



**TWG Network Meeting on Development Effectiveness
27-28 February, 2012
Meeting Report**



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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETING.....	1
II.	MONITORING AND MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP.....	1
	a. NSDP Mid-term Review.....	1
	b. Monitoring the partnership & its effectiveness.....	2
III.	PROMOTING DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS.....	4
IV.	STRENGTHENING PARTNERSHIP & DIALOGUE.....	5
	a. Strengthening dialogue mechanisms.....	5
	b. Civil society contribution to national development.....	6
V.	SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS AND NEXT STEPS IN PROMOTING DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS.....	7
VI.	ANNEX ONE: NEXT STEPS FOR THE TWGS.....	11

I. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETING

The “TWG Meeting on Development Effectiveness”, organized by the Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board of the Council for the Development of Cambodia (CRDB/CDC), was presided over by **H.E Mr. Chhieng Yanara**, Minister attached to the Prime Minister and Secretary General of CRDB/CDC. Around 135 participants attended the meeting comprising of TWG chairs, head of Multilateral Development agencies, heads of TWG Secretariat, Lead Development Partner Facilitators, CSOs and CRDB/CDC officials.

In his opening remarks, the chair welcomed all participants and addressed the agenda by highlighting the main objectives of the meeting, which were to discuss:

1. monitoring and mutual accountability in the development partnership
2. progress in using the implementation tools that we currently employ (PBAs, JMIs, major reforms) to strengthen country systems, improve public service delivery and promote development effectiveness;
3. the effectiveness of partnership arrangements for policy dialogue;

Dialogue on these topics would support a fourth objective, which was to identify issues to be included in a revised development cooperation policy (which will be developed during 2012 and finalized in 2013).

This report provides an overview of the issues presented and discussed. Detailed presentations by speakers and the proposals made by participants in the final session of the meeting can be downloaded from the CRDB/CDC website together with the supporting documents for the meeting (agenda, background note etc).

II. MONITORING AND MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP

a) NSDP Mid-term Review

In the first session, **Ministry of Planning presented an overview of the NSDP mid-term review** in order to clarify national development priorities and to establish the context for results-based monitoring. Medium-term development priorities for growth and poverty reduction were identified as follows:

- Governance & civil service reform
- Promoting agricultural productivity, value-added and diversification
- Industrial policy – adding-value, supply-side reforms, SME-focus
- Infrastructure development
- Education – secondary, tertiary, vocational
- Health – primary
- Gender equality – economic opportunities, social development and representation
- Environment – balancing growth and conservation

To support effective monitoring of the national development programme, RGC has established a National Working Group for Poverty Measurement (NWGPM) in Cambodia for determining a new Poverty Line. The work of the NWGPM is now almost complete and should be able to provide estimates by end-April-end. Based on the old poverty line, poverty should be <20% of the population in 2009, but newer estimates could be different.

Monitoring and evaluation activities of the NSDP Update presently being carried out fall in two categories. First, there is regular M&E of the planned actions, programmes and projects, carried out by the implementing ministries and/or agencies. Second, there is more in-depth periodic monitoring and evaluation of the progress in achieving the overall development results and outcomes of NSDP 2009-2013, as well as identifying the challenges faced in achieving the targeted results and outcomes, based on “core monitoring indicators/targets of NSDP Update 2009-2013”. The initial list of 46 Core Monitoring Indicators incorporated in the NSDP Update document has been updated, removing some immeasurable indicators and adding some measurable ‘national outcome/impact’ indicators. This has resulted in a new list of 63 indicators.

Additional commentary was provided by the **Ministry of Economy and Finance (MEF)**, in order to clarify the links between the NSDP and the Budget. It was emphasized that the Budget Strategic Plan (BSP) was a tool for supporting programme-based budgeting to plan for and resource the implementation of NSDP priorities at line ministry and sector level. It was designed in a three-year rolling plan format to be prepared by line ministries (combining domestic and external resources) prior to consolidation by MEF and approval within Government and then by the national Assembly.

On behalf of development partners, the **United Nations Resident Coordinator** noted good progress in strengthening the institutions that lead on planning and monitoring. It would be necessary, however, to continue to develop coordination and communication within and across Government in order to establish a robust, effective and timely monitoring mechanism that was useful to policy makers. This would require continued commitment by Government and support by development partners to civil service reforms, improved development management processes, new information systems and continued progress towards use of PBAs.

In the plenary discussion that followed some line ministries and TWG representatives (including Forestry & Environment) noted the need for full discussion within the TWG and greater attention by MOP to ensure that line ministry inputs to the NSDP mid-term review were clearly communicated and fully taken into account so that policy and resourcing could accurately and fully reflect national development needs. For budgeting, MOWA requested improved clarity of the BSP guidelines and more responsive and relevant support/outreach provided from MEF to ensure that policy priorities and the associated results framework could be represented in the budget. MOP clarified that the NSDP M&E framework and indicators were still being prepared while participants of TWGs emphasized that further dissemination and consultation would be useful if the national approach was to be coherent and effective.

b) Monitoring the partnership & its effectiveness

A presentation on Results Frameworks was made by **Mr. Peter Brimble**, Senior Country Economist of the ADB. This presentation reminded participants of the approaches that are endorsed by the RGC to promote development effectiveness. The presentation focused on the use of results chains (inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts) and how these could be used to create policy consistency between national, sector and project levels as well as to promote the alignment of resources with national development priorities. With respect to the JMIs, the presentation underlined the need for consistency in setting JMIs as some were outputs and others were activities. The CRDB/CDC guideline states that the JMI should be at the output level clearly linked to an outcome of the sector policy/strategy but some TWGs had not yet implemented this

recommendation based on SMART principles. Stronger results frameworks at sector level therefore offered the potential to improve the JMIs as well as contributing to a more effective national M&E system and to alignment of donor strategies and projects.

The discussant from **Germany** identified the challenge in linking NSDP and line ministry monitoring systems; at present line ministry inputs to the NSDP mid-term review could not be clearly seen and the M&E approach was therefore inconsistent. This meant that it was difficult to establish a meaningful results framework that was consistent across national, sector and project levels. This was complicated as some issues and sectors were not represented by a single ministry or TWG, land, for example, which had strong M&E arrangements in some components but not in others. Cross-cutting M&E arrangements, coordinated at the national level, would therefore be useful and could be extended to the JMIs, which also required higher-level dialogue to ensure commitment and momentum in their implementation.

Australia also provided inputs as a discussant to this session. In the different sectors supported by AusAID the M&E arrangements and capacities differed but there was a general need to better link the inputs (financial) to the results that were achieved. This could help in promoting efficiency as well as effectiveness as the costs of delivering services could also be assessed – this will be important as aid dependency is reduced and RGC resources replace those of development partners. Improved coverage and use of governance indicators was also encouraged.

On behalf of the RGC, CRDB/CDC encouraged TWGs to focus strategically on each stage of the results chain when developing JMIs and to ensure that monitoring indicators could support each stage of the results chain. To promote PBAs, it was essential that there is a strong link between policy priorities, programming of resources and the results that are monitored.

Common Issues

- Sector Result Frameworks were developed by all TWGs mainly associated with JMIs; however, there were still some challenges to link sector-level JMIs with sector and NSDP result frameworks due to limited capacity.
- The quality of JMIs for cross-cutting sectors and their monitoring needs to be improved. All JMIs need to be reviewed to ensure consistency and uniformity in their approach (e.g. to be monitored at the output level). TWGs should lead this process to promote the quality of their JMIs and request CRDB/CDC support if necessary.
- M&E frameworks were not yet developed by most TWGs, while some TWGs (Fisheries & Mine Action-TWGs) need to improve the quality their M&E implementation. The challenges are still remained such as the difficulty to jointly identify and harmonize sector priorities; limitation of capacity in gathering data and sources by line ministries for conducting M&E, and complexity to determine each indicator.
- In terms of policy/strategy-level issues, we need more additional efforts to link the result from major reform programme and its inter-relations, as well as, resource frameworks within sectors.
- For Planning and funding arrangement issues, further efforts should be put to improve the quality of planning and resource allocation and linkage between resource allocation and sector targets (Education, PFM, LJR-TWGs)
- Results frameworks worked best when they kept relatively simple and have strong commitment and endorsement at senior level. They are sector-based tools, however, that can be managed independent of higher-level process.

- Further supports from CRDB/CDC on M&E frameworks and comprehensive JMI preparations would be needed by all TWGs and CRDB/CDC offered to establish a Community of Practice to provide training and support on results frameworks and JMIs.

Specific Issues

- Result framework needs to be revised by D&D-TWG to align with NSDP result-framework
- A clear result framework has been prepared by PFM-TWG in budget preparation for line ministries/agencies including BSP and budget package implementation mechanisms.
- Clear sector strategy was not yet developed by LJR-TWG.
- There were the absence of clear indicators in linking with NSDP result frameworks (Fisheries-TWG)
- MOP clarified that they wish to work with line ministries to develop a comprehensive and coherent set of indicators that can be validated by stakeholders.
- Development partners requested MOP to begin broad dialogue on the preparation of the next NSDP to ensure full consultation and representation of all development actors

III. PROMOTING DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS

This session was conducted to review of approaches to managing development results towards promoting development effectiveness in Cambodia, including to share the details of the 2011 Development Effectiveness Report and the Busan High-level Forum. In the context of national results frameworks, the potential dimension for strengthening and linking between national, sectoral and project level results frameworks would be explored, including the scope for linking between sector JMIs and national development outcomes. Highlights of the DER 2011 and Busan High-Level Forum were presented by **Mr. Chou Heng**, National Policy Analyst of PfDR/CRDB/CDC. Based on national experience and priorities, the policy direction after Busan will focus on:

- The use of a national results framework as a common tool to assess development impact.
- Country systems are now to be used by development partners as the "default option".
- Sustainable impact requires a focus on "effective institutions" and a different approach to managing risk.
- A commitment to country-led coordination arrangements, including PBAs.
- Building more strategic partnerships with other development actors.
- Promoting policy coherence with other development challenges: gender equality, social protection, anti-corruption, climate change.

The discussion that followed was led by **MOWA** who noted that RGC efforts to promote coordination had not always resulted in greater donor harmonisation. The effort now was placed on using the national strategy, Neary Rattanak III, to guide resources and results through a PBA. MOWA requested that all development partners support the PBA initiative.

In their contribution to the discussion, **JICA** emphasised the need for RGC to take the lead in defining the post-Busan agenda especially in looking beyond the ODA relationship to maximise the contributions of new partners, South-South opportunities and the private sector. Clarity on the results to be achieved and the role of each stakeholder was important to the development effectiveness theme of the Network meeting.

SIDA made four observations: (i) to promote sustainability of our joint development efforts we must all stop treating aid in isolation and see it as one element of overall development finance and

activity; (ii) transparency is a fundamental requisite for accountability and for managing for results and the use of country systems is a key issue; (iii) consistency of strategies, resource allocation and results monitoring is a concern that can be addressed through PBAs and adoption of coherent results frameworks; and (iv) data management capacities need to be developed as statistics and information systems are vital for strategic and effective management of the development effort.

Additional issues raised during plenary

- Further support, which needs to be specified in detail by TWGs, from CRDB/CDC in terms of training and preparation on PBA would be required by a number of TWGs
- PBAs were not yet implemented by some TWGs. Some PBA elements issues were raised by DPs, such as linkages between resources and results, transparency of national and external resources, improving of dialogue structure, and use of government systems. However, commitments were raised by DPs in terms of using country systems.
- The Trade SWAp was progressing very well with programming across multiple RGC agencies. Models of progress such as these would be useful to document and disseminate to other line ministries to support their learning and adaptation.
- Partnering skills and dialogue were an important ingredient to making progress in technical areas. MOEYS outlined their own structures that had been adapted to their own specific needs that allowed all inputs to be coordinated to good effect in policy development, resource programming, monitoring and review.
- Sector work was usually highly dependent on the implementation of core reforms programmes, e.g. teacher training depended on PAR, budgeting on PFM. Collaboration and effective outreach by the ministries/agencies leading the reforms is important.

IV. STRENGTHENING PARTNERSHIP & DIALOGUE

a) Strengthening dialogue mechanisms

Mr. Ros Salin, Director of Policy Department of CRDB/CDC, gave a presentation on Effective Partnership and Dialogue Arrangements. In summary, the presentation emphasised that TWG performance could be improved through the following measures:

- Adopting a clear Result framework to guide dialogue
- Adopting a cluster approach for cross-sectoral dialogue
- Maximizing the use of informal relationships to complement formal mechanisms
- More use of joint learning, effective knowledge management
- Developing partnering skills (equity, transparency, openness and honesty in relationship)

The plenary discussion that followed raised some important issues on TWG performance:

- The topics covered by the TWG does not match the "sector" and therefore key issues cannot be resolved or raised for discussion as RGC counterparts are not present
- The level of representation of both RGC and DPs – which has been raised in every TWG review since 2006 – continues to be a problem. Commitment of both sides is questioned
- The mandate of the TWG needs to be reviewed as many non-technical issues are vital to programme progress (GDCC does not address issues raised to that level)
- JMIs may be rolled over continuously, making them rather redundant as there is no progress on areas that both sides have agreed are fundamental to the TWG's work (progress is often outside of the influence of those participating in the TWG). The GDCC link here can also be strengthened to offer a solution to unresolved issues.

- More concrete ideas on the cluster approach are required

b) Civil society contribution to national development

Mr CHHIT Sam Ath, NGO Forum executive director, delivered a presentation on the role of CSOs in National Development. The presentation defined the scope and role of civil society in national development and the sectors in which NGOs are currently active in Cambodia (health, governance, community development, rural development & natural resources etc). NGO engagement in the development partnership is based on promoting: (i) democratic ownership and an enabling environment; (ii) a rights based that is people centred; and (iii) equitable and fair human development. Challenges faced by NGOs included:

- Limited institutional and technical capacity (especially management and governance)
- Lack of long term, sustainable funding
- No leverage in decision making in significant policy and strategy formulation.
- Difficulties in accessing relevant information
- Limited coordination, harmonization and alignment, overlapping catchments and project
- Limited democratic space for effective development.
- Limited space for engagement between CSOs, and Parliament.

Mr Putu Kamayana, ADB Country Director, endorsed many of the recommendations offered by Mr Salin of CRDB/CDC and proposed that a greater results focus should lead to improved implementation. 'Soft side' issues such as trust and relationship building were also important. Partnerships with civil society and with the private sector could be strengthened, although the existing arrangements for private sector dialogue worked well so the task here was to link rather than reform. A review of the dialogue architecture would be useful to consider how TWGs, GDCC and CDCF perform and link with other mechanisms for dialogue.

Mr Douglas Broderick, Resident Coordinator of the United Nations system in Cambodia, shared his "Ten Top Tips" on effective partnering and cooperation:

1. Partnerships require mutual benefit with equity and dividends
2. Learn together, grow together, teach together, makes great partners; like becoming classmates
3. Harvest creative communications, many old ways of communicating but explore new media of communications
4. All of us are farmers with silos, we need to partner to break those silos down
5. Branding Promotes Partnership
6. Partners need a KISS – Catalytic Role
7. Private Sectors are partners, not essentially donors
8. Enhance, Energize, Enlarge, Enrich the dialogue
9. Readiness to embrace new ways and new arrangements
10. Partnerships need to be monitored – ask why? And inquire how?

Common Issues

- Capacity and leadership in both individual and as a whole institution still need to be improved by most TWGs.
- The quality of dialogue structures also need to be strengthened (Health and Education, PPR-TWGs offered examples of where progress has been made under RGC leadership)

- Remaining challenges in coordination around annual plan (HIV/AIDS, Land, Education and Fisheries-TWGs)
- CRDB recommended that where partnerships rely on the JMIs to guide their work they should be reviewed, and revised if required, as these are sector processes that need to be led by line ministries and respective TWGs
- Cluster approach mechanisms would be required as a common agreement and inputs from all stakeholders to support this initiative and to bring separate TWGs together around a common and cross cutting issue although we also need to be efficient and consider other less formal means of communication and dialogue.
- Common issues were also raised by DPs in terms of making more balance of the level of participations to the TWG network retreat to improve the quality of discussion. It should be unnecessary to combine CDCF with Private Sector Forum. It should be more encouragement of CSOs to participate in current dialogue structures like CDCF and GDCC. There should need to extend dialogues beyond formal one.

V. SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS AND NEXT STEPS IN PROMOTING DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVNEESS

This section is based on the presentations and discussion during the final session and closing of the TWG Network meeting as well as further discussion between the CRDB/CDC Secretary General and the Development Partner Lead Facilitator and his Alternate on 14 March 2012.

All issues raised below (together with TWG-specific recommendations in Annex 1) need to be discussed and validated by the TWGs in order to identify practical next steps in strengthening their sector working arrangements and partnerships.

Promoting results-based approaches

- CRDB/CDC will establish a Managing for Development Results Community of Practice. A Concept Note will be developed in the next 4 weeks that identifies the benefits of using results frameworks in sector programmes (as part of their PBA work where relevant) and proposing an approach to develop capacities for producing or strengthening results frameworks that are linked to resource programming (BSPs and AOPs).
- Results frameworks at sector level must be linked to the NSDP monitoring framework and management arrangements. JMIs, which should also be associated with development outcomes set out in the NSDP, should also be drawn from these results frameworks. Project level activity should also be based on sector results frameworks so that there is coherency between national-sectoral-project levels of planning and resource programming and alignment of all resources around an agreed set of development results.
- Ministry of Planning expressed its willingness to work with all partners in developing the NSDP monitoring framework. This is an issue for further discussion in the TWG-PPR that can lay the foundation for future work on the next iteration of the NSDP.
- TWGs are requested to review their JMIs and to consider the need to up-date them (where possible to be based on the established results frameworks of the strategies/plans of the

lead ministries). Further support to developing/strengthening results frameworks will promote the longer-term use of the JMIs to support the development effectiveness agenda.

- TWGs also requested increased cross-learning and experience sharing. Based on the completed review templates, MOEYS appears to be a good example of a sector programme that has developed a results framework that is used for the JMIs with strong institutional linkages to the NSDP, sector plan and budgeting process as well as to dialogue with development partners.

Promoting development effectiveness through PBAs and stronger country systems

- Country systems are now to be used as the "default option" based on the Busan commitments. TWGs that expressed a potential interest (answering Yes to question B4) in working with CRDB/CDC to develop pilot country systems include: Education; Health; HIV/AIDS (ODA management); LJR (budget integration); PPR; A&W (results frameworks); FSN (ODA-budget integration & joint capacity assessments); F&E (planning, M&E, joint CD assessments); RWSSH (PBAs); Land (ODA-budget integration, results frameworks).
- Specific country systems work can be supported for the ministries/agencies and TWGs identified above once these TWGs have discussed the recommendations in more detail and have prepared a more detailed assessment of their needs. ODA-Budget integration and results frameworks appear to be systems that are in high demand.
- PBAs across sectors will look different according to context and priority. MOWA is developing a roadmap that takes account of its own situation, priorities and capacities. This approach may be helpful to other sectors and TWGs.
- Strengthening systems is closely associated with the implementation of core reforms (PFM, PAR, SNDD). It is therefore necessary to improve leadership, coordination and management of the reforms at the sector level. This issue has previously not been high on the agenda of most TWGs but should in future feature more prominently in their discussions with participation of representatives of the reform programmes if required.

Promoting effective partnerships

- Based on the discussions during the meeting, it is apparent that many TWGs need to make an honest assessment of their partnership dynamics. Each reference to trust and relationship-building during the meeting was endorsed enthusiastically by all participants, suggesting that this is a problem area for many TWGs.
- Many of the problems identified during the meeting relating to TWG performance are systemic: issues of leadership, trust, representation, resourcing, coverage of issues, monitoring of progress have all been consistently identified in every TWG review since their establishment in 2004 (see for example, the 2007 Aid Effectiveness Report, page 41). CRDB/CDC has committed to undertaking a review of partnership dialogue arrangements and will take this into consideration in its work together with other proposals such as adopting a cluster approach.
- Some TWGs observed that the remit of their TWG, in terms of the issues that it is mandated to discuss, are outdated or too narrow and do not therefore reflect the most important

development challenges of the sector. TWGs have been in operation since at least 2004 and it may now be opportune to consider the coverage of dialogue (within and between TWGs) and if TWGs are the most appropriate and suitable forum in which to take forward dialogue between RGC and its partners. The forthcoming review may address this issue but individual TWGs are also encouraged to deliberate on whether they are able to discuss issues of a technical nature that are relevant to the broader sector's work.

- MOEYS reported progress in the Education TWG in strengthening partnership and dialogue arrangements. The lessons of the education sector can be instructive, not to simply adopt structures that are similar but to understand the manner in which MOEYS and its partners reflected on their own needs and capacities and made the changes that were necessary over a period of time to create a stronger and more effective partnership.
- TWGs may wish to also reflect on the opportunities for increased engagement with the private sector and for systematic identification of South-South Cooperation and learning opportunities (including through triangular cooperation in which a development partner may be able to sponsor collaboration between Cambodia and a partner country from the South).
- The meeting served as a useful reminder that other channels for dialogue exist but they are often under-utilised. Informal consultations between senior officials are almost always a more effective means of resolving and addressing issues than "big table" meetings of many people that are more usually seen as "milestone" events to agree on areas of progress and future actions. Bilateral consultations are another option for formal dialogue that not all development partners take advantage of (despite this being a recommendation of the 2007 Aid Effectiveness Report, page 42).
- The meeting agreed that civil society partners had made an important contribution to national development. Capacity constraints and challenges were identified, however, and this may be an area for dialogue within respective TWGs or for bilateral support from partners.
- CRDB/CDC has previously supported a 2-year initiative on "Making Partnerships Effective in Cambodia". A comprehensive set of resources for TWG use is available on the TWG website and the local facilitator of this initiative (VBNC) is available to support individual TWGs that wish to strengthen their partnership dynamics.
http://www.cdc-crdb.gov.kh/cdc/twg_network/resource_mpe_stage4/default.htm

In order to follow up the issues raised above, and those related to TWG-specific actions identified in the annex, TWGs are requested to meet to discuss their work and reach a consensus at the highest level required to take priority actions forward. The P&H TWG will provide a forum to follow-up on progress at its next meeting as well as progress towards developing a new Development Cooperation and Partnerships Policy in 2013. Additional observations made during the closing session can also serve to inform future organisation of TWG Network meetings:

- The TWG Network is an effective learning forum. In future more time will be devoted to allowing good practices to be shared amongst line ministries and TWGs.
- The core reform programmes should play an increased role in future meetings as institutional strengthening is mainly taken forward in these reforms.

- Senior representation from both RGC (TWG Chairs) and development partners is encouraged to ensure that the TWG Network is an effective meeting for learning and partnership-building.
- The TWG Network can be used in the future to discuss issues of interest to all TWGs, including the development of the next NSDP and its monitoring framework, and the implementation experience of the major reform programmes.
- Before future meetings of the TWG Network, TWGs would benefit from holding their own preparation meetings in order to discuss the agenda issues as well as to clarify levels of participation.
- In general, participants agreed that the TWG Network offered an informal and inclusive opportunity for learning and sharing. This approach should be retained in the future and complemented by increased preparation and participation of the TWGs.

ANNEX ONE: NEXT STEPS FOR THE TWGS

This annex contains a summary of the issues raised by the representatives of each TWG during the Network meeting. Many of the participants acknowledged that they were not authorized to represent the views of either Government or all development partner members of the TWG. The summaries are therefore intended for discussion within respective TWGs in order to validate and propose the next steps in improving development effectiveness.

Participants at the meeting were invited to use their review templates to provide recommendations and follow-up actions related to: (i) results frameworks & monitoring; (ii) development effectiveness through the use of PBAs, country systems strengthening and the major reforms, partnership & dialogue arrangements.

TWG Chairs and Development partner facilitators are now asked to discuss and review these findings at a meeting of the full TWG in order to validate the recommendations and to identify relevant next steps in promoting development results in their area of work.

(The CRDB/CDC webpage for the TWG Network meeting provides access to the reports of each TWG.)

Name of TWGs	Priorities and Issues	Next Steps
Education	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Results Framework<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Based on planning and resources allocation- Based on capacity to develop result based M&E system2. Development Effectiveness<ul style="list-style-type: none">- 5 years strategic plan for sector- DPs use and strengthen sector systems- PBA supports to sector aims and objectives3. Partnership and Dialogues<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Sector has internal dialogue mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Improve quality of planning and resources allocation➤ Continue to strengthen result based M&E system➤ Further discussion on CRDB/CDC database➤ Continue maintaining the current quality of policy dialogue
Gender	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Results Frameworks<ul style="list-style-type: none">- JMI update and 2012 Action Plan are underway.- Neary Ratanak III has a result framework- Gender Mainstreaming Action Groups (GMAGs) established in all line ministries2. Development Effectiveness<ul style="list-style-type: none">- PBA allows reducing parallel planning and uses and strengthens country system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Currently, CDC-MoWA consultancy to precise scope of PBA gender is underway.➤ South-South cooperation: A study tour on one stop service centre led by MoWA funded by UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and GIZ to Bangladesh is underway.➤ Continue to increase more collaboration with CRDB to identify good practices of

Name of TWGs	Priorities and Issues	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gender has PBA 3. Partnership and Dialogue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development partners are deploying efforts to coordinate themselves, however not much of this coordination is reflected in the harmonization of their individual sector plans with JMI and TWG-G workplan. 	<p>strong TWGs to guide even further strengthening of the TWG-Gender & secretariat.</p>
Health	1. Results Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - JMI derived from sector strategy - M&E framework in placed - TWG-H workplan linked to HSP2 and NSDP 2. Development Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PBA - Extensive dialogue with CSOs and DPs - CSOs and DPs aligned with HSP2 implementation using country systems 3. Partnership and Dialogue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monthly HP meetings; Monthly CSOs Forums (4Ms) - Good sectoral and CSO representation in Pro-TWG-H - Most of TOR of TWG-H agreed between partners and government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Continue to strengthen mutual accountability and transparency; and strategic policy dialogue ➤ Looking forward to developing a one single national M&E framework focusing on results
MINE	1. Results Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Mine Action Strategy aligned with NSDP and CMDG-9; - An instrument to promote alignment of DPs' results framework with the Sector results framework has been developed - A project review mechanism is being set up (endorsed recently) through the TWG to ensure consultation between DPs and the Government on projects - JMIs have been developed in line with NMAS. 2. Development Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PBA has improved organization of the sector by promoting alignment of all stakeholders with same priorities - Support from CDC/CRDB: TWG-MA welcome this support 3. Partnership and Dialogue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A TWG MA workplan exists, in line with sector's objectives, and has been agreed with DPs - Existence of multiple partnership at sector level (South-South technical cooperation as well as with CSOs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will develop an annual sector workplan against the NMAS included increasing cooperation between TWG and 1) DPs and 2) with line ministries/agencies; as well as continue to strengthen M&E Framework of the NMAS (first milestone for evaluation in 2013) ▪ Improving sector budget planning and ODA consultations between DPs and Government. We welcome CRDB/CDC to support (particularly on budget integration and information sharing => ex: ODA database) and the idea of a pilot country systems assessment ▪ To hold more informal meetings/ consultations and dissemination of information between TWGs formal meetings. ▪ Suggestion to CDC/CRDB: capacity development on aid coordination with

Name of TWGs	Priorities and Issues	Next Steps
		staff from government agencies (ex: CMAA)
PFM	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Results Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results framework exists. No updating of JMI Targets not yet linked to resource allocation. Development Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PBA is not applicable to PFM Better results in PFM area Use of country systems depends on improvements Partnership and Dialogue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little interaction by Line Ministries RGC and DPs share the same views Better coordinated decision making in smaller focused groups- link to other reform programs/clusters? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To have greater dialogue on JMIs; as well as project level monitoring arrangements & training. setting up smaller/ focused/frequent meetings on specific issues – not wait for full TWG- need more space for dialogue
Fisheries	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Results Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong “sector” policy/strategy Development Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> components 1-4 are positives but 5-8 are negatives (PBA) common results framework, TWG workplan, JMI, AWP, budgeting and monitoring: Base for PBA Partnership and Dialogue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good TWG performance: meetings, reporting, respect TWG workplan Dialogue FiA – DPs (inc. high NGO participation) Coordination across Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To update JMI => result oriented and to improve planning and monitoring How to bring non-traditional DPs, regional bodies, private sector & CBOs around the table and contribute to PBA development?
Agriculture and Water	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Results Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater clarity on the priorities within the multiple policy frameworks of MAFF and MOWRAM, Develop a results framework based on this. Develop information flows between programs and overarching results framework. Development Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sector does not have PBA. TWGAW is developing a roadmap for a PBA Partnership and Dialogue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The full TWGAW only met twice in 2011. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To revise JMIs in 2012 in order to better reflect the role of the TWGAW in supporting MAFF and MOWRAM to achieve sectoral priorities. To increase more transparency on sector strategies and budget strategic plans Requiring support from CRDB to develop roadmap for the PBA To develop and strengthen results framework and monitoring systems are the immediate priority To review ToRs to support the agreement

Name of TWGs	Priorities and Issues	Next Steps
		<p>and commitment to its role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To discuss the key policy, planning and budgeting frameworks that are driving work in the sector. ▪ In future, TWGAW needs to engage civil society and private sector more actively.
D&D	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Results Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategic framework on D&D - Preparing NGOs Law - Sector Strategic Plan (10years) - JMI was set under the result framework of 3 Years Implementation Plan (IP3) 2. Development Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PBA has supported to sector strategic plan 3. Partnership and Dialogue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not hold a comprehensive sector dialogue and meeting - Partnership with CSO but not really good with private sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CRDB/CDC to facilitate and promote DPs to use the D&D system ▪ To increase more DPs, CSOs and Private sector coordination and partnership in the policy dialogue within the D&D
LJR	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Results Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sector policy/strategy and work plan are in placed - Planned Actions to implement the Prioritized of LJR sector has been put in the NSDP updated - The coordination mechanism between DPs and implementing ministries is no clear due to sector is very broad, and there are only few donors to support this sector. - JMIs have been submitted regularly to CDC - Does on have a clear result framework 2. Development Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not enough support from the Donors to apply PBA in sector. 3. Partnership and Dialogue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internal meeting and dialogue - Inter-ministerial collaboration with high level political leadership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action plan of LJR will be updated through the broad process of participating; and reviewing JMI for updated ▪ To develop a pilot country systems assessment tool in the area of budget integration and capacity development areas. ▪ To have closed dialogue on how to update the Action Plan and develop PBA ▪ Assessment such as PBA, Partnering skill on how to overcome the lack of inter-ministerial collaboration with high level political leadership. ▪ To improve dialogue and meeting structure
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Results Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Result framework and linked to NSDP but not comprehensive. - A key priority would include RGC resources to strengthen its result framework. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To consider updating the JMIs with relevant DPs/NGOs using TWG-L forum. A new JMI will be developed in line with result framework and SMART.

Name of TWGs	Priorities and Issues	Next Steps
LAND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We don't see monitoring target that links to programming resources. <p>2. Development Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amongst the 3 Sub-Sector Programs, only LASSP has been implementing PBAs. The 4th element of PBA (Comprehensive resource framework) has not yet been sufficient. <p>3. Partnership and Dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partnership and dialogue structure are in placed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To have TA supports from CRDB ▪ To have CRDB to serve as coordination forum to provide guideline and direction on JMIs endorsement preparation and further dialogues structure. ▪ To further strengthen and build mutual trust and accountability, open discussion on related issues and need to have an agreement on having 2-3 TWG full meetings a year.
PSD	<p>1. Results Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Results framework exists in form of the JMIs and the associated trade sector wide approach (SWAp) - NSDP links to the working group through the JMIs - JMIs are fairly narrowly linked to trade issues - The JMIs are updated on a yearly basis <p>2. Development Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No discussion <p>3. Partnership and Dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trade and Trade Related Investment, meet quarterly 	NA
FSN	<p>1. Results Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NSDP and JMI are the priorities to strengthen Result Framework at sector level. - JMI is updating every year. - Limited budget reduced the effective linkage between resource-result relationships. <p>2. Development Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited Partnership and Dialogue structures - Limited Capacity development. - More meeting, technical support and training <p>3. Partnership and Dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learning and adaptation phase resulted from limited partnership and dialogue - DPs not fully harmonized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More support (technical and financial) from CRDB/CDC or other agencies
	<p>1. Results Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BSP linkage between ministry and MEF. - Donor mapping. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To strengthen M&E system ▪ To roadmap to PBAs implementation ▪ To expand of partnership and dialogue

Name of TWGs	Priorities and Issues	Next Steps
RWSSH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adjusted to new JMI form which focus on result and impact. <p>2. Development Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agreed institutional arrangements is priority - PBA increases private sector and NGO contribution <p>3. Partnership and Dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct workshop on partnership for rural development and private sector participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To have updated data from NIS/MoP ▪ Increasing the use of country system.
PPR	<p>1. Results Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PBA is not in place - Had informally some arrangements for joint monitoring and discussion of results based on the sector strategy/plan <p>2. Development Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The progress of PBA is small and slow <p>3. Partnership and Dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TWG-PPR did not meeting for over last year, but sub group had met 3 times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To strengthen coordination among MOP stakeholder ▪ Continuing training on PBA clinic, and/or related PBA framework ▪ To hold a meeting regularly. ▪ To have regular dialogue to increase harmonizing TWG-PPR
F&E	<p>1. Results Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NA <p>2. Development effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sector has moved to component 5 of PBA <p>3. Partnership and Dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MoE representative does not attend regularly to TWG F&E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To provide capacity building to FA ▪ To review the JMI of 60% of forest ▪ To identify new JMI regarding maintain forest areas ▪ To support FA to coordinate in planning ▪ To improve and strengthen country system ▪ To identify right members, active members in dialogue structure ▪ PBA clinic is required to move PBA
