance Sub-programme	66

d) Analytical Framework for Gender Sub- Programme67
Annex III: Schedule of Activities69
Annex IV: PROTOCOL 1 - SAMPLING GUIDE70
ANNEX VI: PROTOCOL 3 TO BE ANSWERED BY GENERAL STAKEHOLDERS TO THE PROGRAMME
ANNEX VII: PROTOCOL 4 DISSEMINATION OF ECA FLAGSHIP PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS89
ANNEX VIII: PROTOCOL 5: A GUIDE OF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS WITH ECA SUB-PROGRAMME BENEFICIARIES93
ANNEX IX: PROTOCOL 6 FOR JFA DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS94
ANNEX X: PROTOCOL 7 PARTNERSHIP AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION OFFICE (PATCO)96
ANNEX XI (a): ECA Flagship Distribution for 2010 – 201298
ANNEX XI (b): Availability of Minimum Expected ECA Flagship Publications in Higher Education Institution Libraries100
ANNEX XI (c): Availability of Minimum Expected ECA Flagship Publications in Higher Education Institution Libraries
ANNEX XI (d): Availability of Minimum Expected ECA Flagship Publications in Non-Higher Education Libraries
ANNEX XIV: List of Persons Interviewed and Institutions Visited106
ANNEX XV: Independent External Evaluation of JFA Pooled Partners Support to UNECA113
Ribliography 115

#### Tables

Table 1: Volume of JFA Investment by Sub-programmes (US \$ million)6
Table 2: DAC Criteria and Key Evaluation Questions9
Table 3: Criteria and Selected Countries11
Table 4: Criteria for Selection of Respondents and Tools Used12
Table 5: Sources of Data and Information by Sub-programmes13
Table 6: Views of Respondents from countries visited, RECs and SROs on Evaluation Questions17
Table 7: Summary of Macroeconomic Sub-programme's Performance 2010 -2012 –Log Frames I & II and Field Report20
Table 8: Summary of Regional Integration Sub-programme's Performance 2010 -2012 –Log Frames I & II and Field Report27
Table 9: Availability of ARIA III, IV and V28
Table 10: Summary of Governance Sub-programme's Performance 2010- 2012 –log Frame I &II and Field Report
Table 11: Summary of Field Results Related to Gender Sub-programme Interventions
Table 12: Summary of Gender Sub-programme's Performance 2010 -2012 –Log Frames I & II and Field Results42
Table 13: Income and Expenditure Report – JFA Funding as at 31st August 2012 (in US \$ millions)48
Diagrams
Diagram 1: Analytical Framework - Governance Sub-programme as Example9

## List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACPC African Climate Policy Centre

ACS African Centre for Statistics

ADF African Development Forum

AEO African Economic Outlook

AfDB African Development Bank

AFT Aid for Trade

AGDI African Gender and Development Index

AGOA Africa Growth Opportunity Act

AGF African Governance Programme

AGR African Governance Report

AMU Arab Maghreb Union

APRM African Peer Review Mechanism

ARIA Assessing Regional Integration in Africa

ATPC African Trade Policy Centre

AU African Union

AUC Africa Union Commission

AWR African Women's Report

AWRO African Women's Rights Observatory

CB Capacity Building

CEDAW Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Descrimination Against Women

CEMAC Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa

CFTA Continental Free Trade Area

COMESA Common Market for East and Central Africa

CEPGL Economic Community of Great Lakes Mechanism

CEN-SAD Community of Sahelo-Saharan States

CODESRIA Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa

CSO Civil Society Organization

DAC Development Assistance Committee

DDA Doha Development Agenda

EAC East African Community

ECA Economic Commission for Africa

ECCAS Economic Community of Central African States

ECOWAS Economic Community of West African States

EDND Economic Development and NEPAD Division

EPA Economic Partnership Agreement

ERA Economic Report on Africa

EU European Union

FAO Food and Agriculture Organization

FDI Foreign Direct Investment

FSSD Food Security and Sustainable Development

FTA Free Trade Agreement

GATT General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

GDP Gross Domestic Product

GMO Gender Monitoring Office

GPAD Governance and Public Administration Division

GSI Gender Status Index

ICE Intergovernmental Committee of Experts

ICT Information and Communication Technology

ICSTD Information, Communication, Science and Technology Division

IDEP Institute for Development and Economic Planning

IGAD Intergovernmental Authority on Development

IGO Inter-governmental Organization

ILO International Labour Organization

IMF International Monetary Fund

IPPF Infrastructure Project Preparation Facility

ISTA Institut Sous – Regional, Multisectoriel de Technologie Appliquee, de

Planification et D'Evaluation de Projets

JFA Joint Financial Arrangement

LDC Least Developed Country

MOU Memorandum of Understanding

MDG Millennium Development Goal

MRDE Mutual Review of Development Effectiveness

MS Member States

MYP Multi Year Programme

NEPAD New Partnership for Africa's Development

NGO Non-Governmental Organization

NICI National Information and Communication Infrastructure

ODA Official Development Assistance

OECD Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

PATCO Partnership and Technical Cooperation Office

PRSP-LG African Learning Group on Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers

RCM Regional Coordination Mechanism

REC Regional Economic Community

RITD Regional Integration, Infrastructure and Trade Division

R B Regular Budget

SACU South African Customs Union

SADC South African Development Community

SME Small and Medium Size Enterprises

SRO Sub-Regional Office

SRCM Sub – Regional Coordination Mechanism

TAH Trans African Highway

TF Trust Fund

TPU Trade Policy Units

UN United Nations

UEMOA West African Economic and Monetary Union

UNCTAD United Nations Conference and Development

UMA Union Maghreb Arab

UNECA United Nations Economic Commission for Africa

UNEG United Nations Evaluation Group

UNESCO United Nations Economic and Scientific Cultural Organization

UNICEF United Nations International Children Fund

UNDP United Nations Development Programme

WAMZ West African Monetary Zone

WB World Bank

WTO World Trade Organization

XB Extra Budget

#### **Executive Summary**

This Report presents the findings and recommendations of the independent external evaluation of the second Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA II) Pooled Fund Partners support to ECA Business Plan 2010-2012. The Business Plan was grafted in the context of ECA's decision to strategically align its programme with the African Union Vision which seeks to realize the two pillars of (i) promoting regional integration and NEPAD and (ii) supporting Africa to meet its special needs including sustained development and the MDGs. The partners in the JFA mechanism are Denmark, Norway, Sweden and UK who among them contributed US \$46.21 million (42.05%) of the total US \$109.9 million extrabudgetary requirements of the Business Plan. The total regular budget (RB) provided by ECA over the Plan period was US \$193.2 making a total of US \$303.1 million for the Plan period. This makes JFA contribution to the overall budget to be 15.2%.

The Business Plan 2010-2012 comprised of seven strategic sub-programmes: i) Macro-economic Analysis, Finance and Economic Development (ii) Regional Integration, Infrastructure and Trade, (iii) Governance and Public Administration (iv) Gender and Social Development, (v) Food Security and Sustainable Development, (vi) Information, Science and Technology for Development and (vii) Statistics and Statistical Development for Africa. The first four sub-programmes were selected as a sample for evaluation on the basis of the amount of JFA funds invested in their activities and their strategic capability to influence the African development agenda.

The three objectives of the external evaluation were to: a) assess the impacts of ECA's sub-programme interventions in strengthening/enhancing capacities of Member States (MS), Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and the African Union and its Secretariat (Commission), b) assess the effectiveness and efficiency of JFA working mechanism and c) assess the extent to which the successful results/impacts of ECA's sub-programmes can be attributed to the Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA) mechanism. The scope of the evaluation was the four sub-programmes selected from the seven in the Business Plan (see TORs). The evaluation was done in accordance with the provision of the MOU of the Second Joint Financial Arrangement (JFA) and its findings are intended to help ECA and its JFA partners improve both their working mechanisms and programme results.

The evaluation used a combination of the analytical framework that focused on context, inputs, outputs, outcomes/impacts and sustainability (theory of change) of the sub-programmes and OECD-DAC and UN Evaluation Group (UNEG)'s five point criteria to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the sub-programmes selected for closer evaluation. Key methods and tools used to collect data were desk review and fieldwork. Several data collection tools used included questionnaires, interviews, focus group discussions and direct observation. The qualitative and quantitative data were collated, triangulated and analyzed using the evaluation criteria.

The findings of the sub-programmes and JFA II mechanism evaluation verified that the interventions in all the four sub-programmes in ECA's Business Plan were contextually appropriate and strategically sound. The respondents in the sample countries - Botswana, Ethiopia, Gabon, Morocco, Rwanda and Senegal as well as officials and experts in the regional economic communities (RECs) of ECCAs, ECOWAS, SADC and UMA generally expressed positive contribution of ECA's sub-programmes to their development work. The resources invested from JFA II were mainly in the form of technical

assistance with limited financial support and the process was mainly knowledge generation and sharing. The process included training workshops, seminars, dialogues and consensus building forums, research and advocacy platforms and above all production of flagship publications. The evaluation found that projects such as APRM, AGR, ARIA, AGDI, and ERA, although varied in extent involved non-state stakeholders. Discussions in SROs, MS and RECs revealed that both the processes (activities) and outputs of the programme contributed highly to awareness and knowledge in various areas like social policy, economic policy management, regional integration, market analysis and modeling, trade policy, gender main-streaming, election process, democratic values and others.

Besides the acquired knowledge, specialized skills like negotiations in international trade, dispute settlement procedures, and international contractual arrangements were applied and helped build capacity of RECs and MS. The impact of the programme was widely reported by the key respondents in the field and the review of literature and various reports of meetings and workshops confirmed their value addition. Elections, political dialogues, free trade areas, relatively better intra-Africa free movement of goods and people with countries opening regional integration offices are steadily becoming common. RECs are also gradually gaining development momentum with steps of merger among some of them. Officials in many of these institutions have reflected on the importance of the contribution of the XB in general and JFA in particular. JFA programme, in terms of its features and accomplishments, including mechanism of funding and modality of operation, was found to be relatively efficient, flexible and generally a sound and useful arrangement. As a working mechanism JFA has helped to substantially augment the XB part of ECA resources and has set an example of a relatively efficient platform that others are beginning to emulate.

A number of challenges relating to both the programme and JFA mechanism have been identified. Among them was that there was a weak link between the Plan's objectives, strategies, indicators of subprogrammes to intended results, some multi-year programmes (MYPs) between ECA and individual RECs were found to be out of date. Also found were the limited efficacy of SROs in supporting MS and RECs, limited consistency between priorities in the Business Plan and those set by the funding partners. The other challenge was the difficulty for all partners in JFA Agreement to break away from the project culture to programme approach. Another major challenge is the current ineffective system of the distribution of ECA's flagship knowledge products to the target groups.

The evaluation has also identified a number of lessons learnt ranging from programme implementation to the types of interventions and effective implementation of policy oriented knowledge products to strengthen capacities of the target groups. The first is that JFA mechanism provides an effective model for programme implementation with medium term provision of resources used with some flexibility and joint monitoring of programme implementation by the joint partners including ECA. The second lesson is that ECA's knowledge products uniquely provide two very important impacts relevant to Africa's development. One set of knowledge products such as AGR, APRM and AGDI generate multistakeholders country-driven processes and products which help build capacities and expand good governance, gender equality, equity and democratic space in African countries. The second set of knowledge products such as flagship reports – ERA, ARIA are directly and immediately impacting on policy at the highest levels of Ministers' Council and African Heads of State and Government Summits and at the same time as they generate visionary ideas that are stimulating debates on policy options for governments in the Continent. The other lesson on capacity strengthening comes from IDEP's tailor-made flexible policy training short term and long term courses targeting policy makers and using ECA major publications as part of the training material.

Finally, the evaluation team has made the following recommendations for further improvement of the programme and the efficiency and effectiveness of JFA mechanism and capacity building at RECs and AUC.

- Knowledge products and Tools as ECA niche the production of well researched and policy oriented knowledge products and tools, have given ECA an edge over many development partners. Given their stronger potential to directly improve on capacity strengthening of member States, RECs and AUC, it is recommended that these are maintained and continuously improved.
- Merger of Some Flagship Reports for better efficiency, focus, impact and sustainability the
  evaluation team recommends that some of the 'flagship' reports such ERA, EOA and MDG and
  MRDE should be merged into one annual economic report.
- Process-oriented knowledge products and tools which involve not only high level decision makers but engage a cross-section of citizen stakeholders in producing consensus-based products must be prioritized as they enhance capacity, increase ownership, create collective learning and produce tangible country specific tools for reforms at member State level. Similarly, flagship products with impact on high level policy and generating visionary ideas must continue.
- New strategies for outreach and dissemination of ECA's knowledge products and tools are needed. Stronger marketing through radio, television, print media and social media networks would go a long way in bringing ECA's work to the Continent's general population.
- Capacity Building Strategy of RECs and AUC should be intensified and broadened to deliberately include secondments, attachments, short-term training and institutional building within the operations of recipient partners.
- JFA mechanism applied within the context of defined priorities of ECA has served a useful purpose in programme delivery effectiveness, efficiency and contribution to impact and it should be improved along the lines of budget support and broader flexibility limits defined by the joint partners. For better working relationships, the partners should consider holding more regular Technical Working Group meetings to address and resolve financial and other procedural issues. These meetings will also ensure that more discussions at mid-year and end-of-year meetings focus more on programme implementation and impact issues.
- Extra-Budgetary (XB) support remains a critical aspect of the overall ECA's resources and will be indispensable for the next Business Plan. It is recommended that funding partners re-commit to support Business Plan 2013 -2015 within the context of JFA mechanism.
- ECA must consistently address issues of role clarity, capacity, resourcing and coordination of SROs and their alignment with divisional work in order to improve synergies, effective and efficient service delivery to stakeholders.
- ECA must consider broadening its activities in the social agenda so that it can more appropriately support relevant AUC's programmes and also ensure that regional integration addresses human resource and higher education development particularly critical for the continent's young population.

- ECA has a rich network of experts from across-member States and different professional disciplines. Strategies must be found to use these networks more effectively at sub-regional levels as technical resources and possible forums for launching and advocating ECA's knowledge products. The networks are both individual and institutional and both should have a role to play.
- Finally, the evaluation team recommends ANNEX XV as a Management tool for follow up implementation of these recommendations as needed.

This evaluation report is organized in four main chapters:

Chapter 1 gives the context in terms of AUC and ECA partnership which is the basis of the Business Plan programme comprising of sub-programmes in which the magnitude of JFA financial contribution is given.

Chapter 2 describes the methodology, the evaluation design in terms of analytical frame and evaluation criteria, sampling of the sources and the techniques for data collection applied to respondents in Addis Ababa (location of ECA Headquarters and JFA partners' Offices) and field work.

Chapter 3 presents the main body of the evaluation; the evaluation findings and analysis in the four sub-programmes and the JFA partnership.

Chapter 4 is the conclusion, lessons learnt and recommendations.

## Chapter 1: Background

The United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) has framed its work programme primarily to support the African development agenda as defined in the African Union (AU) Vision. Specifically, UNECA seeks to assist the African Union Commission's (AUC) capacity building programme in collaboration with other UN agencies. The African Union Commission defines its vision as to "...create an integrated prosperous and peaceful Africa, driven by its own citizens and representing a dynamic force in the global arena."- (TYCBP-AU 2012:5) The AUC's work programme addresses the Continent's challenges relating to peace and security, political affairs, trade and industry, infrastructure and energy, social affairs, agriculture, rural development, environment and natural resources, human resources, science and technology and economic affairs. Consistent with AUC's work programme, ECA has focused its programmes to strengthening technical capacities of African member States, the eight regional economic communities (RECs) and AU itself. Within member States, ECA's interventions are predominantly targeted at influencing policy change at government level with only limited direct technical support to non-State actors. programmes are based on knowledge generation (research products), the results of which are then shared in the different formats of technical reports, policy briefs, technical advice, training manuals and materials for use in long term training institutions and/or in the form of training workshops to local and regional stakeholders as appropriate.

ECA's 2010 – 2012 Business Plan focuses on delivering its assistance to the member States, regional economic communities and AU through seven thematic areas/sub-programmes being 1) Macroeconomic Analysis, Finance, Economic Development and NEPAD, 2) Food Security and Sustainable Development, 3) Good Governance and Public Administration, 4) Information, Science and Technology for Development, 5) Regional Integration, Infrastructure and Trade Development 6) Gender Equality and Social Development and 7) Statistics and Statistical Development (ECA Business Plan, 2010). These sub-programmes individually and in some cases jointly produce a variety of technical reports, working mechanisms and frameworks, tools and methods, which are used as knowledge products to support the key target groups – member States, RECs and AUC/AU to realize national, sub-regional and Africa's development goals. At sub-regional level, ECA has five Sub-regional Offices (SROs) which are used to support target groups and partners. The operational modalities include partnerships with different development partners but more consciously, with the wider UN system under a "One UN" strategy.

ECA funds its operations through two budgetary sources – the regular budget (RB) and the Extra-Budgetary (XB) support. The former is allocated by UN Headquarters while the latter comes almost exclusively from development partners. Since 2006, ECA's XB funding requirement has increased in relation to the RB which has been put at zero growth, from US \$13.68 million in 2008 to \$22.04 million in 2010 and \$109.9 million in 2012 (ECA Business Plan 2010-2012: pp.62-63). The XB now constitutes around 36.3% of the total ECA's budget of the Business Plan 2010 – 2012. In 2007, ECA entered into an agreement with a group of development partners to fund its sub-programmes through the first XB pooled Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA I). Based on good relationship between ECA and some of these partners a second JFA Agreement was signed with three partners: Sweden, Norway and the United Kingdom who were later joined by Denmark to make JFAII a four development partner membership with ECA.

By the end of August 2012, JFA II funding partners had provided around US \$46.21 million or 42.05% of the total XB budget or 15.2% of the overall Business Plan budget of US \$303.1 million. JFA funding went exclusively to sub-programmes activities whereas RB funds covered salaries and other institutional expenses also critical for the success of the Business Plan. Table 1 shows JFA funds by sub-programme allocation compared to the original Business Plan proposed allocation by sub-programme.

This evaluation focuses on the impact of the JFA II funding of the ECA sub-programme activities in the Business Plan 2010-2012. JFA II funding provided a substantial component of the listed sub-programme budgets over the past three years. After three years, the Business Plan 2010 -2012 is coming to a close at the end of 2012. This end of Business Plan evaluation was built into the Business Plan activities for 2012.

Table 1: Volume of JFA Investment by Sub-programmes (US \$ million)

Thematic Area	Business Plan XB Requirement*	JFA Contribution	% of Sub- programme to total XB**	% of JFA XB
Economic development and NEPAD	9.8	4.82	8.9	10.5
African Climate Policy Centre	39.1	19.05	35.6	41.5
Food security and sustainable development	11.6	0.16	10.6	0.3
Promoting good governance and public administration	9.9	7.1	9	15.5
ICT, Science and Technology	6.7	0.26	6.1	0.6
Regional integration, infrastructure and trade for development	16.7	4.24	15.2	9.2
Promoting gender equality and social development	5.7	7.15	5.2	15.6
Strengthening statistics and statistical capacity in Africa	4.2	1.78	3.8	3.9
Subtotal	103.7	6	96.4	96.3
Others (Special events)	6.2	1.65	3.6	3.7
Total	109.9	46.21	100	100

Sources: Business Plan 2010-12 and PATCO/ECA, \* for specific sub-programme, \*\*% of sub-programme allocation to total XB requirement.

The JFA funding constituted \$46.21 million (42.05%) of the required \$109.9 million XB for the Plan period.