

HARMONIZATION & ALIGNMENT DRAFT ACTION PLAN
 LAO-PDR May 29-30, 2006
Agreed Indicators for Measuring Progress

Name	Target 2010	Baseline 2006
OWNERSHIP		
NESDP prioritized in line with budget constraints	100% DPs endorsed costing and priorities established under NSEDP VII	
NSEDP VI used as effective framework for PIP	4 Sector programs developed in line with NSEDP (2 Sector programs developed by 2008)	--
Effective SWG led by GoL	80% SWG coordinate ODA	0%
ALIGNMENT		
ODA aligned with National priorities	X% ODA funds recorded in National Budget ¹	Y% ODA funds recorded in National Budget
	From 2007 all new Country Assistance Strategies and Plans by DPs aligned with NSEDP	X Country Assistance Strategies and Plans by DPs aligned
Strengthened GoL Capacity	X% ODA funds through coordinated CD programs*	Y% ODA funds through coordinated CD programs
	NO parallel donor PIUs*	X PIUs
	4 CD sectoral frameworks	0 CD sectoral frameworks
Use of country PFM systems	X% ODA funds through National PFM systems*	Y% ODA funds through National PFM systems
	X% DPs use National PFM systems*	Y% DPs use National PFM systems
Use of country procurement systems	X% ODA funds through National Procurement systems*	Y% ODA funds through National Procurement systems
Percentage of donors using procurement system	X% DPs use National Procurement systems*	Y% DPs use National Procurement systems

¹ Based on the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Instructions on how to calculate the indicators can be found at Annex 5.- Definitions & Guidance www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/monitoring

ODA predictability	X% ODA funds effectively scheduled ²	Y% ODA funds effectively scheduled
Strengthened social and environmental safeguards	CD action plan finalized and funded by June 2007	--
HARMONIZATION		
Use of common arrangements or procedures	6 PB/SW approaches (2 by 2007)	0
	X% ODA funds through PB/SW approaches*	Y% ODA funds through PB/SW approaches
DP work more closely	33% joint missions*	Y% joint missions
	33% joint ESW* All core ESW in previous 3 years	Y% joint ESW
Incentives do not create distortions	Harmonized Incentive system developed and applied all by DPs from June 2007	--
MANAGING FOR RESULTS		
<p>Results Frameworks developed and used</p> <p>A results-oriented performance assessment framework is characterized by</p> <p>(a) clear definition of objectives in terms of expected results;</p> <p>(b) availability of monitorable outcomes and output indicators, baseline data, and time-bound targets;</p> <p>(c) M&E arrangements and capacity;</p> <p>(d) Use of information for decision-making.</p> <p>Each criteria is scored using following scale :</p> <p>1. nonexistent</p> <p>2. emerging practice</p> <p>3. established practice</p> <p>4. best practice</p> <p>The weighted average gives the overall rating :</p> <p>An overall rating of 3 (three) and above would indicate an existing results oriented framework.</p>	=> 3	X
MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY		
DPs provide comprehensive and timely information on their program at GoL's satisfaction	100% DPs	0%
Joint Assessment of Progress	Annual Assessments	--

² Based on the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Instructions on how to calculate the indicators can be found at Annex 5.- Definitions & Guidance www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/monitoring