

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, 2010, 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. 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 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.