

The 10th ODA Evaluation Workshop

Hanoi, 24– 25 February, 2011











Table of Contents

Co-Chairs' Summary	1
1. Opening Session	6
1.1 Welcome Address and Introduction by Co-Chairs	6
1.2 Welcome Address and Opening Remarks by Co-Hosts	6
1.3 Announcements by Co-Chairs	7
2. Session 1: Case Studies of Joint Evaluation	7
2.1 Joint Evaluation by Vietnam and Japan	7
2.2 Joint Evaluation by the Philippines and Japan	9
2.3 Discussion and Q&A	10
3. Session 2: Capacity Building for Evaluation.....	13
3.1 Efforts by Nepal	13
3.2 Efforts by International Organization and Donor Countries	13
3.3 Discussion and Q&A	15
4. Session 3: Evaluation on Bilateral ODA.....	17
4.1 ODA Evaluation in Japan.....	17
4.2 ODA Evaluation in Maldives	18
4.3 ODA Evaluation in Sri Lanka	20
4.4 Discussion and Q&A	21
5. Session 4: Evaluation of the Paris Declaration	24
5.1 Evaluation of the Paris Declaration.....	24
5.2 Part 1 of Presentation	24
5.3 Discussion and Q&A on Part 1 of Presentation	26
5.4 Part 2 of Presentation	27
5.5 Discussion and Q&A on Part 2 of Presentation	27
5.6 Part 3 of Presentation	27
5.7 Discussion and Q&A on Part 3 of Presentation	28
6. Session 5: Roles of Evaluation Network for Capacity Building	31
6.1 Updates on Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association Network	31
6.2 Discussion and Q&A	32
7. Closing Session: Co-Chairs' Summary and Closing Remarks	34
 Appendix 1: Workshop Program	 35
Appendix 2: List of Participants.....	37
Appendix 3: List of Abbreviations	39

Co-chairs' Summary
The 10th ODA Evaluation Workshop in Hanoi in Feb. 2011
co-hosted by
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan,
Ministry of Planning and Investment, Viet Nam,
and
Japan International Cooperation Agency

The 10th ODA Evaluation Workshop was held in Hanoi, Vietnam, on February 24th and 25th, 2011, jointly organized by the Governments of Japan and Vietnam and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA).

1. Opening Session

Opening remarks were made by the two co-chairs, Mr. Naonobu Minato, Director, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Japan and Mr. Cao Manh Cuong, Deputy Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI), Vietnam.

Welcome speeches were delivered by the representatives of the three co-hosts; Mr. Hiroki Owaki, Deputy Director-General, International Cooperation Bureau, MOFA and Dr. Ho Quang Minh, Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Department, MPI and Mr. Atsushi Sasaki, Director General, Evaluation Department, JICA.

2. Session 1: Case Studies of Joint Evaluation

In this session, joint evaluation between donor and partner countries was discussed. Two presentations were made on the case studies of joint evaluation in Vietnam and the Philippines, with the former by Mr. Cao Manh Cuong, MPI and the latter by Mr. Roland Tungpalan, Deputy Director General, National Economic Development Authority (NEDA). Professor Ryokichi Hirono, Seikei University and Senior Adviser of Japan Evaluation Society moderated the discussion following the presentation.

Discussion by participants focused around the major themes and points brought out by the two presenters:

1) Japan's systematic approach to joint evaluation centered on the development of evaluation capacity both in terms of human resources and institutions in Vietnam and the Philippines based upon the Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) which clearly set the responsibility of the respective partner governments,

2) Recognition that joint evaluation is an effective evaluation modality in contributing to the enhancement of partner countries' sense of ownership, donor alignment to their development priorities, and priority to management for results and so forth,

3) Strong emphasis on the necessity for making credible evaluation recalling the dual purposes of evaluation for improving development management and enhancing transparency and accountability to the people in both donor and partner countries,

4) A growing interest in both donor and partner countries in conducting impact evaluation which requires evaluation at sectoral and country levels, while recognizing the usefulness of joint evaluation conducted at the project level in the two countries where major interests lay in installing/enhancing the culture of effective evaluation and individual and institutional evaluation capacity,

5) Increasing voices of the civil society in partner countries on the critical importance of the parliament, the legislative branch of the government, and to make external evaluation of the development performance by executive branch,

6) An increasing awareness in both donor and partner countries of the need for all relevant stakeholders including local communities and governments concerned to get involved in the entire process of evaluation activities from design phase through implementation to feedback stages including lessons learned, and

7) Recognition that all the evaluation results should be shared and used as either positive or negative lessons learned by all the stakeholders including both intended beneficiaries in partner countries and sensitized tax-payers in donor countries.

3. Session 2: Capacity Development for Evaluation

In the second session, two presentations were made on efforts to build Capacity Development for Evaluation in partner countries; with the former by Mr. Lokdarshan Regmi, Joint Secretary, Monitoring and Evaluation Division, Ministry of Finance, Nepal, and the latter by Mr. Hans Lundgren, Manager, OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation. Mr. Kabir Hashim, Member of Parliament, Sri Lanka and member of Sri Lanka Evaluation Association moderated the discussion following the presentations.

The two presentations evoked a lot of interests and many questions were raised. Some of the main issues raised and key suggestions made were;

1) To recognize that one of the main reasons that "Evaluation" is mostly donor driven is due to the lack of trained experts and lack of capacity in evaluation in the partner countries,

2) To establish a sustainable capacity development system in partner countries, before motivating them to engage in evaluations,

- 3) To take measures to strengthen and improve the evaluation culture in partner countries and find ways to institutionalize such culture,
- 4) To develop sustainable capacity development programs which are locally driven or country driven and not donor driven,
- 5) To set up university level education training program,
- 6) To focus on improving the demand side for evaluation that can help development of the supply of trained persons, and
- 7) To increase the demand for evaluation was by increasing awareness amongst politicians and officials about benefits of evaluation and develop training programs for members of parliament.

4. Session 3: Evaluation on Bilateral ODA

In Session 3, three presentations on bilateral ODA evaluation were made from perspectives of both donors and partner countries. The Japanese policy evaluation system and its challenges were presented by Mr. Naonobu Minato, MOFA. Highlighting different aspects of ODA evaluation including evaluation subjects and criteria, he emphasized the need for improving policy level evaluation, evaluation implementation system and ways to make synergy effects with partner countries. Two perspectives were presented respectively by Ms. Khadyja Zahir, Deputy Additional Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Maldives and by Ms. Loshani Peiris, Director, Department of External Resources, Ministry of Finance and Planning, Sri Lanka. Ms. Zahir made presentation on ODA to Maldives, focusing on external aid disbursement, assistance from Japan, aid institutional structure, aid coordination and evaluation mechanisms, and challenges in the work due to inconsistent and varied mechanisms of donors. Ms. Peiris made presentation on Japan's ODA in Sri Lanka and highlighted its contribution to and achievements in the country, evaluation of Japan's ODA focusing on relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability with some examples of success stories. Mr. Subarna Lal Shrestha, Secretary General, Nepal Evaluation Society moderated the discussion that followed.

Participants made various questions and comments on the points that include;

- 1) Evaluation culture and policy evaluation criteria,
- 2) Evaluation for country development assistance program,
- 3) JICA's participation in the evaluations of municipality,
- 4) Evaluation capacity issues,
- 5) Harmonization of donor assistance, and
- 6) The need for country assistance strategy and sector assistance evaluation system in partner countries.

5. Session 4: Evaluation of the Paris Declaration

In this session, the current progress in terms of evaluation between partner countries and donors based on the Paris Declaration and findings of Phase 1 and Phase 2 survey were presented by Mr. Niels Dabelstein, Head of Evaluation, the Secretariat for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration. These findings include how the Paris Declaration has had effects in terms of stronger national strategies, increased alignment of aid, performance and accountability to citizens and parliament, and less duplication of efforts and rationalised activities. The co-chair, Mr. Naonobu Minato moderated the Q&A session following the presentation.

Questions and comments were made by participants mainly on the following points;

- 1) Possibilities for applying the Paris Declaration for improvement of local government development programs and management,
- 2) Identification of national stakeholders,
- 3) Degree of participation by donors and partner countries to conduct evaluation survey,
- 4) Advantage and disadvantage of ex-post evaluation and process evaluation,
- 5) To compare transaction cost and benefits of harmonization,
- 6) Concern of host countries having to work with a lot of surveys conducted by bilateral and multilateral donors,
- 7) Involvement of parliament, as reportedly practiced in Vietnam,
- 8) Linkage between monitoring and evaluation, and progress report for Busan meeting,
- 9) Relationship between conclusion and recommendation formulation process, and
- 10) Usefulness and essentiality of honest monitoring and evaluation survey.

6. Session 5: Role of Evaluation Network for Capacity Building

In this session, as one of the concrete measures of promoting the exchange of evaluation experiences among countries in the Asia-Pacific region with a view to improving evaluation capacity, practices and system, a proposal for establishing Asia Pacific Evaluation Association Network (APEA-NET) was introduced by **Prof. Ryokichi Hirono**, Seikei University, Japan. Welcoming the establishment of APEA-NET at the earliest possible time, appreciating the support to it of the participating countries of in the Workshop, the co-chair, Mr. Cao Manh Cuong opened the floor for Q&A session.

Several key questions and comments made by participants were as follows;

- 1) Critical importance of the Government of Japan and other countries of the region

to support the initiative of several national evaluation associations and those countries participating in the interim organizing committee to work out further details of the APEA-NET,

2) Major objectives and activities of such regional evaluation associations now in operation in Africa, Europe, Latin and North America,

3) Possible cost and benefits of APEA-NET which may differ among Asia-Pacific countries,

4) Need for APEA-NET, when established, to assist evaluation capacity particularly in small island developing countries and small land-locked countries.

5) Need for APEA-NET to work closely with other regional evaluation associations, International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS) and Organization for International Cooperation in Evaluation (OICE) as well as with international development and finance organizations such as UNICEF, UNDP, World Bank, Asian Development Bank and OECD/DAC, with rich evaluation experiences and

6) Need for opening to any participants of the Workshop for joining the interim organizing committee planned to meet immediately after the final session of the Workshop.

7. Closing Session

The two co-chairs concluded the Workshop by sharing the draft of the co-chairs' summary and thanking all participants for their lively and stimulating presentations and discussions.

1. Opening Session

1.1 Welcome Address and Introduction by Co-Chairs

Mr. Naonobu Minato, Director, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Japan

The 10th ODA Evaluation Workshop was opened by co-chair Mr. Naonobu Minato. He stated he had been involved with ODA evaluation for a long time and had attended the past several workshops. He then introduced Mr. Cao Manh Cuong of Ministry of Planning & Investment (MPI), Vietnam, as a co-chair of the present workshop. He concluded his welcome address by stating that the organizers hoped for a lively two days of discussion of ODA evaluation.

Mr. Cao Manh Cuong, Deputy Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI), Vietnam

Mr. Cao Manh Cuong introduced himself and stated he had been involved in evaluation activities since 2000. As a co-chair, he hoped that the workshop would be successful.

1.2 Welcome Address and Opening Remarks by Co-Hosts

Mr. Hiroki Owaki, Deputy Director-General, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Japan

Mr. Owaki welcomed all the participants to the 10th ODA Workshop. He informed about fifty experts and officers had gathered to attend the meeting, demonstrating that people were very much interested in ODA evaluations and efforts for improving aid effectiveness.

Mr. Owaki mentioned Japan had continuously worked on improving ODA program through PDCA cycle (Plan, Do, Check, Act). He informed evaluation allowed learning from past experiences and enhanced the overall quality of the program. It also promoted accountability and transparency. He stated MOFA had recently redefined its ODA policy by strengthening the PDCA cycle and improving the ODA evaluation. He informed Japan had been organizing annual ODA Evaluation Workshops since 2001 to understand the ODA evaluation in Asia-Pacific countries. He also stated capacity development in the partner countries had been the central theme of past workshops, with this year's workshop focusing on the same theme.

Mr. Owaki stressed on the importance of participants' contributions. He hoped the participants would capitalize on their experiences, challenges, and good practices and would identify future roadmaps to further elevate the ODA evaluation quality. He concluded his remark by extending his heartfelt welcome to all the participants and wishing them fruitful discussions over the next two days.

Dr. Ho Quang Minh, Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI), Vietnam

Mr. Minh welcomed all the participants to Hanoi for the 10th ODA Evaluation Workshop jointly hosted by the Government of Japan and Government of Vietnam. Due to the Paris Declaration(PD) and the Accra Agenda for Action, the quality, transparency, and accountability of aid for development results has been receiving great attention. He pointed out recently the development of evaluation culture had become increasingly important. Vietnam as a partner country appreciated the Japanese Government for organizing the workshop. The workshop was a unique forum for exchanging knowledge and sharing experiences to establish an effective ODA evaluation system and capacity development for evaluation of Vietnam and other partner countries. Vietnam was also increasing its effort to

establish and operate the national ODA Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system and trying to establish evaluation as a profession.

Further, Mr. Minh stated the second day workshop on roles of evaluation network for capacity building was relevant to Vietnam in the current context. Vietnam had found the joint evaluation program a powerful way of strengthening evaluation capacity and getting closer to international standard in evaluation. Mr. Minh explained that over the last 4 years, Vietnam had enriched its knowledge and experience of evaluation with high quality evaluation and recommendation reports generated by both sides in an effort to improve the quality of Japanese ODA projects and programs in Vietnam.

In conclusion, Mr. Minh hoped the workshop would help initiate in a clear vision, duration, and concrete actions to bring the ODA evaluation agenda forward. He also hoped the outcome would be reflected in the 4th High-Level Forum (HLF) in Busan in November 2011. He then wished the workshop to be a success.

Mr. Sasaki Atsushi, Director General, Evaluation Department, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), Japan

Mr. Sasaki welcomed the participants to the 10th ODA Evaluation Workshop in Hanoi. He believed that Vietnam was the right venue to conduct the workshop from JICA's perspective since Vietnam was a key partner in conducting joint evaluation under multi-year agreement similar to the Philippines. He pointed out that the concrete experiences of Vietnam and the Philippines illustrated the efforts for improvement of host country's evaluation and program management capacity building. He stated the workshop provided an opportunity to share experiences amongst the participating countries. He hoped for a fruitful discussion and thanked the Vietnamese authorities for co-hosting the workshop.

1.3 Announcements by Co-Chairs

Providing the workshop schedule, Mr. Minato informed this year's workshop would focus on:

- Effective joint evaluation, Capacity building for Evaluation in partner countries.
- Evaluation on bilateral ODA, Evaluation of PD, and rolls of evaluation network for capacity development.

He hoped the participants would be able to share a wide range of evaluation experiences and insights through interactive discussion.

Mr. Cuong announced that each session would include two to three presenters followed by question and answer sessions. After the Q&A session, the floor would be opened for free discussions. He announced that the workshop was being recorded for the purpose of drafting a report. The report would be published in MOFA's website and a booklet would eventually be released in March. He assured that the questions and comments would be noted anonymously in order to have a candid discussion.

2. Session 1: Case Studies of Joint Evaluation

2.1 Joint Evaluation by Vietnam and Japan

Presentation: Evolution and Outcomes of Joint Evaluation

Mr. Cao Manh Cuong, Deputy Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI), Vietnam

Mr. Cuong gave a presentation on the evolution and outcomes of joint evaluation in Vietnam. He underlined the point that joint evaluation was a progressive approach.

Mr. Cuong stated PD on Aid Effectiveness and Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) were important commitments of donor and partner countries that set the background for improved aid effectiveness. Together with the donor community, Vietnam had localized PD by implementing Hanoi Core Statement (HCS) which had a strong commitment on actions.

Mr. Cuong then introduced the development of ODA M&E system in Vietnam by explaining Vietnam's efforts on pilot projects, institutionalizing M&E system through legal framework, and partnering with donors through experience sharing. He provided various examples to illustrate the points indicated above. He mentioned the ODA Strategic Framework 2006-2010 and the Action Plan. He also explained the joint ODA project management training with World Bank and the joint evaluation training with Japanese and Australian governments.

Next, Mr. Cuong informed the joint evaluation of Vietnam with MOFA in 2005 was the first program between the two countries. Then, in 2007, MPI and JICA agreed to a three-year MOU on joint evaluation to promote effective and efficient ODA management and a harmonized evaluation mechanism. There were two components to it; a joint evaluation of Japanese ODA projects and capacity development, specifically providing evaluation training for government officers.

Mr. Cuong then went on to explain the evolution of joint evaluation approach with JICA. He mentioned the evaluation approach was one of transferring the role from JICA to the Vietnam Government. From 2009, Government of Vietnam had started conducting the primary evaluation while the JICA team assumed the secondary evaluation role. He explained the team composition of the Joint Evaluation Team 2010.

Mr. Cuong stated Vietnam made efforts to set up network to make the evaluation independent. By doing so, it had gained experience of other countries' evaluation society such as that of Malaysia and Japan.

In the next part of the presentation, Mr. Cuong explained the role of joint evaluations in project-level lesson-learning. He showed the results of the evaluation work done together with JICA. In Vietnam, most of the projects have been awarded an "A" rating signifying that ODA had been used effectively. Mr. Cuong also stated through joint evaluation, common issues which affected the sustainability of the project were identified, such as issues dealing with land acquisition and resettlement, procurement, project design, and technical assistance.

Mr. Cuong then explained the role of joint evaluations in institutional development of the country's evaluation system. Evaluation helped in finding obstacles that hindered the overall development process of the system such as time constraints in public sector offices, budget constraints, and institutional constraints.

Mr. Cuong remarked the lessons learnt through ODA M&E system would help Vietnam replicate the model of ODA to public investment. The M&E system would be used for maximizing public investment system. He mentioned that the government had introduced Circular 22 which correlated to cost norms for investment monitoring and evaluation. The cost norms were important in the planning process for allocation of the budget. Circular 23 was also introduced which set the qualification criteria for those providing services in evaluation activities.

Mr. Cuong concluded his presentation by stating that first and foremost the cornerstone of their achievement was ownership of the country in working together with a development partner; secondly, capacity development needed to be supported by institutional enhancement; and thirdly, joint evaluation was a powerful tool for expanding the country's knowledge and experience and also a tool to transfer technology in evaluation areas.

2.2 Joint Evaluation by the Philippines and Japan

Presentation: Joint JICA-NEDA Ex-Post Evaluation

Mr. Roland Tungpalan, Deputy Director-General, National Economic and Development Authority, Philippines

Mr. Tungpalan started his presentation by providing a context to understand the delivery of JICA-NEDA joint evaluation. He elaborated the situation that existed in 90s when there was little emphasis on evaluation. Instead, the emphasis was on building and creating new things. There was weak feedback loop with no demand for evaluation results that would feed into the decision making. There was limited interest from financing institutions except from independent evaluation group. Mr. Tungpalan also talked about the moral hazard that was present where implementing agencies could get incriminated if evaluation results were not as expected. Also, adequate resources were not devoted to M&E capacity and practice and evaluation literature were not widely accessible and disseminated.

Next, Mr. Tungpalan explained the emergence of an enabling environment in the year 2000. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and PD on Aid Effectiveness were examples of a changing world with its emphasis on outcomes and commitment to aid effectiveness respectively. The political imperatives had also started questioning the effectiveness of the programs. The Philippines had localized the five principles of PD which emphasized management for development results.

Mr. Tungpalan explained the MOU signed between NEDA and JICA in May 2006 and explained the objectives of this MOU. Initially, the joint evaluation was focused on the partner country with accountability for evaluation towards JBIC and emphasis on improving the Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC) projects.

He then provided the progress and results of four rounds of projects between the two countries from 2006 to 2010. He informed the projects were chosen based on their diversity and selectivity, and those projects which provided maximum lessons were selected. Furthermore, he analyzed the progress of joint evaluation made over time. These were: (1) improved mechanisms under the MOU allowing the possibility of questioning of initial findings, (2) cost burden of NEDA participation, (3) addressing capacity development, and (4) NEDA playing a greater role in evaluation.

He mentioned that many lessons had been learnt at the project level like budget planning and execution, anticipating cost increases, project planning and risk assessment, stronger commitment of Local Government Units (LGUs) and project stakeholders, and O&M sustainability. At the ex-post evaluation, they had realized that everybody was responsible for respective results. There was also a need to archive important documents properly, baseline indicators were important to measure the results, and allocating resources helped in proper evaluation. He also stated they had learnt that capacity building was a continuous process, that rating system should be continuously improved, and other development partners should be engaged for joint ex-post evaluation.

In the end, Mr. Tungpalan spoke about the future direction of the joint evaluation system. He explained about the Philippines development plan draft which emphasized results by allowing government agencies to be held accountable. The budget would be linked to the plan through a joint circular forged by NEDA and the Department of Budget and Management. He explained that operationalizing M&E network, deepening engagement with development partners with strong evaluation capacities, and bringing capacity at the sub-national level and different agencies were important steps to be taken in the future to strengthen the joint evaluation system. He remarked that consolidating and disseminating evaluation products to various stakeholders should continue into the future. Furthermore, different types of

evaluation were needed where the focus would be on results. Lastly, he emphasized that some sort of link of results from projects to national outcomes should be established in all evaluation activities.

2.3 Discussion

Moderator: Ryokichi Hirono, Professor Emeritus, Seikei University, Senior Advisor, Japan Evaluation Society, Japan

After the presentation, Prof. Hirono suggested some points for discussion. He pointed out that the two presentations had mentioned orderly evaluation of joint evaluation, the importance of involving stakeholders from both sides, a two-step joint evaluation system, and importance of institutional development in evaluation. He also stated that the presentation had also emphasized on human resource development to train good evaluators. The presenters had also discussed about the issue of budget constraint, the moral hazard issue, and the importance of linking planning to design and then to final evaluation. Prof. Hirono then opened the floor for questions and comments.

Question: Do Vietnam and JICA prepare different reports or the same report prepared by Vietnam is then refined by JICA during the two-step evaluation process?

Answer: The same evaluation report prepared by Vietnam was reviewed by JICA. For the evaluation to take place, both sides had to set up evaluation framework and agree on the evaluation process and indicators for collection of report study. However, at present time, Vietnam prepared the report and improved it further through JICA's feedback.

Question: For FY2010 when Vietnam was leading and managing evaluation, was the framework jointly prepared or was it prepared by Vietnam alone?

Answer: From FY2009, Vietnam had starting taking a leadership role in the evaluation work. JICA consultants were present for a limited time when the Vietnam team needed training for capacity building. The final report was prepared by Vietnam and JICA which did a meta evaluation of the report. This was then submitted to the Government of Vietnam and JICA for their final consideration.

Question: In Vietnam, why are most of the joint evaluation projects focused on infrastructure and not on social sectors?

Answer: The projects were selected based on the following points: (1) the project should be of interest to both sides, (2) the project should support future projects through lessons learnt, (3) ex-post evaluation of expensive projects was appropriate as joint evaluation which entailed cost sharing while social sector projects were inexpensive, and (4) majority of the projects where Japan provided assistance to Vietnam was in the infrastructure sector.

A participant commented the original agreement with Vietnam and the Philippines was with JBIC. JBIC handled lending operations for economic infrastructure while former JICA dealt with technical cooperation. However, the present JICA was handling all these operations combined together. He also mentioned in the future, social sector projects would also be evaluated. He hoped that since Vietnam was increasingly taking lead roles in joint evaluation, future projects would be managed by Vietnam.

Question: To what extent has the experience gained through joint evaluation with Japan been effective on Vietnam's and the Philippines' cooperation in evaluation with other donors? Have other donors taken on this approach?

Answer: Vietnam previously had a joint evaluation with the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) on technical projects. Their process of evaluation of development was to ask the donor for a yearly evaluation schedule with the possibility of joint evaluation and sharing the study, which was in line with PD. However, it was difficult to

connect the donors as well as the donor and the government. Also, some donors conducted a review mission instead of evaluation where the government agencies provided document and reported the progress to the donor.

Another participant stated the mechanism of working with other donors varied. However, before the start of the project, both sides clarified the terms of reference. They held joint meetings and allowed independent teams to conduct evaluation. Also, before the report was finalized, they held discussions and debriefings about the project. However, this mechanism still lacked the systemic approach that was employed with JICA and IFAD.

Question: In the Philippines, when discussing results of the joint evaluation between Japan and the Philippines, do you invite other bilateral donors for comments or for learnings?

Answer: Although recently the Philippines had invited other donors while discussing the joint evaluation result done by a specific country, the donors have backed off for various reasons. However, these donors were present during roundtable discussion and evaluation.

Question: In the Philippines, regarding the possibility of disagreement of findings, everybody had their own position and interest. Hence, the criteria for evaluation could be different.

Answer: Objectively verifiable indicators (OVI) and means of verification (MOV) should be agreed upon. However, perspectives and experience were diffuse terms and there could be disagreement on that. In such cases, in the Philippines, the process was to proceed with the disagreement with the government putting its justification. The economic planning agency was responsible for approving plans. They were accountable for the project results and reported to Congress. Hence, they needed evidence to believe in the disagreement.

Question: In Vietnam, when there is a disagreement in the findings between primary and secondary evaluations, how is the final result arrived at? Further, if one party is involved in the design and implementation of the project, should the same party be involved in its evaluation? And, if yes, in what capacity should the party be involved in, as an evaluator or as a facilitator?

Answer: One participant stated that the issue was of neutrality of evaluators. In Vietnam, project owners could only conduct internal evaluation. Other evaluations like the midterm and the impact evaluation were to be done by independent evaluators. In the case of a conflict, the project owner could attach a justification with the report. The government, however, was only involved in the management and organization of the evaluators. For joint evaluation with Japan, the same process was followed. When there was a disagreement between the two governments and the evaluator, they would provide evidence. It was more about getting strong evidence to persuade the consultants to agree.

Another participant remarked that the result of the evaluation findings should be free of either party's interest. She reasoned that independent evaluators were privy to information and views that the country could have missed. She also informed in her country a statement was made, informing that some of the recommendations could be adopted while others could be looked into. Hence, she stated although the report had to have some national color, it had to stand by itself.

One participant stated that independence of evaluation was important and JICA should not be involved in evaluating self-funded projects. Also, there should not be any scope for donors for joint evaluation because PD emphasized that recipient should take the lead in managing the projects. If some countries wanted joint evaluation and donors did not agree, then there would be a role for OECD DAC in convincing the donors.

A participant agreed that joint evaluation modality was being employed by increasing number of donors. He stated there was progressive movement from being evaluated to taking the lead

and managing the evaluation themselves. He felt the future was to redefine MOU or other cooperation agreements to receive the transfer of ownership.

Another participant felt evaluation should be credible. He felt a completely independent evaluation did not exist except for a Civil Society Organization (CSO)-conducted evaluation. The concept of credibility of evaluation should be developed rather than focusing on independence of evaluation.

One participant stated rigorous evaluation of the development impact was the main purpose of evaluation. He informed that JICA's evaluation department was independent from regional department that was responsible for implementation of the projects. He stated the joint evaluation between MPI or NEDA and JICA was independent and neutral.

Prof. Hirono remarked that firstly, in partner countries, evaluation departments are independent from implementing departments. Secondly, the main purpose for evaluation was to see its benefit for future projects.

Question: A participant wanted to know if evaluation results had improved and by how much since JICA had started conducting joint evaluations since 2002. Another participant wanted to know the expectations from impact evaluation by the two countries.

Answer: One participant stated that impact evaluation was important as it could ensure the sustainability of the project. Impact evaluation could teach important lessons for improvement of future projects. In Vietnam, impact evaluation was done for selected projects only selected by the ministry along with government agencies and donors. Also, impact evaluation was expensive.

Another participant stated NEDA did not do impact assessment because of costs. He also felt the impact evaluation answered the causality question. He informed NEDA was planning to do impact evaluation at the program level for large projects and was looking at the methodologies and the quality of information.

One participant stated the emerging definition of impact evaluation was one of analyzing the impact of ODA to the society utilizing microeconomics and statistical method. He, however, felt JICA was not conducting such kind of impact evaluation in Vietnam. However, in the Philippines, similar impact evaluation was being conducted for some projects.

One participant stated his country was struggling with impact evaluation. To measure the impact of each project, he felt they needed to look at the project's contribution to the sector as a whole. This contribution then could be used to measure the impact of ODA projects as well as other projects within that sector.

With regard to the case studies by Vietnam and the Philippines, Prof. Hirono remarked that he was impressed with (1) the orderly development of the joint evaluation by both countries, (2) the development of human resource institution for promoting joint evaluation, and (3) the increasing quality of the evaluation process. He also stated the time was appropriate to move from joint project evaluation to sectoral and then to country evaluation. Also Prof. Hirono stated in developed countries like US, a question was being raised about external evaluation being done by the legislative branch apart from the executive branch for further transparency and accountability purposes. However, he felt that in many countries, the parliament was not strong and, therefore, parliamentary evaluation would not be realistic at this point in time.

-----Coffee Break-----

3. Session 2: Capacity Building for Evaluation

3.1 Efforts by Nepal

Presentation: Way to Capacity Building for Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Results in Nepal

Mr. Lokdarshan Regmi, Joint Secretary, Monitoring and Evaluation Division, Ministry of Finance, Nepal

In the first part of his presentation, Mr. Regmi gave the background information and institutional arrangement for M&E in Nepal. He informed initially Nepal had adopted the practice of reviewing the progress of the project. However, with time, it shifted from process monitoring system to output-focused and sometimes impact-oriented M&E system. Detailing the M&E structure system in Nepal, he informed that National Development Action Committee (NDAC) was the apex body which reviewed important national projects with MDAC at the ministerial level, M&E cell at the department level, and M&E unit at the district level.

Mr. Regmi then talked about different tools used for M&E system in Nepal such as log frame matrix which was essential for donor-funded projects, business plan which gave detailed activities based on the log frame matrix, public expenditure tracking survey which consisted of four software systems, and project performance information system which captured the performance data.

In the next part, Mr. Regmi provided an example of business plan of Department of Roads to demonstrate the practicality of the systems developed. The business plan contained: (1) sector vision, goals, and objectives, (2) performance gap analysis, (3) core program activities, and (4) M&E plan. He laid out the vision and objective of the road department from which the department had prepared a performance gap analysis sheet for 2007-2008 and 2008-2009. This sheet listed the performance gap and the reasons for the gap. This analysis then led to core program activities for 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 along with appropriate budget allocation. Mr. Regmi explained that the mismatch between the proposed and the allocated budget could be a reason for the project being left incomplete. He then explained about the result matrix and the M&E plan in detail. Mr. Regmi also informed there were other monitoring systems to strengthen the M&E system such as the Poverty Monitoring and Analysis System (PMASS) and the Managing for Development Result (MFDR). Furthermore, he stated JICA also provided support in this regard.

Lastly, Mr. Regmi stated lack of proper human resource was a major hurdle in making an effective M&E system in Nepal. There were experts involved in M&E process in all levels, but they lacked expertise. Therefore, he stated workshops and training programs were organized to provide them with appropriate skills. Some experts were also sent overseas to gather further knowledge and experience. Furthermore, a sector-specific Human Resource Development (HRD) plan had been developed to tackle this issue and a performance-based incentive system had been introduced to encourage good performers.

In conclusion, Mr. Regmi laid out three agendas which Nepal needed to address to strengthen the M&E system; firstly, an on-line reporting system for M&E needed to be strengthened; secondly, creating a separate service to perform M&E function; and lastly, encouraging M&E officials by providing an incentive structure.

3.2 Efforts by International Organization and Donor Countries

Presentation: Strengthening Capacities for Development Evaluation – Experiences from the DAC Network on Development Evaluation

Mr. Hans Lundgren, Manager, OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation

In his presentation, Mr. Lundgren stated the objective of DAC evaluation network was to increase the effectiveness of development cooperation through credible and independent evaluation. He informed the network participants included bilateral agencies and multilateral development banks and UN evaluation groups with expertise and knowledge on different aspects of evaluation. Partner countries and evaluation associations also participated in individual evaluations and workshops.

Mr. Lundgren then discussed about the role of network in strengthening evaluation capacities. The network had developed and released a booklet on norms, standards, and guidance. The booklet also contained the DAC evaluation criteria and standards. The DAC evaluation standards provided framework for quality evaluation process. Other publications of the network included a key term glossary and review on evaluation systems in 39 agencies. Mr. Lundgren stated the network was also interested in sharing experiences and lessons on capacity development. The network had also developed an evaluation resource center to facilitate evaluation of knowledge function.

On capacity development, Mr. Lundgren stated evaluation capacity involved institutions and systems and an evaluation culture that created demand for evaluation. He then highlighted the emerging key lessons on capacity development taken from the review work of various agencies, workshops, and studies. He stated capacity development must be owned and driven from within. It also needed to be tailored to local needs. He said that evaluation capacity involved supply and demand, and, therefore, a certain effort was needed for use and creation of this demand. The benefits of evaluation needed to be demonstrated, and so advocacy based on real products was important. He also felt it was useful to seize opportunity for participation in ongoing evaluations like joint evaluations with international partners. Mr. Lundgren agreed that top-level support was needed to build a good evaluation culture. Also creating networks of skilled champions helped in evaluation capacity development.

Mr. Lundgren indicated that they were promoting collaborative approach to doing evaluations because it increased credibility of evaluation, reduced transaction cost for partner country, assessed broader development changes, and strengthened mutual accountability, thereby, increasing the impact of evaluation. However, he remarked that collaborative approach was time consuming as well as complex. He felt one good way of learning was by mixing experience and skill like joint evaluation of implementation of PD.

Next, Mr. Lundgren agreed that at present there was a new focus on capacity development because of changing context. In most OECD countries, the focus was now on results due to the demand from the public and from the system makers. These demands were due to fiscal pressures as well as demand for effective public sector programs and learnings. Further, international agreements on mutual accountability and alignments in use of country evaluation systems contained within PD were also creating a stronger focus on capacity development.

Lastly, Mr. Lundgren talked about the new task team that had been created within the DAC Network to move the agenda forward. He informed they had made accessible 700 planned evaluations of major development partners in order to identify the evaluations being planned in a country or a sector as well as to stimulate possible joint or country-led evaluations. He stated they were also interested in strengthening collaboration with evaluation networks and regional groups. They had already worked with Africa and Latin America and wanted to work more with the Asian community. Mr. Lundgren also showed interest in working with countries like India and China that were providing and receiving development assistance. He felt such network would provide mutual learning and sharing of experiences. He hoped to structure such an event in the future so it could be beneficial to the members as well as the DAC Network.

3.3 Discussion and Q&A

Moderator: Mr. Kabir Hashim, Member of Parliament, Sri Lanka and member of Sri Lanka Evaluation Association, Sri Lanka

After the presentation, Mr. Hashim felt that the remark by Mr. Lundgren that evaluation capacity building must be owned and driven from inside was a very critical point in the discussion. He stated the use of evaluation had been increasing in the recent years in the developing world because of donor pressure, civil society pressure, and government pressure. He, however, felt that there was limited supply of capacity development in most parts of the developing world because evaluation was considered a multidisciplinary skill and a focused training was missing. He suggested that establishing professional and academic training programs would address the short supply of trained manpower as well as establishing an evaluation culture and a system would help institutionalize the culture of evaluation. Mr. Hashim then opened the floor for questions.

Question: Attempt of Asian Development Bank (ADB) to do country evaluation with many participants had failed 2 years back. Could Mr. Lundgren share lessons or experiences from joint country or joint sector evaluations?

Answer: Mr. Lundgren stated they had done many evaluations beyond project level. He agreed that joint evaluations were complicated in an international level and country level evaluations were especially difficult to do as a modality. He felt partner countries should lead such evaluation instead of donor or bank. He agreed that the system could not be changed in the near future due to institutional requirements in all the banks. He, however, stated in the end, the usefulness of such evaluations for partner country was important.

Question: When talking about the results of an evaluation, what is the next step for the donor in terms of policies for the partner country?

Answer: One participant felt the question was actually about evaluation being country-led or donor-led. However, he felt that the capacity for doing country-led evaluation was inadequate at present. He suggested that capacity building had to be tackled before taking ownership of the evaluation.

Another participant stated evaluation was a defined process which could result in an outcome that was different than originally desired. He felt that whether the partner government or the donor acted on the result of the evaluation should not influence the overall process of the evaluation.

A participant remarked that with in regards to capacity development for evaluation, sometimes the donor did not have the capacity nor the legal framework that allowed them to do evaluation. Hence, the partner country needed to build capacity, which was a challenge, as this capacity was unavailable even in nongovernmental sector. The participant suggested that to meet this challenge, the government should provide an enabling environment and introduce legal framework to formalize training and certification process which would require all evaluators to undergo training.

One participant stated although Japan had a long history of evaluation of ODA, quality evaluators were still amiss. He, therefore, felt Japan Evaluation Society needed to formalize a professional training program and establish a certification process. For this, evaluation courses were needed to be introduced at the graduate and university level. However, this was difficult due to budget constraint of the universities. He, therefore, felt that they had to be selective in introducing the program in the universities. Japan Evaluation Society's program had to be focused in its approach for which it needed a university body which was well trained at the university level. He also informed that Japan needed to do evaluation of the evaluation program sometimes in the future.

Another participant felt the issue of local capacity needed to be seen in the context of individual versus institutional capacity. He stated in many countries, donor-led evaluation would engage individual local consultants. Therefore, the issue was to find ways to harness indigenous local capacity to accelerate institutional capacity at hand through incentive systems. He, however, reminded that in the Accra Action Agenda, country systems were to be used regardless of its strengths or weaknesses.

A participant agreed that the main issue was to strengthen institutional capacity through incentivization. He commented that with regards to individual training, there was a new trust fund set up by World Bank and financed by donors and the Bank which would train and provide institutional support. He felt that although international training universities had trained many evaluators in the past, institutional foundation still lacked. Therefore, it was critical for local level approach to transform skills from international training to skills that would be applicable and useful locally.

A participant remarked evaluation was created to learn lessons from experiences and not for accountability purposes. He, however, felt this was the shift they were seeing, especially in donor countries. He suggested they needed to work with decision makers' demand and find ways to fulfill that demand. He felt it was dangerous to educate peers regarding the scope of evaluation. In the partner countries, in the past, there was individual capacity, but no demand for evaluation. However, the scenario had changed and there was increasing demand from the bureaucracy regarding evaluation. He suggested that evaluation should be discussed from the donor and the partner country's point of view.

A participant felt that there were two kinds of demand, demand from the political level and demand from the market. He stated if the government has demand but does not provide funding, then the market for evaluation cannot be created.

Another participant felt that demand from the work side is sometimes ignored or given less priority due to individual interest, attitude, or lack of commitment. He suggested that in order to make evaluation accountable and transparent, cultural and commitment parts of the partner and the donor countries should be strengthened along with capacity building for M&E.

Another participant shared an example of South Asian region. The evaluation community from South Asia had setup TESA (Teaching Evaluation in South Asia), which was a consortium of academic institutions, to develop a university curriculum. He remarked that this was one way of developing a culture of evaluation in the country. He further informed the stakeholders that demand for evaluation were the people who cared about performance. He gave an example of Malaysia bringing in legislation for performance-based budgeting for its ministries in order to create further demand for evaluation. He suggested such systems needed to be incorporated in other countries as well. He reminded that in many South Asian countries, the constitution had enough clauses that made the parliament responsible for all financial transactions in the country. The auditor general's office also had immense power to be a tool for parliamentary use, but its office had insufficient fund. He felt such inherent system problems should be changed. To illustrate this point, he gave an example of Sri Lanka. In 2002, Sri Lanka had championed the cause of evaluation by setting up national operations room and had formed evaluators association which brought in the stakeholders of evaluation. He informed this association was, in fact, now developing the university training program without the help of the state.

A participant added that Japan made evaluation policy compulsory for all government agencies in 2001. Each ministry had to conduct internal policy evaluation of government programs and projects. The ministry of general administration was setup to supervise internal ministry evaluations. Also, in both houses of the parliament, a committee was setup for external evaluation. He remarked that the committee was not functioning well, and to make

effective policy evaluation, even the members of parliament needed to be educated. Therefore, he suggested that unless the whole society took part in creating awareness of the importance of evaluation, evaluation would ultimately not work.

A participant remarked that there were different kinds of demand depending on the stakeholders. However, he stated in Parliament, there were two kinds of demands; the opposition wanted failures while the government wanted success. Therefore, only the common citizen wanted to know the truth about evaluation.

A participant stated in MOFA, the evaluation unit worked with the implementation unit to produce action plan addressing each issue pointed out in the evaluation reports of ODA projects. This was then published and followed up after a certain period of time. He informed this cycle was repeated to make the stakeholders aware of the development in the PDCA cycle. He suggested that this kind of practice could be applied in other countries as well.

Regarding the presentations by Nepal and OECD, Mr. Hashim remarked that capacity building was a key factor for moving forward. He commented that the point was not about educating parliamentarians because parliamentarians were transitory. However, he felt that an M&E unit could be setup in every parliament to educate interested parliamentarians who would use the knowledge for the betterment of their country.

-----Lunch Break-----

4. Session 3: Evaluation on Bilateral ODA

4.1 ODA Evaluation in Japan

Presentation: ODA Evaluation in Japan

Mr. Naonobu Minato, Director, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Japan

Mr. Minato divided his presentation into three parts: (1) ODA evaluation system in Japan, (2) evaluation issues on policy level, and (3) making synergy with donor and partner countries.

Mr. Minato stated in Japan ODA evaluation was conducted by MOFA in cooperation with JICA. He laid out the different roles MOFA and JICA played with regard to ODA evaluation. While MOFA was responsible for planning and formulation of ODA policies, JICA was in charge of implementation and facilitation of individual projects. He stated JICA used five-evaluation criteria recommended by OECD-DAC (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability) while MOFA used three evaluation criteria (relevance of policies, effectiveness of results, and appropriateness of process) for ODA evaluation.

Mr. Minato then provided the details of the evaluation projects conducted by MOFA and JICA during FY2009 and FY2010. In FY2009, MOFA had conducted five country policy evaluations, evaluation of aid through Human Security Fund Institutes, review of past ODA evaluations, and evaluations by partner countries (Afghanistan and Guatemala) while JICA conducted around 85 project level evaluations and 11 program level evaluations. JICA had also introduced a rating scale to project level evaluations based on the quality of evaluation result. Then, in FY2010, MOFA conducted six country policy evaluations, evaluation of peace-building cooperation, evaluation of grant assistance for Japanese NGO projects, evaluation by partner countries (Bangladesh and Senegal), and also evaluated on implementation status of PD. JICA on the other hand had 175 ongoing project-level evaluations and five program level evaluations in 2010.

Mr. Minato showed the annual evaluation report booklet containing the summary of the evaluation project conducted annually. It contained several recommendations and the way recommendations had been followed up. There were also reports on evaluation by partner countries.

Next, Mr. Minato talked about the ODA Review Final Report announced in June 2010, which detailed the ways to improve evaluation for strategic and effective aid in three ways; (1) reinforcing ODA evaluation division, (2) strengthening feedback mechanism, and (3) improving accessibility of evaluation result.

Mr. Minato stated three aspects of evaluation needed to be improved; quality of content, neutrality or transparency, and feedback mechanism. Evaluation content quality could be improved by recruiting expert to the head of evaluation division, by revising ODA evaluation guidelines, and by improving capacity of evaluators by developing graduate programs and conducting seminars and trainings programs. He informed that in Japan, the Japan Evaluation Society certified the evaluators.

Mr. Minato then outlined the steps needed to strengthen the neutrality of the evaluation system. In MOFA, the evaluation division should be kept out of International Cooperation Bureau, all evaluations should be done by a third party, and evaluation report should be made easy to understand. Also the advantages and limitations of introducing rating system at the policy level needed to be discussed. To help with transparency, ethics code for evaluators was also being prepared.

With regards to feedback mechanism, Mr. Minato emphasized that evaluation objective should be selected based on policy needs. Also, the evaluation recommendation should reflect on the policy-making process. He further stated for a proper feedback, the recommendation needed to be clear and realistic and its application should be reported in the annual report.

Lastly, Mr. Minato's presented his thoughts on creating synergy between partner and donor countries. He stated capacity development of partner country had a positive effect on different aspects of evaluation. He listed many questions which when answered would lead to better synergistic effects between the two countries. The questions covered a range of topics including creating legal framework in partner countries, other evaluation criteria needed for evaluation, most effective feedback mechanism, benefits of introducing rating system, whether knowledge was transferred through joint evaluation, and so on.

4.2 ODA Evaluation in Maldives

Presentation: Evaluation of Bilateral ODA – A Maldives Perspective

Ms. Khadyja Zahir, Deputy Additional Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Maldives

Ms. Zahir informed that the ODA to Maldives had jumped after 2004 due to aid towards tsunami reconstruction efforts. However, ODA was on decline as tsunami-related projects were now near completion and also because Maldives had graduated from the UN list of least developed countries. She remarked that sector wise, the highest grant was for HRD followed by capacity building, infrastructure, and so on. Also, the grant figure of \$150 million in 2005 was still less when it was distributed to the 190 inhabited islands. Therefore, the government had prioritized islands with larger population and with more developed areas for distribution of ODA. She also informed that until recently, most of the ODA had been supply-driven in areas and projects the donor was interested in; however, from 2011, the government was following a program-based budget which would also lead towards a program-based approach for ODA mobilization and utilization. She further stated this approach was based on strategic action plan of the government.

Ms. Zahir next explained the process of approval of projects in Maldives which involved the National Planning Council (NPC), the Department of National Planning, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Ministry of Finance and Treasury. She then illustrated ODA from Japan to Maldives in the form of grants, technical cooperation, training opportunities, assistance for grass-root human security projects, and food aid.

Comparing bilateral ODA with Japan, Ms. Zahir informed that up until 2004, Japan was the major development partner for Maldives. The most recent and largest projects implemented in the Maldives by Japan included non-project grant aid of 2005 which focused on reconstruction and recovery of tsunami, the 2nd girls secondary school project, and the clean energy project. She remarked that in the past most of the Japanese assistance had been towards infrastructure development.

Ms. Zahir then explained the evaluation mechanism for the ODA projects. Most projects were based on regular consultative meetings. For example, for Non-Project Grant Aid (NPGA) of 2005, Maldives had monthly working group meetings and for 2nd girls secondary school project, it had monthly consultative committee meetings (CCM). There was also a periodic mission from Tokyo and from JICA office in Sri Lanka to conduct progress evaluation. The food aid and clean energy projects also had CCM as well as the sewerage and ground water management project. For volunteers, which were a major component of Japanese assistance, an annual general meeting was held. Also, when the volunteers' term came to an end, they shared their report with stakeholders including the line ministry, the Ministry of Finance, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Ms. Zahir revealed that one reason for Japan's ODA to Maldives being strictly evaluated was because of annual audit missions from Japan which assessed past ODA results and achievements. The auditors gave constructive feedback which the government paid attention to and made sure the issues addressed in the audit missions were immediately resolved. It was also because the mechanism for evaluation had been agreed by the two parties at the signing of the project. She remarked that not many donors did this kind of agreement and mentioned that this agreement was possible because of strong evaluation mechanisms developed by JICA.

Ms. Zahir informed that Maldives had recently developed some evaluation mechanisms because 2011 budget was based on program-based approach. The country had started following the Managing for Development Results concept. Some workshops had already been held to familiarize the stakeholders with the process. She remarked that later, the projects and programs would be monitored through a more standardized mechanism.

Ms. Zahir informed that from 2005 to early 2008, the government of Maldives established a development assistance database with assistance of the United Nations which was used for tracking aids and the disbursements and the progress of projects; however, this project did not continue because of capacity and budgetary constraints. She stated with the change of the administration in November 2008, a database had been established of all ongoing projects under a new program called ISLES. The project and ISLES followed a quarterly reporting mechanism, however, this was also constrained by capacity issues.

She also remarked that in Maldives, there was learning opportunity due to the introduction of new systems like program-based budgeting and strategic action plan evaluation. There were also many challenges like institutional capacity constraints, high staff turnover, and difficulty in teaching newly elected officials about the system. One major issue facing the aid evaluation mechanism was an inconsistent donor reporting mechanism. She remarked that for most projects, only in country mechanisms were used. Giving an example of the inconsistent reporting mechanism, she said that EU had periodic missions for some projects administered

through other donors while for its own project, however, it asked for an independent evaluation at the completion of the project.

She then explained the tsunami assistance program by US which included nine different projects. The US required quarterly reporting of the progress of different components. Ms. Zahir then informed that the Ministry of Environment, Energy, and Water had to produce three different reports every quarter based on different components. She also talked about the periodic missions from Sri Lanka regarding USAID. She remarked that there was a strong working relationship in the project, and so, the executing department had found it easy to follow this particular project.

Lastly, Ms. Zahir informed that India and Australia were the largest partners for capacity building for human resource. However, there was no proper mechanism set to evaluate these projects. The Ministry of Human Resource, Youth, and Sports made reports on the progress of the project on required basis. She stated that Maldives had technical assistance programs with Australia in education sectors the evaluation for which was done at the end of the volunteers' term. She further remarked it was true for UK volunteers as well.

4.3 ODA Evaluation in Sri Lanka

Presentation: Evaluation on Bilateral ODA for Sri Lanka

Ms. Loshani Peiris, Director, Department of External Resources, Ministry of Finance and Planning, Sri Lanka

Ms. Peiris opened her presentation by informing that Sri Lanka had been receiving financial assistance from various donors with Japan in the beginning; however, financing by new partners like Russia and Hungary had recently increased.

She stated that Sri Lanka loans had been for infrastructure development projects, grant assistance had been for basic human needs projects, and technical assistance had been in areas like agriculture, energy, and health. She remarked that Sri Lanka's per capita GDP had increased rapidly through such assistance.

Next, Ms. Peiris informed that the Department of External Resources did evaluation for various reasons such as examining the project's intended benefit to stakeholders, analyzing effectiveness factors in achieving objectives, institutionalizing experiences and lessons learnt, and decision-making on "replicability" of future projects.

Ms. Peiris mentioned that evaluation could identify weaknesses, strengths and traits for future projects. She stated Japanese ODA evaluation was based on five criteria; relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability, and informed that it confirmed with Sri Lanka's national development policies.

She provided a successful example of small-scale infrastructure rehabilitation and upgrading project funded by JICA. The objective of the project was to enhance socioeconomic development in rural and urban areas, specifically reducing poverty, improving access to market, and improving living environment. She informed after the completion of the project, access to safe drinking water improved, traffic volume increased, number of schools increased, and sales outlet of handicrafts increased. Then she introduced Maldives' evaluation of this project by the following five criteria; Relevance-high, Efficiency-fair, Effectiveness-high, Impact-positive, and Sustainability-fair. She also stated there were number of lessons learnt from that project such as appropriateness of the project, need for baseline survey and setting targets, establishing implementation and monitoring structure, and flexibility concerning procurement.

Ms. Peiris provided another example of a rural development project aimed at reducing rural poverty and mitigating regional inequity. Areas were selected on the basis of Personal Health Records (PHR) ratio. She stated the project has been directly beneficial to around 133,000 people. The project was able to overcome delays through proper monitoring. It was in alignment with the development priorities of the region. Loan funds were used for effective construction work and for rehabilitating 465 kilometers of road. She mentioned that at its completion the project had achieved its objectives.

Ms. Peiris then remarked from the project, one could learn that sufficient time was needed to be allocated for design phase, disbursement procedure was needed to be introduced for the last 10% of the loan, and the disbursement procedure also needed to be included in the agreement.

In conclusion, Ms. Peiris stated that Sri Lanka did need continuous support from Japan in the future also because of the high return of the joint projects.

4.4 Discussion and Q&A

Moderator: Mr. Subarna Lal Shrestha, Secretary General, Nepal Evaluation Society, Nepal

After the presentation, Mr. Shrestha opened the floor for discussion, comments, and queries on all the three presentations made.

Question: Do the nontraditional donors like India, China, and Hungary come with a different evaluation culture than the traditional DAC donors and what does that mean to the partner countries?

Answer: Since projects receiving assistance from emerging countries were incomplete, evaluation system, sustainability, and impact of these projects could not be determined.

Question: Regarding country assistance program in Pacific Rim countries, there were issues on alignment. Could JICA tell the process of developing country assistance programs which were aligned to their development plans?

Answer: JICA formulates a country assistance program by aligning it with the partner country's development strategy. First, JICA tries to understand the development direction of the partner country and then formulates the development program. There are many projects within the program which will be evaluated together with the partner country.

Question: In Papua New Guinea, there was a draft country assistance strategy from JICA. What is the time line for JICA for finalizing country assistance strategy for Papua New Guinea and such other countries?

Answer: JICA is now putting increasing importance on aligning its country assistance program strategy with the host country's strategy based on policy dialog between partner country, JICA, and the Japanese government. This increased pressure is due to the decreasing trend of ODA budget and the international trend of aligning and harmonizing joint efforts between two countries.

Question: Will JICA be in a position to play a role in the evaluation of the assistance projects that is coming in from Japanese cities to Fiji?

Answer: If the assistance is directly extended by the Japanese local governments and not through JICA, then JICA will not be involved in the evaluation process. However, if the JICA projects involve components from Japanese local governments, then JICA will get involved in the evaluation process of those components as well.

Question: In Maldives, is it possible to have consistent mechanism for all the development partners and can OECD-DAC or evaluation networks play a role in this regard?

Answer: It will be difficult for Maldives to have a consistent mechanism for all development partners, especially through OECD-DAC because Maldives was not yet a signatory to PD and would be becoming a signatory only in 2011. However, Maldives is making an effort to take ownership of the programs by paying attention to program-based approach and developing monitoring mechanisms, and which the National Planning Council is keen on ensuring the aid to be demand driven. Also, in the past, Maldives Partnership Forum has addressed the needs of the country and established dialog with relevant development partners regarding challenges facing the program implementation. The inconsistency in mechanism will exist for a few more years, especially until the local councils are established.

A participant remarked that at present funding came from many sources for partner countries, some with certain conditions while others without any conditions. Hence, it was important to have an inbuilt evaluation culture because every project had a payback period and when the payback time came, sometimes the projects had yet to achieve its goals.

Question: By doing evaluations, say, of ODA in a particular country for a particular period of time, has JICA been able to measure its success and failure rates and how does it stand?

Answer: In JICA, rating system was used for evaluation focused on project level. By using five evaluation criteria, project evaluation could be standardized. However, in policy evaluation, introducing rating system is difficult since grasping evaluation objective itself is difficult. Country evaluation includes many project in different sectors and measuring the total contribution of the project with regard to macro-level goal is difficult.

Another participant added that JICA conducted project- and program-level evaluation every year throughout the world and rated it at four levels; A, B, C, and D. He informed roughly “A” and “B” rated projects accounted for 80%, while “D” accounted between 5-10%. He further informed JICA did not select specific country, but rather brought results and lessons from evaluations and recommended them to be used with partner countries for improving future decisions.

Question: Was the evaluation of Japanese ODA by Sri Lanka based on evaluation reports done of Japanese aid programs or evaluation reports of a separate evaluation? Has such kind of evaluation been done with other development partners also?

Answer: The evaluation was done by Sri Lankan consultants after 3 years from the completion of the projects. She stated the post, ongoing, and ex-post evaluations were being done for other projects as well, especially ex-post evaluations for ADB, World Bank, and JICA projects.

With respect to Mr. Minato’s presentation, one participant remarked that although the discussion had been about capacity building for evaluation, there was also a different type of capacity, which was the capacity to identify capacity needs. Therefore, the partner countries should look into capacity building for capacity needs identification. Secondly, he remarked that regarding ODA, partner countries needed to be careful that the process was not driven by donor countries. He stated for partner countries to take the lead, they needed to have a certain capacity. However, the partner countries should not forget that the donor countries were also accountable to their stakeholders. He, therefore, suggested that the partner countries needed to build their capacity to take the lead during ODA evaluation before asking the donor country to minimize reporting systems.

Question: To what extent would JICA consider budget support as a modality for issuing ODA?

Answer: Both donor and partner countries have their strengths and weaknesses. The partner country has the strength of local language, project site, and cultural context while donor country has difficulty in identifying indicators for improving organization capacity. Therefore, it is important to use the comparative advantage of donor and partner countries and

build synergy in the partnership for improving capacity. The collaboration should be from the beginning to the end of the evaluation.

With respect to harmonization, one participant commented that Maldives immediately assessed the tsunami effects and developed a national recovery and reconstruction plan. Different development partners were able to access projects from this plan. She informed a separate tsunami reconstruction and recovery fund account was formed. The progress of the projects was tracked through the Development Assistance Database. Regular review meetings were held to discuss the steps and progress of the projects. Standardized systems were developed for tender and aid coordination process. However, there was still incomplete harmonization between the development partners. For instance, an attempt to harmonize the reporting formats for all partners was unsuccessful.

A participant mentioned developing countries had gathered a lot of experiences with donors since ODA started in 1949. Hence, they could develop their own country assistance strategy. However, donors were hesitant to ask the partner countries about this and the partner countries also did not question this seriously within their government. He gave an example of India which was discussing about restricting aids from particular countries due to complicated procedural demands and excess evaluation missions. Therefore, he asked the participants from partner countries whether they had already established a country strategy for receiving aids vis-à-vis donors.

Question: Many donor countries while deciding to reduce ODA were willing to increase OOF (other official flows) for poverty reduction, environmental sustainability, and so on. Did the partner countries welcome OOF in the present situation and would they think of using the same evaluation criteria for OOF as was being used for ODA?

Answer: A participant responded that Vietnam had developed an ODA Strategy Framework to support socioeconomic development plan. He stated the government asked the donors to provide information regarding the fund, their priority sector, the type of fund they were planning to provide in the next 5 years. The government also came up with similar information regarding sector wise requirement of ODA. Then, the donor and the government worked together on the country assistance program. He gave an example of ADB which sent their missions to Vietnam. By working together, they came up with a strategy which included a list of projects to be considered for the next 3 years. He stated the process involved dialog and consultation from both sides which supported the development and implementation of the plan. The participant also informed Vietnam was preparing ODA and less concessional loan strategic framework. Vietnam was facing reduction of ODA, especially from Europe, as it was now a middle-income country. He stated the less concessional loan was one channel. Vietnam also opened its access to the private sector in the form of public-private partnership model. Vietnam was, therefore, working on the mechanism of combining resources between ODA, less concessional loan, and private sector in their development.

A participant remarked in the Philippines the best approach for partnership was to align donor's work with the Philippines' priorities. However, the country assistance strategy did show support and the kind of resources the donor would bring in. He also remarked during financing, the framework of monitoring and financing needed to be relevant as there were many modalities like ODA, OOF, Private Flows (PF), and private investment. Remittance was a much larger component in the Philippines compared to ODA. He informed the new approach of the Philippines was to have a general evaluation framework where the government would evaluate results based on the use of resources from all sources.

A participant stated that India received ODA from select countries which included G8 and some EU members. Also, for India, Japan was the biggest bilateral donor, most of the aid being in the form of Yen loan. He mentioned since the last 2 years, the projects have been based on India's priorities which were guided by 5-year plan. For India, ODA was a small

proportion of the budget and, therefore, it could decline the ODA if the donor country did not base its on India's priority. However, for other partner countries, where ODA constituted a huge part of the budget, whether the donor listened to the partner country's priorities would depend on donor's commitment to PD.

A participant shared that his country had drafted and was finalizing a foreign assistance policy framework which aimed to govern the provisions and management of foreign aids under full national ownership and ensured foreign assistance added value and was complementary to Pakistan's development priorities.

One participant gave an example of a case where Maldives developed a country assistance strategy. She informed Maldives' Donor Conference of March 2010 had produced a country assistance strategy comprising of priority sectors and priority projects within that sector, and NPC on the behest of a large donor had identified local government as the priority. However, the donor decided to go through a multilateral partner into environment sector, which was totally different sector. She also informed since 2007, Maldives had been looking more into PPP and OOF since ODA was expected to decline. However, Maldives was not in a position to evaluate any of these projects because their existed new projects.

Summarizing Session 3, Mr. Shrestha remarked that many important issues were discussed in Session 3 including ODA evaluation aspects, better understanding of ODA and ODA evaluation, and country strategy for development assistance. He felt that a common understanding was that the ODA evaluation should gear towards results needed by the country and country beneficiaries. Therefore, he concluded that the discussion had helped to vitalize synergy between the participants and make ODA and other donor country's assistance more effective and efficient.

-----End of Day 1-----

5. Session 4: Evaluation of the Paris Declaration

5.1 Evaluation of the Paris Declaration

Presentation: Evaluation of the Paris Declaration

Mr. Niels Dabelstein, Head, the Secretariat for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration

Mr. Dabelstein divided his presentation into three parts; the process of joint evaluation of PD the results of phase 1 of the evaluation, and the emerging findings of phase 2.

5.2 Part 1 of Presentation

Mr. Dabelstein stated the evaluation of PD was embedded in the declaration itself. The word "evaluation" had progressed in the past years and the demand for evaluation had increased. He stated monitoring informed the countries of the progress while evaluation gave the reason for this progress and the outcomes of the evaluation.

He outlined the three key evaluation questions relating to PD. The first question dealt with PD in context; second dealt with the process and intermediate outcomes of PD; and the third dealt with development outcomes of PD. He mentioned that these questions, although simple were difficult to answer.

Mr. Dabelstein then stated the definition of joint evaluation as given in PD. He then gave details of the phase 1 and 2 studies of 22 country-level evaluations and 18 donor/agency headquarter studies. He stated most of the DAC-member development partners had participated in the evaluation. Also, in phase 2, 21 countries had participated compared to 7

in phase 1 in country-level evaluation. Indicating the increased value the partner countries attached to the evaluation.

Describing the management structure, Mr. Dabelstein stated PD had an International Reference Group (IRG) comprising of 50 members composed of all participating countries/agencies and CSO representatives. The IRG developed evaluation framework and approved the report quality. He stated a management group was responsible for the conduct of the international part of the evaluation including country and development partner evaluations. Further, the two groups were supported by an evaluation secretariat accountable only to the two groups. Also each country had a national reference group and evaluation coordinator who organized evaluations in the country. There was an independent evaluation team financed partly from trust fund and also local funds. A core evaluation team provided support to the country teams and was working on combining the outcomes and the results of the evaluations.

Mr. Dabelstein informed a high-level team advised on how the evaluation report fit into the policy processes. He stated the country report and the donor study were of high value for the partner countries due to their own assessment of progress on PD principles and their preparations for the Busan HLF. The World Bank and the European Commission have decided not to participate in the evaluation.

Mr. Dabelstein stated at the country level the focus was on the utility of PD as a tool for aid effectiveness and on the change of donor behavior in terms of alignment and their implementation of the five principles of PD. The focus was also on the change of partner country's behavior with ownership as the key element and how the implementation of PD has strengthened the contribution of aid to sustainable development results.

Mr. Dabelstein next stated at the donor level, the changes of donor behavior at country level were measured in the form of policies and strategies by political leadership of donor agencies. After the PD 2005, changes in languages in policies and strategies were seen in many places, though at different paces. The US adopted PD after the Obama administration was established. Mr. Dabelstein stated remarked that delegation of authority to field level was one important factor affecting the implementation of PD by donors. There was a change in incentive system that was focused on aid effectiveness rather than disbursement and delivery.

He mentioned that the design of both in country evaluations and the donor HQ had a common framework, but the donor had freedom to ask questions. He also informed a number of supplementary studies had been conducted, such as on statistical capacity building, on applicability of PD in fragile states and conflict-affected situation, a report on untying of aid, a theoretical paper on PD, Aid Effectiveness, and Development Effectiveness, and another report which looked at funding sources outside of DAC.

Mr. Dabelstein then elaborated the milestones of PD Evaluation. He remarked that in 2006 DAC network prepared on options paper which was the basis for the 1st reference group meeting in March 2007. This was then followed by 2nd, 3rd, and 4th round of reference group meetings. He remarked the independent evaluation team completed the synthesis report of phase 1 in June 2008, that was then used in the preparation of HLF. He stated the evaluation had an effect on the AAA in Accra which marked the completion of phase 1. Then, in December 2009, phase 2 was launched with the 2nd reference group meeting in Paris. He stated in phase 2, a firm framework for evaluation was agreed upon for easier synthesis of the report. Then, the emerging findings of phase 1 came out in December 2010. He then informed 4th reference group meeting would be held in April 2011 to discuss the draft synthesis report, and the phase 2 would get completed in November 2011 with a 4th HLF in Busan.

5.3 Discussion and Q&A on Part 1 of Presentation

Mr. Minato, Co-chair, opened the floor for questions and comments on the first part of the presentation.

Question: Do the members of national stakeholders remain fixed, irrespective of program or sector or change to its configuration?

Answer: Mr. Dabelstein stated the focus should be on the national reference group which is comprised of national stakeholders. He informed the national reference group does not have firm configuration, but is composed of government, donor representatives, CSOs, and academia. He, however, stated the academia had not been represented well in all countries.

One participant remarked that in Vietnam after it participated in phase 1 and 2 of evaluation, the joint evaluation approach improved by giving the partner country ownership in conducting evaluation together with the development area in particular. He also described the country level structure in Vietnam. He stated as national evaluation coordinator, he set up the national reference groups. They then developed the terms of reference to recruit the country evaluation team. The global evaluation team felt the term of reference should be standard and suitable to the country context. When recruiting consultants, evaluation coordinator also went through the national reference group. He stated a feedback workshop was also organized where all the national stakeholders were invited to provide comments for improving the document.

Question: By end of phase 2, what percent of donors and recipient countries participated in the evaluation and what are the reasons for lack of interest on the part of donors like World Bank and the European Commission?

Answer: The reason for only having seven donors in phase 2 was that they were looking at policy and strategy changes and not evaluating donors at the HQ level. The seven participants were those who had missed out on the 1st phase. The World Bank said the set up at national level was not sufficiently independent while the European Commission might have had internal confusion regarding which department should be responsible for evaluation. However, in the country evaluations, their behaviors were being assessed.

Question: Was it the intention of the framework to have all donors join in the evaluation?

Answer: It is too late as the evaluation is almost completed. However, the major donors with the exception of the World Bank and the European Commission are already part of the process.

One participant remarked the head of the independent evaluation group of the World Bank while talking at the Japan's Evaluation Society's 10th anniversary had said in-progress evaluation was more important than ex-post evaluation in today's fast changing world. He mentioned that in-progress evaluation needed higher level of intervention and that such in-progress evaluation was political rather than technical.

Question: What are the presenter's thoughts on real-time evaluation?

Answer: In the evaluation of humanitarian operations, real-time evaluation makes more sense than ex-post evaluation. The phase 2 evaluation is a process and an outcome evaluation simultaneously, but the phase 1 focused only on process evaluation.

One participant did not agree that ex-post evaluation was less important because some of the projects implement through ODA and domestic funding had long-term effects. Mr. Dabelstein replied that ex-post evaluation mattered; however, less attention had been paid on process and mid-term evaluation.

Further in the discussion regarding ex-post and in-progress evaluation, Mr. Dabelstein clarified that it was important to distinguish between project implementation and project evaluation and evaluations of policies, government issues, human rights issues, and so on. He stated PD was only a political statement of intent.

5.4 Part 2 of Presentation

Mr. Dabelstein discussed the key phase 1 findings regarding PD:

- PD was considered a technical issue; however, it was an agenda for political action.
- Perception that PD should be applied; however, PD implementation was contextual.
- PD was a shared agenda with different expectations on its usage.
- Issue of capacity and confidence in the national system.
- Monitoring indicators were criticized. Statistician claimed same indicators were needed for comparison with 2011 monitoring exercise.
- Issue needed to treat “transaction costs” seriously.
- PD was perceived as prescriptive for countries and less for donors.
- Known to central levels, but less so in implementing agencies; however, PD was about behavioral change at all levels of implementation of aid programs.
- Different perceptions on transaction costs and benefits. Some quarters perceived transaction cost of implementing PD too high without looking at the benefits. Transaction costs could be looked as a future investment.
- PD was not an answer to development issues and policy themes like climate change. It was about aid and development effectiveness and about contributing to MDGs.
- Faster movement from rhetoric to action needed for PD to retain its credibility.

5.5 Discussion and Q&A on Part 2 of Presentation

Mr. Minato next opened the floor for questions and comments on the second part of the presentation.

Question: Is there an objective way to measure main commitments of PD like alignment of procurement policies?

Answer: There is no objective measure of the commitments, but there are distinct observations made. In many countries, the ministers for development are talking about PD declaration. Alignment with policies progressed further compared to alignment with country systems for many reasons. As an example, ADB does its own procurement due to legislative reasons. Hence, sometimes hard decisions are needed to implement the principles.

Question: How is transaction cost defined?

Answer: There is no clear answer to it. The expenses connected with implementation of PD should be considered as an investment into the future. It is also impossible to measure the benefit of cost.

5.6 Part 3 of Presentation

Mr. Dabelstein informed the emerging findings of phase 2 evaluation were gathered from the early drafts of country reports and donor studies. Stating the context of the findings, he said that aid effectiveness reform was influenced by particular and changing contexts as well as many different features. He then explained the 11 goals of PD:

- PD had minor to moderate effects in strengthening national strategies. However, there were other influences in the national strategy like new donors, financial crisis, etc.
- PD has had moderate effect in increasing alignment.

- PD has had moderate effect in advancing towards defined performance standards in country.
- PD has had minor effect in reducing duplication of efforts.
- PD has had minor to moderate effects in reforming and simplifying donor policies and procedures.
- PD has had minor effect in leading to multi-year and more predictable commitments.
- Some progress in sufficient delegation of authority, particularly in donors. It proved correct in phase 1 that the single-most important factor influencing donors' change of behavior was delegation of the authority to locals.
- PD has had contradictory findings in integrating global programs in broader development agendas.
- PD has had moderate to minor effects in promoting the use of results-driven strategies, policies, and programs.
- Some progress on accountability structures and engagements with civil society. PD had minor effect on enhancing Parliament and citizen accountability.
- Insufficient information to assess the effects of PD on reducing corruption and encouraging more transparency.

Mr. Dabelstein stated the evaluation had also looked at specific sectors for better results in terms of development outcomes. It was found that PD had reinforced processes especially in the health sector. Regarding improving prioritization of the needs of poorest people, Mr. Dabelstein mentioned a shift to a program-based approach and advances in gender issues could be linked to PD.

Mr. Dabelstein then stated there were contradictory findings in sustainable increases in institutional capacities and in social capital. There had been an increase in social capital as donor supported civil society and civil society was a donor priority. Due to lack of strategy, little progress had been made on improving institutional capacity. He also remarked that decentralization had compromised some of the gains in institutional capacity at some level.

In conclusion, Mr. Dabelstein talked about the evolution of mix aid modalities. He stated PD did not advocate one single aid modality. However, in some parts, budget support was perceived as the only correct form of development assistance. He remarked that a shift in modalities and PD had raised awareness by initiating a debate about it. He remarked that there was a value in having a variety of modalities, but the right mix was dependent on the context.

5.7 Discussion and Q&A on Part 3 of Presentation

Mr. Minato opened the floor for questions and comments on the last part of the presentation.

Question: Can the differences between different surveys be clarified further?

Answer: Monitoring survey and evaluation are two different exercises, but are complementary to each. All countries participating in evaluation are also participating in monitoring exercises. Monitoring survey tracks progress against 56 selected indicators while evaluation assesses the outcomes. Also, monitoring survey has distinct indicators and are quantifiable whereas evaluations dependent on qualitative indicators and interviews rather than hard facts.

One participant stated ex-post and progress are both relevant. He gave an example of Afghanistan where in a UNDP-funded irrigation project; the money was spent on retaining walls that were politically popular. He remarked that in that case an in-progress evaluation would have found the flaw.

Question: At what level is the countries signatory to PD? Why are the requirements made by the donors to the partner countries which are not made mandatory?

Answer: Since the signatory countries committed themselves to increasing accountability to citizens and parliament, it is the responsibility of the individual government. Donors can support such activities, but they cannot dictate them. Governance issues are sensitive areas, and some donors have been using that as conditionalities.

Question: Regarding enhancement of accountability, some countries are more advanced in evaluation and the involvement of Parliament should be encouraged. Can Mr. Cuong give details regarding the involvement of Parliament in Vietnam in evaluation mechanism?

Answer: Mr. Cuong replied that Vietnam had started engaging the parliament only 1 year ago when aid effectiveness structure was renewed. He stated Vietnam felt it was important to integrate aid effectiveness into development effectiveness by creating a new national aid structure that actively involved all stakeholders including partnership group, the National Assembly, and the CSOs. It then prepared and setup the core aid effectiveness forum which helped in the policy dialog between the government, development partners, and other stakeholders. He informed in phase 2 of the Evaluation, it involved the parliament from the beginning of the evaluation and also later on during report sending and feedback workshop. He also remarked that the National Assembly was presently active in the work as they felt it was important.

Question: How does the monitoring survey and the evaluation link together? How did the evaluation process go and why did Mongolia not participate in the process?

Answer: Evaluation is deeper than monitoring surveys and takes place in 22 countries. These countries have voluntarily participated by accepting the invitation that was sent out after the Accra meeting. There were limitations in the way of invitation for evaluation. However, he stated, the 22 countries represented a wide variety with highly aid dependent to non-dependent countries.

A participant added that monitoring survey was a tool for monitoring the 12 indicators while the evaluation was an independent exercise. He said that there would be a progress report to Busan where evidence would be drawn from the monitoring survey as well as the evaluation report regarding their achievements and failures. He remarked there were few international agreements and conventions that had defined indicators, targets, and M&E processes.

Question: Is there any mechanism that PD headquarter can evaluate joint evaluation report made jointly by concerned recipient and donor countries?

Answer: The overall evaluation was made jointly, but the individual country evaluations was led and managed by reference group comprising of major stakeholders. The core evaluation team which is an independent team has done the quality assurance on the country report and has fed their comments back to the country coordinator and the country evaluation team. Also, those comments have been made available to the national reference groups as well.

Question: What is the estimation on what will happen after Busan?

Answer: There was no way to predict what will happen in Busan. The process has just started and the agenda was not known yet. The executive committee will discuss the proposals in March and the Working Party will then make a decision in July.

One Participant replied the declaration would be evidence-based as participants of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness preparing for Busan wanted to base their discussions and future agreement on the results that were achieved or not achieved.

Question: Is there a timeframe by which all participating countries should be in full compliance of all the five principles of PD? What happens if a signatory country does not want to comply with PD?

Answer: PD expired on the 23rd of December 2010. The commitments were made to targets by 2010 and that was being evaluated and monitored. In Busan, they will then outline the next step as the targets have not been reached. There are no sanctions other than peer pressure.

Question: Who will draft the action plan needed in the future PD framework?

Answer: The follow up on evaluation is at two or three levels. Individual countries and donors who do their own study are using it to improve their performance on the PD. However, at the international level, the evaluation report and recommendations are being submitted to the HLF, and it is up to HLF to decide on the way forward.

Question: Is it correct that the synthesis report includes the recommendations?

Answer: The report will contain recommendations. However, it is important to see the concrete findings and the conclusions that can be drawn from that finding. Evaluators feel only conclusion should be provided for the decision-makers. However, giving recommendations will give the decision makers issues to discuss.

Question: Will the final output of this evaluation come with recommendations that can be solutions or actions that donor countries and partner countries should implement after post PD?

Answer: If it is possible, there will be recommendations based on the conclusions. However, it is up to the HLF and the partner and donor countries to work out what to do with the recommendations.

One participant informed that under Working Party on Aid Effectiveness, there were five clusters with M&E as one. Also, the pilot countries selected under each clusters gave actual evidence of their respective situations. He said based on a draft outcome paper would be developed in Busan where the commitments and the actions to be taken beyond Busan would be marked out.

One participant felt that the monitoring and evaluation surveys conducted by PD secretariat were useful. He felt it was an honest judgment of the possible conclusions of the surveys. He reiterated that the conclusion had found minor effects in about 10 goals and moderate to substantive effects in 3 goals, which meant lots of work still needed to be done in the future. He also wished the recommendations be realistic and reflect the changes in framework of PD, not just in principles, but also in application due to different stage of economic and social development of the country concerned.

Question: It seems like one committee is going to be influential with regard to preparation of the papers for Busan meeting, compilation of the report and the recommendations, if any. Who are the members of this committee that will put together this paper?

Answer: The evaluation and synthesis are done in each country by independent and highly qualified professional team. The evaluation report will be presented in a meeting in the Pacific Forum in July 2011 as part of the presentations of Pacific regions' preparations for the high level forum. It is important that the members actively disseminate the report to their peers or their colleagues who have not participated in the evaluation, and who will benefit from the synthesis report.

Mr. Minato briefly summarized Mr. Dabelstein's presentation stating that it was very informative. He stated Mr. Dabelstein introduced key findings of phase 1 and 2 evaluation. The key findings basically outlined the effects the PD has had with regard to the goals and he remarked that some goals had been minorly affected, others had been moderately affected, while still others had no or contradictory effect. .

6. Session 5: Roles of Evaluation Network for Capacity Building

6.1 Updates on Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association Network

Presentation: Updates on Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association Network

Ryokichi Hirono, Professor Emeritus, Seikei University, Senior Advisor, Japan Evaluation Society, Japan

Prof. Hirono started his presentation by giving a brief background about Japan Evaluation Society (JES) which was established in 2001. Next, Prof. Hirono explained the elements such as professionalism that were required to develop a good evaluation society. Further, all stakeholders were needed to be involved in evaluation, including professionals, administrators, and local government.

Prof. Hirono also stressed the importance of dialog with the government because government set rules in the society as well as national and guidelines on various things including evaluation. International communities were also engaged in setting certain standards. Next, Prof. Hirono stressed to make evaluation into something that was shared broadly in the society, a culture of evaluation had yet to be developed. He stated in Japan, JES had tried to build this culture by working with educational institutes at all levels.

Prof. Hirono informed one of JES' missions was to train the evaluators because evaluators came from different fields of work. He stated two things were needed for training, principle and flexibility. He also felt that journal publication was important to disseminate information regarding the work and as an instrument to attract attention of other people and make them interested in evaluation. Prof. Hirono mentioned JES wanted to be practical in its methodology and concept, and hence, it had engaged in number of evaluation missions in partner countries to the evaluation activities of partner countries.

On the need to have a regional evaluation network, Prof. Hirono remarked that while there were evaluation societies in other parts of the world, there were none in Asia. Through the past ODA evaluation workshops, necessity of establishing the Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association Network (APEA-NET) have been repeatedly expressed by the participants of the region. He did acknowledge the tremendous support from many national governments as well as evaluation societies of South Asian countries to this date. Hence, he remarked the preparatory committee was exploring the drafting of the constitution as well as organization structure and program work of the evaluation network.

Prof. Hirono stated in the workshop he came across many comments and questions that he felt should also be addressed in the APEA-NET, especially the network having an Asian perspective. He informed in his extensive involvement with international organization, it was discovered that those organizations were based upon European or American concepts. Although western concepts were good and universal, he, however, felt an Asian perspective was needed. This view was also supported by some of the international organizations.

He emphasized an Asian evaluation society network would provide additional channels into the evaluation as well as into development agenda. Therefore, it was vital for Asians to come together and find a perspective that was relevant from their own cultural context as well that would be the basis for dialog with other partners around the world. He mentioned in the past, having an international outlook meant having a western outlook; however, he wished for an Asian international outlook, so that Asian network of evaluation society could also contribute to the international concept of evaluation. For this, he listed certain points.

- APEA-NET would be open to all countries in Asia. They could be a part of it as a society or as an individual. Also APEA-NET wants all Asian and Pacific island countries to be involved in setting up national evaluation society.

- Existing evaluation societies in Asia may help other countries in setting up their national evaluation society wherever nonexistent and also help strengthen their evaluation activities in the future.
- OECD-DAC was at the forefront of inviting emerging countries to look into the possibility of having international role in ODA and other development programs and evaluations. Hence, it was important to have emerging countries from Asia get involved in this process.
- International organizations such as IDEAS, IOCE, World Bank, ADB, and OECD were engaged in promoting evaluation from their own perspective, and they were interested in the formation of APEA-NET. It was also important for Asian evaluation societies to have close relationship with these organizations to improve evaluation activities in Asian region.

Hence, Prof. Hirono remarked it was an opportune time for Asia to have this association and implement principles, concepts, methodology, and other things crucial to evaluation so that Asia could contribute to international evaluation community in the future.

6.2 Discussion and Q&A

Mr. Cuong, Co-chair summarized Prof. Hirono's presentation. There were many countries in Asia-Pacific region having evaluation societies like Malaysia, India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and so on. Therefore, creating a network among the different societies in Asia-Pacific region would be useful in supporting each other and creating a synergistic effort in promoting the evaluation culture in the region. Mr. Cuong liked Prof. Hirono's idea about creating an Asian outlook in evaluation. He remarked Prof. Hirono stated the idea of setting the evaluation network had been discussed for quite long time and hence it was right time to think about specific steps in setting up APEA-NET after the workshop.

Mr. Cuong then opened the floor for comments and questions.

A participant informed the Sri Lankan Evaluation Association was having its annual convention in April, and he formally invited all other countries to send their representatives for the convention. If the participants were interested in making presentation, then that opportunity would also be provided. He also informed about international workshops that would be held after the convention. He noted this information would be disseminated to all member countries. He further stated the convention would provide a good opportunity to discuss about Asia-Pacific Evaluation Network and build a consensus with some of the current issues at hand. He felt the convention could be used as a starting point to get the message to all the countries. He wanted to know from Prof. Hirono the tentative dates of establishing APEA-NET and the expectations Prof. Hirono had from member countries on what role they would be required to play.

One participant informed about Nepal Evaluation Society (NES). He stated NES was established with the objective of strengthening evaluation system in Nepal, and it focused basically on developing cultural aspect, commitment aspect, and capacity aspect of the evaluation system. He also informed NES was an independent, non-profit-making organization. He agreed with Prof. Hirono that the establishment of APEA-NET would help strengthen evaluation system in developing countries in Asia-Pacific region as well as give a strong message to developing countries outside of Asia-Pacific region.

Another participant remarked that from the government's perspective, establishing an Asia-Pacific evaluation society network was a good idea. He stated from a small island's perspective, the network could play a crucial role in decision making from within the government. He further stated such a body needed to have independence and neutrality, and

the respective governments needed to agree and work on this aspect. For this, he felt that each participant needed to take the issue further and to make sure to include it in their country strategies. He, therefore, proposed that with the help of JICA another workshop be held specifically to discuss the details of such an organization. He, however, commented that he was aware of the Sri Lankan colleague's suggestion about further promoting the discussion on APEA-NET in the Sri Lankan convention, but he felt such a convention would derail the agenda they already had or would not assist in achieving the goal in the allotted time frame. Hence, he suggested a special gathering to discuss specifically on APEA-NET. He felt the representative of all evaluation societies present as well as Prof. Hirono with his vast experience would provide information to assist in setting up the APEA-NET organization.

A participant commented that creating such a network would help in sharing knowledge from experienced society to the newly established ones since new society would lack requisite experience of conducting evaluation, especially related to methodology and concept. He also felt that such a network could then come out with common practices in evaluation area.

Question: Is somebody from the evaluation society invited to get involved in the country's evaluation process? How is this kind of independent body operated?

Answer: One participant gave the Sri Lankan perspective. He informed during inception of the Sri Lankan Evaluation Association in 2002, the government gave initial support in the form of funding to setup, initiate, and start up the association. However, at present, the association was self-sustainable by having an annual subscription from the members. He also stated the association got some support irregularly from international organizations and donors. Furthermore, by conducting workshops, the association had also been able to increase their respective incomes.

One participant replied there was no limitation in having government representative in the evaluation society. He stated in Vietnam, the government officers could join the society if they considered evaluation as a profession. He agreed with Prof. Hirono that the society needed to represent all the stakeholders.

Question: Can we have more information on what is involved and how we are going to be involved in the network?

Answer: Prof. Hirono informed a preparatory committee would engage in what should be discussed for presentation amongst the member countries as well as to the governments who were interested in supporting the network. He explained there were several issues regarding the establishment of network such as the kind of program that the network would engage in. He stated the network would basically reinforce the national evaluation societies' program. He hoped that all the stakeholders get involved in setting up the network within each country, and it was the responsibility of each country to give good leadership not only to the establishment of the association, but also to the future work program of the association. He also felt it was important to build relation with evaluation society of other countries around the world as well as with international organizations to be able to exchange views and experiences and gather some financial assistance which may be needed in the initial period. He hoped that people interested in evaluation from all sectors would give their full support in setting up evaluation society network in Asia. He then announced that they would be meeting in the lobby after the last session of this workshop, and anybody who was interested in setting up the APEA-NET was welcome to participate.

A participant stated that in the preceding discussion everybody had supported the initiative because of its usefulness, and he felt that they would have to work on which country would volunteer in the network and also on setting up a committee to study and develop a charter and ways to take the issue forward.

Question: Will the setting up of APEA-NET be under ODA Workshop or under separate mechanism? I feel APEA-NET should not be under ODA Workshop agenda since it is not clarified whether some society is aligned to the government or operates on its own.

Answer: Prof. Hirono replied that they were interested in evaluation of development. He stated much of the development took place from the country's national finance and ODA was only a small portion. He remarked that looking into the local government's development was a much broader concept and did not have much relation with the ODA. Therefore, the approach to the framework on evaluation of development was important so that evaluation of development would be more efficient and effective.

Question: Should Asian evaluation society focus on development? Evaluation penetrates all ways of life, and if you can broaden that scope, you would have a broader audience for such an association.

Answer: Prof. Hirono replied that the concept of development was different between West and East societies. He stated development in Buddhism meant development of soul or humanity, and humanity covered the entire range of activity. Therefore, development covered not only physical development, but the entire range of human activity.

7. Closing Session: Co-Chairs' Summary and Closing Remarks

Mr. Cuong, Co-chair, read out a draft of the Co-chairs' summary with the main themes emerged from the two-day discussions.

Mr. Minato, Co-chair, announced that the final version of the summary would be on the workshop record which would be formally published and distributed in March by MOFA. He mentioned he was deeply impressed by the active participation and the discussion during the workshop. He thanked the participants and sincerely hoped for a positive impact of the present and the past workshops. He then formally announced the closure of the workshop.

Appendix 1: Program

Feb 23 rd (Wed) <<All events take place in Hanoi Daewoo Hotel.>>	
	Participants arrive at Hanoi
Feb 24 th (Thurs)	
08:30– 09:00–09:30	<p>Registration at “GARDENIA” on Lobby Level</p> <p>Opening Session</p> <p>(1) Welcome & Introduction by Co-chairs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mr. Naonobu Minato, Director, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Japan – Mr. Cao Manh Cuong, Deputy Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Dept., Ministry of Planning & Investment (MPI), Viet Nam <p>(2) Welcome & Opening Remarks by Co-hosts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mr. Hiroki Owaki, Deputy Director-General, International Cooperation Bureau, MOFA, Japan – Dr. Ho Quang Minh, Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Department, MPI, Viet Nam – Mr. Atsushi Sasaki, Director General, Evaluation Department, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) <p>(3) Announcements</p>
09:30–11:00	<p>Round Table Discussions</p> <p>Session 1 Case Studies of Joint Evaluation</p> <p>– moderated by Prof. Emeritus Ryokichi Hirono, Seikei University and Senior Advisor, Japan Evaluation Society</p> <p>(1) Joint Evaluation by Viet Nam & Japan</p> <p>by Mr. Cao Manh Cuong, Deputy Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Department, MPI, Viet Nam</p> <p>(2) Joint Evaluation by the Philippines & Japan</p> <p>by Mr. Rolando Gumia Tungpalan, Deputy Director-General, National Economic and Development Authority, The Philippines</p> <p>(3) Discussion</p>
11:00–11:15	Coffee Break
11:15–12:45	<p>Session 2 Capacity Building for Evaluation</p> <p>– moderated by Mr. Hashim Kabir, Member of Parliament, Sri Lanka and Member of Sri Lanka Evaluation Association</p> <p>(1) Efforts by Nepal</p> <p>by Mr. Lokdarshan Regmi, Joint Secretary, Monitoring & Evaluation Division, Ministry of Finance, Nepal</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><continued></p>

	<p>(2) Efforts by International Organizations by Mr. Hans Erik Lundgren, Manager, OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation</p> <p>(3) Discussion</p>
12:45–14:00	Lunch at “La Paix”
14:00–16:00	<p>Session 3 Evaluation on Bilateral ODA –moderated by Mr. Subarna Lal Shrestha, Secretary General, Nepal Evaluation Society</p> <p>(1) ODA Evaluation in Japan by Mr. Naonobu Minato, Director, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau, MOFA, Japan</p> <p>(2) ODA Evaluation in Maldives by Ms. Khadyja Zahir, Deputy Additional Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Maldives</p> <p>(3) ODA Evaluation in Sri Lanka by Ms. Loshani Peiris, Director, Department of External Resources, Ministry of Finance and Planning, Sri Lanka</p> <p>(4) Discussion</p>
16:00–16:15	Miscellanies & Closing of Day 1
18:00–20:00	Dinner Reception at “La Paix”
Feb 25 (Fri)	
09:00–10:30	<p>Session 4 Evaluation of the Paris Declaration –moderated by Mr. Minato, Co-chair</p> <p>(1) Evaluation of the Paris Declaration by Mr. Niels Dabelstein, Head, the Secretariat for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration</p> <p>(2) Q&A</p>
10:30–11:30	<p>Session 5 Roles of Evaluation Network for Capacity Building –moderated by Mr. Cuong, Co-chair</p> <p>(1) Updates on Asia Pacific Evaluation Association Network by Professor Emeritus Ryokichi Hirono, Seikei University and Senior Advisor, Japan Evaluation Society</p> <p>(2) Discussion</p>
11:30–11:45	<p>Closing Session Co-chairs’ Summary Closing Remarks</p>
12:00–13:30	Lunch at “La Paix”

Appendix 2: List of Participants

Co-Chairs

(Presenter: Name / Moderator: Name*)

Country	Organization	Title	Name
Japan	ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Director	<u>Mr. Naonobu MINATO</u>
Vietnam	Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment	Deputy Director General	<u>Mr. Cao Manh CUONG</u>

Partners

Country	Organization	Title	Name
Bangladesh	Japan Branch, Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance	Senior Assistant Chief	Mr. Md. Saiful ISLAM
Bhutan	Development Cooperation Division, Gross National Happiness Commission	Programme Coordinator	Ms. Lekema DORJI
Cambodia	Multilateral and UN Agencies Department, Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board, Council for the Development of Cambodia	Acting Director	Mr. Nak OUL
China	Department of International Trade & Economic Affairs, Ministry of Commerce	First Secretary	Ms. Yu LUO
Fiji	Ministry of Foreign Affairs & International Cooperation	Acting Director Development Cooperation	Mr. Penijamini R Tuikubulau LOMALOMA
India	Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance	Director	Mr. Surendrakumar BAGDE
Lao	International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment	Director of Division	Mr. Sysomphom PHETDAOHEUANG
Malaysia	International Unit, Corporate Services & International Section, Economic Planning Unit, Prime-Minister's Department	Deputy Director	Ms. Hidah Binti MISRAN
Maldives	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Deputy Additional Secretary	<u>Ms. Khadyja ZAHIR</u>
	Ministry of Finance and Treasury	Director	Ms. Aminath NASHIA
Micronesia	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Deputy Assistant Secretary, Asian and African Affairs	Mr. Brendy H. CARL
Mongolia	Department of Development Financing and Cooperation, Ministry of Finance	Senior Officer, Head of Aid Effectiveness and Data Management Team	Mr. Tuguldur BAAJIKHUU
Myanmar	Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development	Deputy Director	Mr. Khin Maung HTAY
Nepal	Monitoring and Evaluation Division, Ministry of Finance	Joint Secretary	<u>Mr. Lokdarshan REGMI</u>
	Ministry of Finance	Under Secretary	Mr. Abi Nath RAI
	Nepal Evaluation Society	Secretary General	Mr. Subarna Lal SHRESTHA*
Pakistan	Economic Affairs Division, Ministry of Economic Affairs & Statistics	Deputy Secretary	Mr. Mumtaz Hussain SHAH
Papua New Guinea	Department of National Planning & Monitoring	Assistant Secretary	Mr. Pero Lawrence DUGUMAN
Philippines	National Economic and Development Authority	Deputy Director-General	<u>Mr. Rolando Gumia TUNGPALAN</u>
	National Economic and Development Authority	Director, Project Monitoring Staff	Mr. Roderick Mari PLANTA
Samoa	Ministry of Finance	Deputy CEO-Policy Management	Mr. Sealiimalietoa Melepone ISARA
Sri Lanka	Department of External Resources, Ministry of Finance and Planning	Director	<u>Ms. Loshani Umayangani PEIRIS</u>
	Department of Foreign Aid & Budget Monitoring, Ministry of Finance and Planning	Director	Mr. Kattri Arachchige Don Kumaradasa SIRIWARDANA
	Sri Lanka Evaluation Society	Member of Parliament, Consultant, Economist	Mr. Kabir HASHIM*
Thailand	Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency	Development Cooperation Officer	Mrs. Charintip YOSTHASAN
Timor-Leste	Ministry of Planning and Finance	Data Entry Officer	Mr. Gaudencio SOARES DE DEUS

International Organizations

(Presenter: Name / Moderator: Name*)

Organization		Title	Name
Asian Development Bank	Independent Evaluation Department	Senior Evaluation Specialist	Mr. Marco GATTI
OECD/DAC	Network on Development Evaluation	Manager	Mr. Hans Erik LUNDGREN
Evaluation of the Paris Declaration	Secretariat	Head	Mr. Niels DABELSTEIN

Co-hosts

Country	Organization	Title	Name
Japan	International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Deputy Director-General	Mr. Hiroki OWAKI
	ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Officer	Ms. Keiko MIURA
	Embassy of Japan to Viet Nam	Advisor for Economic Affairs	Mr. Akihiko NAKANO
	Evaluation Department, Japan International Cooperation Agency	Director General	Mr. Atsushi SASAKI
	Vietnam Office, Japan International Cooperation Agency	Chief Representative	Mr. Motonori TSUNO
	Vietnam Office, Japan International Cooperation Agency	Senior Representative	Mr. Masaei MATSUNAGA
	Vietnam Office, Japan International Cooperation Agency	Senior Aid Coordination Advisor	Mr. Tsutomu UCHIDA
	Vietnam Office, Japan International Cooperation Agency	Administrative Officer	Ms. Reiko KINJYO
	Japan Evaluation Society	Senior Advisor	Prof. Ryokichi HIRONO*
	Seikei University	Professor Emeritus	
	Overseas Project Department, OPMAC Corporation	General Manager	Mr. Keishi MIYAZAKI
	International Development Associates Ltd.	Senior Consultant	Ms. Takako HARAGUCHI
	Convention Linkage, Inc.	Meeting Planner	Ms. Megumi TAKATA
	Convention Linkage, Inc.	Meeting Planner	Mr. Fumiro IIRI
Vietnam	Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment	Director General	Dr. Ho Quang MINH
	Supervision and Appraisal Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment	Director General	Mr. Nguyen Xuan TU
	Supervision and Appraisal Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment	Deputy Director General	Ms. Nguyen Thanh HUONG
	Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment	Head of General Division	Mr. Bui Quang VU
	Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment	Head of Japan Division	Mr. Nguyen Hoang LINH
	Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment	Expert, Japan Division	Ms. Nguyen Thu HIEN
	Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment	Senior Expert	Mr. Cao Thanh PHU
	Supervision and Appraisal Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment	Expert	Mr. Do Xuan NAM
	Planning and Investment Department, Ministry of Transport	Senior Expert	Mr. Nguyen Ngoc HAI

Appendix 3: List of Abbreviations

AAA: Accra Agenda for Action
ADB: Asian Development Bank
APEA-NET: Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association Network
AusAID: the Australian Agency for International Development
CCM: Consultative Committee Meetings
CSO: Civil Society Organization
DAC: Development Assistance Committee
HCS: Hanoi Core Statement
HLF: High Level Forum
HRD: Human Resource Development
IDEAS: International Development Evaluation Associations
IOCE: International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation
IFAD: International Fund for Agricultural Development
JES: Japan Evaluation Society
JICA: Japan International Cooperation Agency
JBIC: Japan Bank for International Cooperation
LGUs: Local Government Units
M&E: Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs: Millennium Development Goals
MFDR: Managing for Development Result
MOFA: Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MOU: Memorandum of Understanding
MOV: Means of Verification
MPI: Ministry of Planning & Investment
NDAC: National Development Action Committee
NEDA: National Economic Development Authority
NES: Nepal Evaluation Society
NPC: National Planning Council
NPGA: Non-Project Grant Aid
ODA: Official Development Assistance
OOF: Other Official Flows
OVI: Objectively Verifiable Indicators
PD: the Paris Declaration
PDCA: Plan-Do-Check-Act

PF: Private Flows

PHR: Personal Health Records

PMASS: Poverty Monitoring and Analysis System

PPP: Public-Private Partnership

TESA: Teaching Evaluation in South Asia

UNDP: UN Development Program

USAID: United States Agency for International Development