

## Table 1: Possible Key Building Blocks for Independence of IA reviewers

*Both individuals and reviewing bodies/agencies*

	<b>Institutional and legal arrangements</b> <i>Formal independence</i>	<b>Operation in practice</b> <i>De facto independence</i>
<p><b>Status &amp; powers</b></p> <p>the reviewer has independent status and powers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role in reviewing has a formal basis</li> <li>• Independence has a formal basis</li> <li>• Adheres to a Code of Ethics</li> <li>• Signs a 'declaration of absence of conflicts' – no past or present professional conflicts with a project</li> <li>• Mandated to deliver unsolicited advice on the quality and scope of assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has no stake or interest in subject (project, plan, etc.) of the assessment</li> <li>• Has no conflicted relationship with the authors of the assessment</li> <li>• Chooses its own benchmarks &amp; approach</li> <li>• Can show evidence of independence in practice (products and actions)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Financial autonomy</b></p> <p>the reviewer is financially autonomous</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial sourcing has a legal basis</li> <li>• Is not paid by those reviewed</li> <li>• Mandated to set its own budget</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secures sufficient budget for the review</li> <li>• Is autonomous in internal budget allocation</li> <li>• Budget for reviewing is stable over time</li> <li>• Finances are provided upfront</li> </ul>
<p><b>Organizational autonomy</b></p> <p>the reviewer functions autonomously</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mandated to nominate its own staff, board and chairperson</li> <li>• Has rules for incompatibility of offices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Successfully withstands political pressure, e.g. on nominations or dismissals of board or staff, or on conclusions of the assessment or review</li> </ul>

**Knowledge and expertise**

the reviewer has sufficient knowledge and professional expertise to execute its task

- Requirements exist for professional expertise
- Access to information is formally secured, including right to collect information
- Mandated to seek external advice where needed

- Chairperson, board and staff have adequate professional expertise
- External advice is used in practice

**Accountability and transparency**

the reviewer is accountable and transparent

- Formal obligation to publish & justify reviews
- Legal mandate to organize consultations
- Complaint mechanism exists
- Formal requirement on external financial and quality audits

- Review results are published and justified
- Consultations take place, are of high quality and response is given to those consulted
- Complaint mechanism is regularly used
- Financial and quality audits take place