

## **THEME 2: PARTNERSHIPS AND DEVELOPMENT ACTORS – DEALING WITH THE INCREASING COMPLEXITY OF DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES**

### **Presentation n.1**

***Cristina Tirado***

#### ***Partnerships, development, actors, roles***

Goal 2 is composed of 5 agreed multi-dimensional targets and 3 agreed means of implementation (increase investment, correct and prevent trade restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets and ensure the proper functioning of food commodity markets).

1. Complex and Multi-disciplinary challenge related to every goal component:

-Addressing malnutrition and undernutrition requires also progress on other SDGs such as:

- SDG3 Health
- SDG 5 Status of women – SDG 4 education
- SDG6 Water and sanitation

-Achieving sustainable agriculture will require ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices→connections with SDG 13, SDG 15

2. SDG2 will need: i) multi-sectoral collaboration, ii) multi-stakeholder collaboration among governmental and non-governmental.
3. Global Partnerships for development (The SDG Agenda, CFS, Zero Hunger Challenge, the SUN movement, Climate Smart Agriculture Alliance, etc.)

#### **Conclusions:**

Meeting SDG 2 will require broad partnerships;

Regional and sub-regional multi-stakeholder partnerships can play a role in supporting resilience at the national level;

Continuing efforts to enhance policy coordination across sectors through better information systems;

Identifying entry points for partnership and transparent multi stakeholder collaboration which specifically address where each stakeholder can add value;

Partnerships involving business and industry can play a key role in promoting more sustainable food consumption and food production patterns.

### **Presentation n.2**

***Dorothy Lucks***

***“End hunger, achieve food security, improve nutrition promote sustainable agriculture”***

1. Accountability for development can be satisfied – we have, or are building, the tools but are we ready for accountability for learning?
2. And how do we deal with the issue of individual accountability for support of complex processes and partnerships?

Food security dimension: in addition to the traditional 4 dimensions (availability, access, utilization and stability) there are now new tools in place for measuring it e.g. Geo-tagging, point of sale metrics, climate change science.

Weak point in evaluation is ACCOUNTABILITY FOR LEARNING. There are two dimensions of accountability: individual and collective accountability for SDG2.

How can the need for accountability for development be satisfied in a situation where development processes are becoming increasingly complex?

Evaluation-accountability+learning. It's not the complexity of the problem itself, it is our understanding of the complexity around us that matters.

What accountability means for:

- ✓ development financiers → \$ account-ability
- ✓ National governments → ac-count-ability
- ✓ People: account-ability

IMPORTANCE OF STRENGTHENING THE INVOLVEMENT OF ACTORS! ACKNOWLEDGE ACCOUNTABILITY IS AN INTERESTS FOR ALL ACTORS

**EVALUABILITY OF SDG2**

- Targets provides focus for **what** we are going to change
- Evaluation must include accountability and learning
- Evaluation has to adapt and become more relevant to **facilitate** change and achievement of the SDGs

## **Evaluation as a collective effort. Lessons from the Paris Declaration Evaluation**

There is no one recipe for successful evaluations but reflections: evaluand & process.

### Evaluation of the Paris Declaration:

- carried out between 2007 and 2011
- has been the largest aid evaluation conducted
- Evaluation pledge within Declaration - mutual accountability
- Multi-stakeholder – 50+ governments and agencies
- An evaluability assessment has been conducted prior to the evaluation (2009)
- Fully joint evaluation over 4 years (2 phases)
- Meta-evaluation

### Content of the evaluation-PHASE1:

- Donor study updates;
- Evaluation studies

### Content of the evaluation-PHASE 2:

- Country evaluations
- Donor HQ studies
- Supplementary studies

### Key challenges faced:

- Complexity – country level
- Non-linearity - attribution/contribution
- Different starting points of aid reforms for different countries
- Large partnership (more than 50 governments and agencies)
- Political declaration

### **LESSONS LEARNT:**

- Importance of conducting and ex-ante evaluability assessment
- Theory-based approach
- Political evaluation not technocratic = both evaluand (PD/SDG2)
- Balance between independence and ownership vs consistency
- Prioritise governance and intelligent management– but costly and time -consuming
- Independence and impartiality
- Contribution analysis validated – complex/indirect causal chains
- Identify starting point for reform
- Need a strong central evaluation framework for managing varied evidence
- Embedding utility from the start

### **Group 2 – Summary of outputs**

1. Use SDGs as a normative framework that are aspirational and will enable the partners to aim for the goal not a detailed legal or planning framework – planning will be aligned in line with country interests.

2. Process is inherently political, recognising that government are not the only actors who have political interests
3. There is not an overarching theory of change for SDG2, but there are over-arching principles can do theory-based evaluation but have to uncover a multiplicity of TOCs and should link back to Agenda 2030 principles. Difficult to construct but may emerge
4. Conceiving complexity underpins pluralism, evaluability of SDGs should allow evolution of concepts and approaches to evaluation
5. Evaluability assessment (or learning agenda) would allow assessment of what can be evaluated and how. Slight divergent views as to whether only some aspects can be evaluated or all areas and the expectations that we should have of those evaluations
6. Evaluation of SDG2 – Nested multiplicity of evaluations at different levels, segments, nested country led evaluations. Different actors in different places will want to work to different TOCs. Coalitions may be required for evaluations.
7. Diversity of ownership and individual evaluation agendas (e.g. Rome-based agencies) - but in a way that allows synthesis and learning and contribution/attribution
8. Evaluation as an adaptive process; use of mixed methods.
9. Analysis of partnerships, alignments and relationships is needed, what they need, what they bring, and how we can achieve those better., remembering that single entity may be multiplicity of interests and power relations (e.g. government).
10. Winners and losers – need to be explicitly acknowledged and evaluated. Trade-offs between different parts of SDG2 need to be covered.
11. Personal reflection – need to ensure that there is collaborative learning effort so that the sum of the learning is greater than the parts of individual studies.
12. Part of the evaluators' role is to look upwards to bring change