

Evaluation of the 11th European Development Fund

Overview of findings and conclusions

Muriel Visser (TL), Karolyn Thunnissen, Javier Pereira,
Paolo Scalia, Ana Maria Garcia Femenia, Fran Girling

March 2017



SCOPE AND FOCUS OF THE EVALUATION

Objectives:

- Independent assessment
- Recommendations for the EDF and the next generation of EFIs

Nature of the exercise

- High level **strategic evaluation**
- Focus on '***fitness of purpose***' of the instrument:
 - Did the EDF 11 take into account lessons from EDF 10 and can it perform?
 - Does the EDF have a unique contribution among the suite of EFIs?
 - Is it contributing to development aid and advancing the EU's evolving priorities?

Methodological consideration > The evaluation takes place early in the implementation of the EDF to align with EFI evaluations

MAIN FINDINGS

EQ 1: DID THE 11TH EDF RESPOND TO EU AND BENEFICIARY PRIORITIES AND CAN IT ACCOMMODATE CHANGED PARAMETERS?

- EDF11 has been highly relevant. It remains highly relevant
 - Partnership strong feature in the past -> less present in EDF11
 - Limited room to adapt to new priorities
 - EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa
 - A response to EU priorities
 - But modalities weakened partnership & ownership
- The EDF remains primarily a medium- to long-term framework = one of its key strengths

EQ 2: HAS THE EDF DELIVERED RESULTS AGAINST OBJECTIVES AND SPECIFIC EU PRIORITIES?

- EDF10 contribution to poverty reduction & MDG progress
 - Strong tangible results at country level, less tangible for regional cooperation
 - Management, structures and processes in place for EDF11
 - Results reporting and monitoring weak – reducing EDF's effectiveness, accountability, lesson learning
 - Sustainability weak in EDF 10 -> result of internal and external factors
- The EDF has contributed to poverty reduction and can contribute to the SDGs. Effectiveness is still hindered by a focus on administrative and financial management and insufficient attention to results-oriented management.

EQ 3: IS THE EDF DELIVERING EFFICIENTLY?

- Focus on operational efficiency under EDF 11
 - Some modest gains: the full impact cannot yet be measured
 - Some negative consequences of efficiency measures
 - CSOs
 - Distancing from implementation -> less influence?
 - Some efficiency bottlenecks persist:
 - Burdensome procedures
 - One size fits all approach
 - The NAO system
- EDF11 systems and procedures have seen some improvement. They continue to be slow and represent a challenge for partners

EQ 4: DO THE EDF PROGRAMMES ADD VALUE AT COUNTRY, REGIONAL AND INTRA-REGIONAL LEVELS?

- EDF added value from a unique **combination** of features
 - EFI complementary by addressing gaps
 - Added value compared to MS and DPs
 - Represents interests of EU
 - EDF added value stronger at country level
 - Intra-ACP and regional cooperation has potential (unrealized) added value.
- The EDF has a continued unique added value, but faces challenges in making the most of its unique combination of features

EQ 5 – DOES EDF FACILITATE COHERENCE, COMPLEMENTARITY AND SYNERGIES INTERNALLY, VIS-À-VIS EFIS, AND WITH MS & DONORS?

Internally:

- Improved EDF coherence in country
- Better alignment of NIP and RIP priorities
- Limited national, regional and Intra-ACP synergies

EDF with EFIs:

- EFIs have an important complementary role
- Duplication with EFIs at regulatory level and in practice
- Centrally managed DCI thematic lines particularly problematic

EDF with MS/other donors:

- Progress on joint programming, but challenges in practice

➤ EDF 11 has seen some improvement in coherence at country level, and with regional priorities. Full synergy remains challenging

EQ 6: HAS THE EDF LEVERAGED FURTHER FUNDS AND/OR POLITICAL OR POLICY ENGAGEMENT?

- DRM: budget support has created the structures & incentives
 - Blending facilities:
 - Insufficient data/ information to assess leveraging
 - Concerns relate to: ownership & partnership, visibility, advocacy for EU values, and debt levels
 - Political and policy dialogue:
 - EDF a valuable entry point (esp. country level)
 - Reinforced by funding volume and convening role of EU
 - Sensitive to external factors
- The EDF has tools to leverage funds and political and policy dialogue. Success is highly dependent on context

MAIN CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS (1/2)

1. The EDF serves well and continues to serve well
2. The EDF is a good entry point for promoting EU values
3. The EDF faces strong demands to tackle an increasing number of priorities
4. Results in EDF having to respond to new agendas
 - These are difficult to reconcile with the EDFs core values/founding principles
 - May compromise what it has traditionally done well.
5. The EDF = an anchor in a fast changing world. But still rigid and is insufficiently able to respond to changing needs
6. Partnership principles have suffered under EDF 11
7. Challenges with EDF procedures (not adapted to different contexts)

CONCLUSIONS (2/2)

7. The EDF unique acknowledged added value but not made the most of this. Has tended to use a one-size fits all approach
8. EDF11 increased attention to complementarities
 - Challenges remain for centrally managed budget lines
 - Establishing synergies across national, regional and Intra-ACP cooperation
9. Reporting, accountability, lesson learning, and sustainability constrained by:
 - Limited results orientation
 - Lack of measurable indicators
 - Inadequate monitoring

Efficiency measures have alleviated some burden. Changes have had implications for support to CSOs. The EDF increasingly a cooperation administrator and less of a hands-on player

RECOMMENDATIONS

AREAS OF RECOMMENDATION

Strategy level recommandations for strenthened relevance of the instrument

R1: Restore the spirit of Cotonou's partnership principle

R2: Focus efforts on increasing accountability for results

R3: Introduce more flexibility for EDF adaptation to needs

R4: Base programming on a political economy analysis and keep programming choices at country level

R5: Improve sustainability of EU support

Operational recommandations for increased effectiveness and sustainability

R6: Ensure the coherence of EDF tools and implementation modalities with the instrument's core values and principles

R7: Strengthen the effectiveness of regional and intra-ACP cooperation

R8: Conduct a structured review of the impact of the various changes under the EDF 11 and take corrective action where necessary

Recommandations on organisation and management to increase efficiency and effectiveness

R9: Entrust all DCI thematic projects and programmes to EUDs

R10: Increase transparency and improve clarity of the role of different actors in the programming and project cycle for the EDF

R11: Increase the impact of the administrative and financial simplification process while preventing negative spill-overs